

MPLS Grand Slam Club

December 30, 2011

Team-of-Two-Pairs Mentoring Game



Mike Cassel, Newsletter Coordinator, mc2mikec@aol.com

19 teams played in the first ever MGSC Team-of-Two-Pairs Mentoring game at the TCBC. Team members sat the same direction and played the same hands against the same teams in both 9.5 table sections which included a NS rover (bumping team). We were most fortunate to have almost exactly as many 499ers and life masters so that our director, Tony Ames, could efficiently balance the field. A very successful potluck party and event.

Travelers and individual scores are available at <http://clubresults.acbl.org/Results/101691/2011/12/111230E.HTM>

Team of Two Pairs Holiday Party					Friday Eve Session December 30, 2011	
Scores after 8 rounds Average:					168.0	North-South
Pair	Team Pct	Score	Rank	O/A	MPs	
8	60.12	202.00	1	1	1.90 (O)	Judy Nassar - David Neiman Shelly Husebo - Don Gray
3	59.70	200.57	2	2	1.43 (O)	Steven Gaynor - Jean Boettcher Andrew Yeckel - Keith Thompson
1	53.57	180.00	3	4/6	0.62 (O)	Judy Schwarz - Phil Schwarz James Holm - Michael Holm
2	53.40	179.43	4		0.35 (S)	Richard Lawson - Andy Caranicas Gary Smith - Eunice Smith
6	50.32	169.15				Gregg Van Dyke - Judy Malcomson Marylou Doerrie - Carol Ann Paulson
9	48.64	163.43				John Crouch - Mary Brown Dorothy Hardon - Kamal Amin
7	47.62	160.00				Marsha Devine - Marian Plummer Joe Ambrose - Ingrid Stocking
4	46.26	155.43				Linda Brammer - Sherry Hansen Larry McIntyre - Peter Dean
5	44.22	148.57				Peg Mitchell - Phyllis Anderson Denise Scroggins - Robert Scroggins
10	34.19	114.86				Michael Cassel II - Carol Rynders Mary McIntyre - Peter Solberg
Scores after 8 rounds Average:					168.0	East-West
Pair	Pct	Score	Rank	O/A	MPs	
1	53.72	180.50	1	3	1.07 (O)	Stephen Jackson - Susan Jackson David Gronbeck - Gary Rowland
4	53.57	180.00	2	4/6	0.60 (O)	Donald Prierwert - Liz Hughes James Essex - Tom Juntunen
9	53.57	180.00	3	4/6	0.60 (O)	Kerry Holloway - Peggy Kaplan Mary Duffy - Matthew Duffy
5	53.13	178.50	4		0.35 (S)	Paul Gutterman - Eric Hendrickson Nita Fronk - John Doty
8	52.38	176.00				Diane Henson - Larry Henson Pat Smith - Scott Smith
7	50.15	168.50				Glen Meeden - Nancy Meeden Marcia Eaton - Morris Eaton
3	45.24	152.00				Paul Winter - Paul Meerschaert Sally Degner - Nadia Smith-Hennessy
6	44.50	149.50				Mark Krusemeyer - John Minton Mariana Shulstad - R Craig Shulstad
2	43.75	147.00				Erwin Heisler - James Higgins Betty Salber - Madeleine Kaye

Highlights from the Team-of Two Pairs Game

Congratulations to **Judy, Dave, Shelly and Don**, and **Steve, Jean, Andrew and Keith** who distanced themselves from the rest of the field by more than 1½ boards with 60% games. Team scores were the aggregate of each pair's matchpoint scores in their section. The EW scores were very tightly bunched. EW teams were somewhat disadvantaged as NS had a distinct advantage in the balance of hcp power and thus, the final contracts. The travelers for each hand separate the scores from each section, so that you can easily see the different contracts and results by section. The top individual pair score was Andrew Yeckel and Keith Thompson with 107.43 (64%). Top individual pair score in Section A was Judy and Dave with 99.5 (59%). All but three NS scores were factored due to the rover. The 'adjust' column on the ACBL website shows your teammates' matchpoints and the 'score' column is the sum of your team's matchpoints.

