

## DISTRICT 4 MASTER SOLVERS CLUB

NICK STRAGUZZI, DIRECTOR

*"Ch-ch-changes...Turn and face the strange...." Fall is near, David Bowie is still dead, and the winds of change are blowing through the Middle Atlantic bridge community. This will be the last 4Spot of the year as our District magazine moves to a new monthly publication schedule beginning in January 2017. Thus, our **2016 MSC Challenge** will be an abbreviated affair, ending with this set. Read on to see who won the Panelists' and Solvers' contests, and the changes coming to the D4MSC beginning in January.*

METHODS ARE 2/1 WITH "WALSH"

### MATCHPOINTS, NONE VUL.

♠-A10873 ♥-AK ♦-QJ97 ♣-K10

<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>
1♠	Pass	3♠*	Pass
??			

\* - Limit raise

### 1: What call do you make?

CALL	PANEL	SOLVERS	AWARD
4♠	3	4	20
3NT	1	1	16
4♣	1	4	16
4♥	0	1	14

*Two decisions here. Problem 1A: Is this hand worth a slam try? Problem 1B: if so, what try is best? The Solvers split down the middle on the first issue. Our five battle-scarred Panelists, however, looked at the form of scoring, reflected on what tends to happen at matchpoints when you go minus holding two-thirds of the deck, and decided 4-to-1 that their answer to 1A was "no thanks".*

**RAY RASKIN:** 4♠. Partner might have the perfect cards for slam, but there is a reasonable chance that anything above 4♠ is too high.

**PETE FILANDRO:** 4♠. I'm missing five important cards. Even with a control-rich max (say, ace-king of diamonds and ace of clubs), I'm still only around 50%. For any one or more of the six missing quacks that partner might happen to hold, he'll have fewer controls, and my odds sink dramatically. Plus, 4♠ is our safety level, so any higher investigation risks a minus.

**DON DALPE:** 4♠. I would really like to try 3NT as an offer to play, but I suspect that CHO might not take it that way. Looking for the magic hand from partner while

telling the opponents more about our cards seems like a poor choice at match-points. However, at bridge I might try 4♣.

*Three no-trump? That wasn't even on my radar when I posed the question, but taking a fresh look at the problem: yeah, why not? It's matchpoints, where crazy contortions for an extra 10 points are part of the game. We have controls, tricks, intermediates, and no particular reason to believe that spades will or will not be worth an extra trick. One hitch is that many expert partnerships today play 3NT as artificial, either inviting cue bids or (when North is unlimited) some sort of serious/non-serious slam invitation. Unconcerned about whether they'll be taken seriously, unseriously, semi-seriously, or ignored entirely by North are:*

**CONNIE GOLDBERG:** 3NT. If 3♠ is limit, then we obviously don't use Bergen Raises in the MSC (*we don't - NS*), and I am unsure whether we play a 1NT response as forcing, thus allowing for a delayed three-card limit raise (*we do - NS*). So, I assume partner can have three or four spades, and that he will probably assume this is an offer to play. He knows I have extras. I expect North to pass with appropriate balanced hands. Because he has already limited his strength, he should freely cue bid when unbalanced or on the way to 4♠ if his hand is suit oriented.

**RUI MARQUES:** 3NT. Even with a perfect hand from partner, slam looks bad at best. The choice is between 4♠ and 3NT. With no space to investigate, I go for all the marbles with 3NT (assuming we don't play it as some sort of slam try).

*These are reasonable arguments, and the Panelist consensus was to settle for game, so I promoted 3NT in the scoring. Signing off in spades remained the plurality choice, however, supported by:*

**DAVE WACHSMAN** (with fellow LTC advocate **HOWARD WACHTEL**): 4♠. While some North-South pairs will drive to a slam, the Losing Trick Count (five from me, eight from partner, thus 13 total subtracted from 24) suggests that 11 winners is the most likely result.

**STEVE WHITE:** 4♠. At first I thought the question was, "How to try for slam?" After reading this month's *Bridge World* (but not before voting on their September MSC problems, unfortunately), I know the answer to that should be 4♦. Upon further reflection, 6♠ is too unlikely so I won't try for slam. Maybe I should take a shot at 3NT, but I'll hope for an extra trick here.

**BOB BROWNE:** 4♠. I think it unlikely that partner has, say, ♠K, ♣A, ♦K, and even then you'd probably need two-two spades. More likely, slam will require a favorable trump split plus a finesse at a minimum. I'll settle for game.

