

MINUTES OF THE ACBL LAWS COMMISSION
HILTON HOTEL, HOUSTON, TX
MARCH 14, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chip Martel, Chairperson	Georgia Heth
Adam Wildavsky, Vice-Chair	Eric Rodwell
Peter Boyd	Matt Smith
Chris Compton	John Solodar
Allan Falk	Howard Weinstein
Ron Gerard	

ALSO PRESENT:

Gary Blaiss, ACBL Executive Administrative Officer
Mike Flader, ACBL Tournament Director
Matt Koltnow, ACBL Tournament Director
Al Levy, ACBL District 24 Director

The meeting was called to order at approximately 10:00 AM.

The minutes of the Boston meeting were approved.

The WBF Laws Committee minutes were discussed.

After review of the report of the Law 27 survey as reported by Matt Smith, there was a consensus to continue to encourage tournament directors to be reasonably flexible/liberal in allowing a replacement call without immediate rectification (penalty) when that replacement call is more precise or similar in meaning to the insufficient bid (Law 27B1.) However, if without assistance gained through the insufficient bid the result could well have been different and in consequence the non-offending side is damaged, the director applies Law 27D.

The Commission discussed how the tournament director is to apply Law 27B1. A consensus was reached on the following:

- The tournament director should refrain from looking at hands to decrease or eliminate the possibility of transmission of information about the deal to the players via the director.
- The tournament director explains the law to the table without mentioning specific actions that could be taken without immediate rectification except for the action permitted by Law 27B1(a). If the player committing the infraction or that player's LHO wishes to know whether the director will accept a specific call without immediate rectification, the question and the response should take place away from the table.
- Some of the examples in the commentary produced by Ton Kooijman of the WBF Laws Committee would be useful to tournament directors as guidelines to identify instances in which the tournament director should be more alert to the necessity of a Law 27D adjustment.

Matt Smith will ask the ACBL Tournament Department to codify the director's approach and send it to the Commission for review.

In applying Law 64C to Law 64B2, the director firsts looks at the non-offending side's equity after the first revoke (e.g. a one trick penalty would have been awarded). So while there is no automatic penalty for second revoke in the same suit by the same player, there may still be an adjustment if the revoking side regains a trick that might have been lost due to the penalty after the first revoke. There was no consensus concerning the application of these Laws

The procedure that is used by tournament directors to conduct polls to assist in determining logical alternatives and whether a logical alternative was demonstrably suggested by unauthorized information was discussed.

There was a consensus that tournament directors:

- Should continue to pose questions carefully in order to allow the pollee to respond freely.
- Should attempt to poll players who can be objective rather than ideologues.
- Should continue to include in polls peers who are at the same bridge expertise level as those involved at the table.

There was a consensus that in Law 16B1 where the word "some" is used it should suggest to the tournament director and a committee more than one, and the word "significant" should suggest to the tournament director and a committee more than a minor proportion (e.g. 2/100) but less than a major proportion (e.g. 40/100).

The meeting was adjourned at noon.