The MGSC has two more mentoring games scheduled this year at the TCBC in March including a second team-of two-pairs game on March 23. With some members in Memphis a good turnout by others will be most helpful.

Fighting for part scores is the essence of matchpoint play.


Board 8
West Deals
None Vul

♠ 7 2
♥ 8 6 5 2
♦ A K 9 8
♣ Q 9 2

♠ K 6 4 3
♥ A 10 3
♦ J
♣ 10 8 7 6 3

♠ 10 9 8 5
♥ K Q 9 7 4
♦ Q 3
♣ A J

♠ A Q J
♥ J
♦ 10 7 6 5 4 2
♣ K 5 4



	Contract Scores		Matchpoints		Pair
	N-SE-W	N-S	N-S	E-W	
4 ♠ W	50	6.50	0.50	A7-	
3 ♥ E	50	6.50	0.50	A9-	
2 ♠ E	110	5.00	2.00	A8-	
3 ♥ E	140	2.00	5.00	A1-	
2 ♥ E	140	2.00	5.00	A3-	
2 ♠ W	140	2.00	5.00	A5-	
3 ♠ E	140	2.00	5.00	A6-	
3 ♠ W	140	2.00	5.00	A10-	
3 ♦ S	130	5.50	1.50	B3-	
4 ♦ N	130	5.50	1.50	B5-	
4 ♦ S	130	5.50	1.50	B8-	
4 ♦ S	130	5.50	1.50	B9-	
3 ♥ E	100	3.00	4.00	B1-	
3 ♥ E	50	2.00	5.00	B7-	
2 ♥ E	140	1.00	6.00	B10-	
3 ♥ E	170	0.00	7.00	B6-	

NS can make 4♦ but no pairs found that strain in the 'stronger' section. ½ the N/S pairs in the 499r field were able to compete and make a diamond partial for a shared top.

E opened 2♦ Flannery at our table (4S 5H with 11-15hcp) and South has a difficult decision in the passout seat after W makes a non forcing 2S call. A balancing double works. 3♦ works but is scary. 2N for the minors is very offshape. W might only have 3 spades, and there is no guarantee of a nine card minor suit fit. Any action by S can be wrong including no action

When faced with the choice of playing in a 4-4 fit vs. a 5-3 fit you want to play in the 4-4 because the long suit can provide discards after trump are drawn and the 5 card suit established.


Board 4
West Deals
Both Vul

♠ J 7 4 3
♥ A 10 8 4 3 2
♦ A 4
♣ 5

♠ Q 9 8 5 2
♥ 9 5
♦ K 9 8 3
♣ J 8

♠ A
♥ K 7 6
♦ J 10 7 6 2
♣ Q 6 4 3

♠ K 10 6
♥ Q J
♦ Q 5
♣ A K 10 9 7 2



	Contract Scores		Matchpoints		Pair
	N-SE-W	N-S	N-S	E-W	
4 ♥ N	620	5.50	1.50	A1-	
4 ♥ S	620	5.50	1.50	A2-	
4 ♥ N	620	5.50	1.50	A8-	
4 ♥ S	620	5.50	1.50	A9-	
2 ♠ W	200	3.00	4.00	A10-	
2 ♥ N	170	2.00	5.00	A7-	
4 ♥ N	100	1.00	6.00	A6-	
3 ♦ E	110	0.00	7.00	A4-	
4 ♥ N	620	6.50	0.50	B7-	
4 ♥ N	620	6.50	0.50	B9-	
2 ♠ W	200	5.00	2.00	B6-	
3 ♥ N	170	4.00	3.00	B1-	
4 ♥ N	100	2.50	4.50	B2-	
3 ♥ N	100	2.50	4.50	B4-	
3 NT N	200	1.00	6.00	B8-	
3 NT S	300	0.00	7.00	B10-	

Opening light in 3rd chair was not evidently too popular on this deal. If E does open NS will find it very difficult to reach the making 4H game.