*Okay, on to Problem 1B. If you're going to cue-bid something, what should that something be? There's a school of thought that says that, after a limit raise, you should make what amounts to a "long-suit slam try". You'll likely need a secondary source of tricks to get to twelve (if all you need are first-round controls, you can use Blackwood), so you should tell partner where you think those tricks are coming from. No D4MSC respondent chose 4♦, preferring to go instead with a cue-bid that's slightly more economical.*

**RICK OLANOFF:** 4♣. A second-round control as a slam try.

BARRY COHEN: 4♣. Tempting to just bid 4♠, but I have just enough to make a first move towards slam.

JOHN SCHWARTZ: 4♣. Let's see if partner can come up with a diamond bid.

BILL SCHMIDT: 4♣. The tougher problem might come on the next round, after partner cue-bids diamonds.

*I think that if you're going to bid 4♣, and partner cooperates with 4♦, you're pretty much obligated to follow up with 4♥. If instead you try signing off in 4♠, partner will assume you have no heart control. In fact, you have seven rounds' worth of heart controls. Good luck explaining that in the post-mortem.*

BILL FOSTER: 4♥. Just in case partner may have slightly underbid her hand. I don't think slam is there, but who knows? Cue-bidding hearts first tells her I lack first-round control in both minors.

*Four hearts is the old-school cue-bid, and it just might be best on such a marginal hand. The takeaway of Problem 1B is that all three cue-bids are plausible depending on your partnership philosophy. Do you know what your favorite partner expects?*

*Incidentally, when this problem arose on BBO, slam was terrific but it was exceedingly difficult to reach. My robot partner had made a limit raise over my 1♠ opener on:*

♠ K9654 ♥ 953 ♦ K ♣ A762

*This itself is a pretty worthy MSC problem, to be honest. Maybe you'll see it in 2017.*

MATCHPOINTS, N-S Vul.			
♠-87432 ♥-AKJ105 ♦--- ♣-J52			
<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>
---	1♦	Pass	3♦*
??			
* - Preemptive			

## 2: What call do you make?

CALL	PANEL	SOLVERS	AWARD
Pass	2.5	3	20
Double	1.5	3	18
3♥	1	3	16
4♦	0	1	12

*Wow. I mean...really? Pass is our experts' choice? Not that I have any clue what to do in this predicament, as usual, but...um, playing matchpoints, pass is about twelfth on my list behind the other three scored options, plus 3♠, plus*

4 ♥, plus spiking my RHO's drink with Ex-Lax for setting me this wretched problem in the first place.

Oh well, the scoring rules around these parts are clear. If a call attracts an overall majority, it gets the top award. Failing that, if there's a Panelist majority, then it gets the top. If all we've got are pluralities everywhere, the director wings it. Let's see if the passers can convince me that silence here is golden.

**DON DALPE:** Pass. I am not sure that I could really get myself to pass at the table, but I really believe that it is the correct action at matchpoints. Minus 130 or so is so much better the minus multiple hundreds that any other action is likely to generate.

**RAY RASKIN 1.0:** Pass. Another hand where bidding might work out but could also be deadly. Remember that partner still has a bid coming.

**CONNIE GOLDBERG:** Pass. Partner has some points, and knows I'm short in diamonds, so maybe he will balance if it's right. It could obviously be wrong to bid at all, so I pass.

*It's hard to argue against a highly respected trio of Panelists like this. Yes, I would concede, under medieval-style torture, that passing could well be the winning call. But, it's really, really hard to stay silent at matchpoints with ten major-suit cards and a void (a void, people!) in the opponents bid-and-violently-raised minor. Speaking of "void", I think there is zero chance that partner will bail us out of this if we pass. He eschewed a chance to act over a measly 1 ♦; I can't see how he's going to work out that the three-level, vulnerable and holding our side's length in diamonds, is a hunky-dory place to enter the auction.*

*Let's see what their Solver counterparts (counterpassers?) have to offer.*

**BILL FOSTER:** Pass. If partner cannot overcall the opening 1 ♦ bid, where are we going?

**BOB BROWNE:** Pass. Must be the late hour -- I'm going passive again. The vulnerability worries me. If I bid, partner will assume more points from me, and my hand is full of losers. We might get overboard.

**HOWARD WACHTEL:** Pass. The unfavorable vulnerability discourages an attempt to fight for a part-score. If the colors were reversed, then I would double.

*Again, it's not easy to counter-argue, particularly since one of the above Solvers happens to be a regular partner of mine, and he tends to make better decisions at matchpoints than I do. Come to think of it, I have a shelf full of stuffed sheep in my office who routinely make better decisions at matchpoints than I do. I kind of suck at this form of scoring, so maybe I should just shut up. Passing could be very right. Then again, so could be:*

**PETE FILANDRO:** Double. My diamond void and fifth trump (saying a small prayer that partner finds a major) makes this a worthwhile attempt, even with my paucity of high cards. 4 ♦ risks a big minus if West has the moose with both black aces. Also, 4 ♦ might find 2=2=3=6 with partner, leaving us both ill.

**BARRY COHEN:** Double. Very dicey, but I can't see passing 3 ♦, and I don't have enough to bid 4 ♦.

RUI MARQUES: Double. Partner probably has the wrong shape for reopening, having passed 1♦, so passing is out. 3♥ runs the risk of losing the spade (or club) suit, but points you to a good start if they buy the hand. 4♦ seems excessive and very committal, vulnerable (partner may be 2=2=4=5.) Double keeps all options open.

*Double would be my choice too if there were a card in my bidding box I could play to accompany it, reading "Take this out or else, partner." A second auxiliary card would read "...And not to 3NT, either."*

JOHN SCHWARTZ: 4♦. Too risky to pass (hard to believe I said that about a nine-count). If partner bids spades, at least we'll be taking the tap with our low trumps.

*4♦ is risky, to say the least, but it does get ten of our cards into the auction. Having passed in second seat, partner will not get us any more overboard than we already are. Four of a major might play spectacularly opposite many crappy hands. Or, it may go down so many doubled tricks that the BridgeMate will explode when North tries to enter the score. Either way, you'll have a great story for the bar after the game.*

*I admit that I chose 3♥ mostly in an attempt to win the post-mortem. Making a less craven case for it is:*

**RICK OLANOFF:** 3♥. Dangerous, but most opponents won't double, and I have to tell Don what to lead.

DAVE WACHSMAN: 3♥. As tempting as 4♦ is, I think getting partner off to the correct lead "trumps" showing the spade suit. I'm taking into account the fact that partner didn't overcall.

STEVE WHITE: 3♥. At least it's the lead I want, though this does cut down on the chances he (or I) will be on lead. Bidding only 3♥ may be successful at keeping us out of game when we don't belong in one. Alas, most of the time it keeps us out of game we won't even be taking nine tricks, but we'll be a trick lower and likely undoubled. Either double or 4♦ is more likely to lead to the right denomination but could all too easily lead to a contract we can't make, at a level that might be doubled.

*Addendum: after I sent a reminder email in early August to the MSC's usual respondents, I received a second set of answers from Panelist Ray Raskin. His original set had arrived within a couple days of the June 4Spot's publication, but he evidently forgot. In four of the five problems, Ray chose the same action. On this one, however, after a two-month huddle in which the director was summoned nearly eight hundred times before both East and West died of boredom, he changed from Pass to:*

**RAY RASKIN 2.0:** Double. This keeps clubs in play since there is no guarantee that we have a major-suit fit.

*In this situation, I would normally ask the respondent to clarify his intentions. Here though, in the interest of breaking what would otherwise be a complex two-way tie between Pass and Double, I counted it as one-half vote for each and awarded points accordingly.*

**IMPS, BOTH VUL.**

♠-A ♥-AQ3 ♦-Q83 ♣-AQ10986

<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>
1♣	Pass	1♦	3♠
??			

**3: What call do you make?**

CARD	PANEL	SOLVERS	AWARD
4♠	2	3	20
Double	2	2	18
4♣	1	1	15
4♦	0	2	14
3NT	0	1	12
5♣	0	1	12

*East is operating again. This time, at least, instead of an emaciated 5-5 hand in the majors, we have the goods. How best to express this to partner? Our district experts came up with six different calls, all of which have merit. Let's explore them from cheapest to dearest, starting with:*

**DON DALPE:** Double. I assume that this shows extra values (though perhaps not this much) and asks partner to decide between playing or defending. It is hard to believe that 3♠ is not going down at least one if partner passes, and guessing to bid a slam without input from partner is tough. If partner bids anything other than four of a minor, I will drive to slam.

**CONNIE GOLDBERG** (with RUI MARQUES): Double. Most flexible.

**STEVE WHITE:** 3NT. At least it's a game. Sure it could be very bad, but we can't be sure 5♣ or 5♦ will be better.

*Double is unquestionably the most flexible action here, though the follow-up actions might get a little murky. For example, while Don sounds willing to settle for game over North's 4♣ or 4♦ rebid, Rui would cue-bid 4♠ to look for slam. As for the thoroughly inflexible 3NT, Steve is spot-on about one thing: if it's right, it's now or never.*

**PETE FILANDRO:** 4♣. 3NT puts all our eggs in the "hope you have the club king, partner" basket. 4♣ can get us to worthwhile minor suit games or slams with many, many other holdings. In my view, "many, many" is superior to "hope".

**BARRY COHEN:** 4♣. I'll hope partner has enough to move forward.

**BOB BROWNE:** 4♦. I think partner can read this as a strong hand with clubs and secondary diamonds based on my opening bid. I really hope North will bid again, but if I bid more aggressively, I'm sure he'll put down a crappy six-count, and if so, where are those red kings? Likely to my left, so the finesses will lose.