5 of 8 pairs did play in 4H in the A section, and 3 of 8 in B.

The Hensons effectively disrupted NS at our table with a light opening and a frisky 2S passed hand free bid, and +200 which is usually a fine score was only an average.

Board 12

West Deals
N-S Vul

♠ 6
♥ A 7 4
♦ K J 10 9 7 6
♣ A J 7

♠ J 7 4 3
♥ J 8
♦ 5 3
♣ K 10 5 4 3



♠ K 10 8 5
♥ Q 10 9
♦ 4 2
♣ Q 8 6 2

♠ A Q 9 2
♥ K 6 5 3 2
♦ A Q 8
♣ 9

Contract	Scores	Matchpoints	Rank
	N-SE-W	N-S	E-W
6♥S	1430	6.50	0.50 A2-
6♥S	1430	6.50	0.50 A3-
6♦N	1390	5.00	2.00 A1-
6♦N	1370	3.50	3.50 A4-
6♦N	1370	3.50	3.50 A8-
3NTN	690	2.00	5.00 A6-
5♦N	640	1.00	6.00 A10
3NTS	630	0.00	7.00 A7-
6♦N	1370	7.00	0.00 B3-
4♥S	680	4.00	3.00 B1-
4♥S	680	4.00	3.00 B2-
4♥S	680	4.00	3.00 B4-
4♥S	680	4.00	3.00 B6-
4♥S	680	4.00	3.00 B8-
3NTN	660	0.50	6.50 B7-
3NTN	660	0.50	6.50 B10

Most pairs in the A section reached slam NS, but only Andrew and Keith did so in the B section.

The hand record indicates that 7♦ is makeable, but that requires a spade finesse so that you can shed your sure heart loser. The rule of thumb is that you don't bid 7 unless you can count 13 tricks, so 6H is really the optimal spot. In an imp game you might prefer playing in the 9 card fit solid to the 6 spot.

Both Gaynor-Boettcher and Yeckel-Thompson reached slams to score 13.5 of a possible 14 on this one.

A good hand to bid with your regular partners. Barry & I would bid: 1D – 1H, 2D – 2S, 3H – 4D, 5C – 6C, 6

Board 14

East Deals
None Vul

♠ A 8 7
♥ K 8 4 3
♦ A K 7 4
♣ 6 5

♠ 10
♥ A Q J 5
♦ J 9 6 5
♣ 10 8 7 2



♠ Q J 3
♥ 9 7 2
♦ Q 10 8
♣ K J 9 3

♠ K 9 6 5 4 2
♥ 10 6
♦ 3 2
♣ A Q 4

Contract	Scores	Matchpoints	Rank
	N-SE-W	N-S	E-W
4♠S	450	5.00	2.00 A1-
4♠S	450	5.00	2.00 A3-
4♠S	450	5.00	2.00 A8-
4♠S	450	5.00	2.00 A9-
4♠S	450	5.00	2.00 A10
3♠S	200	1.00	6.00 A2-
2♠S	200	1.00	6.00 A4-
3♠S	200	1.00	6.00 A5-
4♠S	450	7.00	0.00 B3-
2♠S	200	3.50	3.50 B1-
3♠S	200	3.50	3.50 B2-
3♠S	200	3.50	3.50 B4-
3♠S	200	3.50	3.50 B5-
3♠S	200	3.50	3.50 B8-
1♠S	200	3.50	3.50 B9-
2♠S	170	0.00	7.00 B10

Fortune Favors the Bold?

5 of the 8 pairs in Section A reached 4S making 5 when the HA is onside, but only one pair found the game in section B. Can you say Beuller?...Beuller?... I mean Yeckel-Thompson! That was 12 of 14 for the second place finishers.

This is a good game with 10 sure tricks if the spades are 2-2 as you can ruff a club in the dummy.

4S is down only if spades don't break, and both the HA and ♣K are offside, an unlikely scenario.

The NS hands hold 9 of the 12 controls (A=2, K=1), another big plus.

Board 26

East Deals
Both Vul

♠ A J 10 8 4
♥ 10 8 5 3
♦ 10 2
♣ A K

♠ Q 9
♥ 7 6 4
♦ A K 9 7
♣ Q 10 6 2



♠ —
♥ K Q 2
♦ Q J 8 6 5 4 3
♣ J 4 3

♠ K 7 6 5 3 2
♥ A J 9
♦ —
♣ 9 8 7 5

Contract	Scores	Matchpoints	Rank
	N-SE-W	N-S	E-W
6♦x E	800	7.00	0.00 A3-
5♠N	680	4.50	2.50 A2-
4♠N	680	4.50	2.50 A7-
4♠S	680	4.50	2.50 A8-
4♠N	680	4.50	2.50 A10
6♦x E	500	1.50	5.50 A4-
5♦x E	500	1.50	5.50 A5-
5♦E	100	0.00	7.00 A9-
5♠N	680	4.50	2.50 B2-
4♠S	680	4.50	2.50 B3-
4♠N	680	4.50	2.50 B4-
4♠N	680	4.50	2.50 B7-
4♠S	680	4.50	2.50 B8-
4♠N	680	4.50	2.50 B10
3♠S	230	1.00	6.00 B5-
4♦E	130	0.00	7.00 B9-

20hcp slam

This lively hand, balanced in hcp, featured some very high level decisions. Not surprisingly no N/S pair was able to diagnose the 12 tricks available.

Steve and Jean scored a top with accurate defense to beat 6♦X and vulnerable by 3. N must find the heart shift after winning the first club to score above average.

The E hand has only 6 losers but not enough defense to open 1♦, and too much honor strength in hearts to make a diamond preempt very attractive

Last Word on that suit combination

We've had a running commentary for about two months on how to play the suit combination of Axxx opposite QTx. You can strip the hand of side suits so that you can lose a trick to the hand behind the QTx and hold the losers in the suit to one via a ruff & sluff. Peder developed a spreadsheet 3 decades ago that adjusts percentages for holdings in a key suit based on distributions in the other suits. He writes:

I am beating a dead horse here, but it tickles my curiosity. One would suspect that the absence of opponent's bidding would tend to flatter distributions, playing the A rather than a small club would be more advantageous.

The first part is true, but not the second. Take the actual hand, with N following once in H, and both opponents following 3 rounds of S and D:

Odds for N having number of clubs: 0=0, 1=1.3, 2=16.23, 3=43.29, 4=32.47, 5=6.49, 6=0.22 %

Success playing ♣ A=60.82 %, Playing small ♣ success=74.03 %

Compare with a priori- A=66.95, small=76.42. Note that a flat hand has a worse effect on playing the A.

Now take a more distributional opponent's holding:

N has 6 S (South was out third round), 2 H, and everybody follows 3 rounds D, leaving N 1 or 2 ♣.

If 1 ♣ both plays succeed, but if 2 ♣s, Playing A is 100%, playing small not much better than 66%

Peder



Update on Cecil from Sue Jackson

Cecil Frank is in Martin Luther Manor nursing home for rehab. He gave me permission to share information about his condition. The original problem was a blood clot that traveled from his leg to his heart. The resuscitation machine saved his life but caused a lot of damage to the chest. He is still in a lot of pain, but he is gradually improving. He said he is getting great care. He is happy to receive phone calls. If you visit, be aware that he tires easily and can't carry on a conversation for very long.

Martin Luther Manor

1401 East 100th St.

Bloomington

952-888-7751

Room 104

On Deck

1/6 & 1/13 2-session MGSC Swiss Teams. Pay for both sessions on 1/6 to be eligible for the free play awards for first overall. Each session will be scored separately with a full sectional rating (GNT club qualifying games). \$6/table goes to the district to support GNT champions, so entries will be \$26/team/ night or \$6.50/person.

1/20 Club Night #3

1/27 Winter Carnival (No Game)

Happy New Year