*Great minds think alike. So do demented ones, apparently, because I joined Bob as the other 4♦ bidder. I have the values, and I already announced that clubs were my better minor, so I feel okay supporting on three to the queen. I wish the disparity between my suits wasn't this much, but meh, this is what they dealt me.*

*The top score went to the overall plurality call, 4♠. That feels a touch overaggressive, but if slam is afoot, it ought to get the job done.*

**RAY RASKIN:** 4♠. Because we're using Walsh-style methods, slam is more likely to be on once partner responds 1♦.

**RICK OLANOFF:** 4♠. Slam is possible, but it's very hard to know what partner's strength is. 5♣ is my second choice.

**DAVE WACHSMAN:** 4♠. I must tell partner that I have a big hand with first-round spade control. I'll respect North's judgment.

**JOHN SCHWARTZ:** 4♠. Hopefully partner will be able to work out level and strain.

**BILL SCHMIDT:** 4♠. Transfer to 4NT. ☺

*At the top of the totem pole sits:*

**HOWARD WACHTEL:** 5♣. North has no more than six cards in the majors, thus at least seven in the minors. We have a chance to make a minor suit game or slam.

*Well, hold on. Playing Walsh, partner does not deny a four-card major with his 1♦ response. What he does deny is a four-card major in a weak hand. If he has, say, four diamonds, four hearts, and invitational or better values, his proper response is 1♦. That, I think, is the basis of Ray's assertion that aggressive action here is warranted: partner is likely to hold real diamonds or real points, either one of which will mesh nicely with our very fine hand.*

#### MATCHPOINTS, N-S VUL.

♠-AQ1043 ♥-942 ♦-KQ95 ♣-10

<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>
--	Pass	1♦	Pass
1♠	Pass	2♣	Pass
??			

#### 4: What call do you make?

CALL	PANEL	SOLVERS	AWARD
2♥	3	4	20
3♦	2	5	18
2NT	0	1	12

*This turned out to be a classic two-horse race. I thought that some matchpoint desperados might trot out 2♠ (or even 3♠), but no one so much as mentioned*

it. Using the free deal generator at **playbridge.com**, I examined 26 plausible 52-card layouts. Rebidding in spades works well an annoying, nay, disgusting amount of the time. Maybe someday I'll work up the guts to try it at the table. Or maybe not.

Anyway, here in staid and stolid District 4, the choice came down to whether to force to game or merely invite it. For the inviters:

**PETE FILANDRO:** 3♦. Fourth-suit forcing to game is an overbid with this probable misfit, catering primarily to finding partner with 3=1=5=4 or similar. An invitational 3♦ is just right. There is a mild inference that the *a priori* possibility of either opponent holding 6 or 7 hearts is reduced by their non-vulnerable silence. That increase the chances of some heart length with partner (say 1=3=5=4, 1=2=5=5, or similar) suggesting neither black suit will be a source of tricks.

**RICK OLANOFF:** 3♦. I won't force to game with these rounded-suit holdings.

**BILL SCHMIDT:** 3♦. Showing my great support and suggesting a fifth spade. Most partnerships would play 2♥ as a game force, but that's too likely here to end in a shaky 3NT.

**BILL FOSTER:** 3♦. Support with support. This is not quite an opening hand.

**JOHN SCHWARTZ (with BARRY COHEN):** 3♦. Seems to describe about this strength and no heart stopper.

3♦ was my choice too, but when I told this to the **playbridge.com** simulator, it basically laughed in my face. The form of scoring is very relevant here. To borrow Don Dalpe's vernacular: 3♦ is the best call playing "bridge" (IMPs or rubber), where the safest plus score is your target on a part-score deal. But at "matchpoints," safety must be balanced against reaching the highest-scoring strain. If diamonds are our only high plus, well and good, but if not, the match-point comparison for +110 (or maybe even +130) is not likely to be in our favor. That godawful 2♠ call is looking better and better to me. So is:

**CONNIE GOLDBERG:** 2♥. With a good fit in partner's primary suit, I'm worth a game force.

**DON DALPE:** 2♥. Opposite a second-seat opener, even one of mine, I cannot help but force to game. Even at matchpoints.

**RAY RASKIN:** 2♥. Setting up to play in diamonds or notrump, depending on partner's response. (Ray 1.0 added that spades are still in play, too. -- NS)

**RUI MARQUES:** 2♥. Too good for an invitational 3♦, and searching for secondary spade support from partner.

**BOB BROWNE:** 2♥. I think I can effectively deal with any response from partner.

**DAVE WACHSMAN:** 2♥. Sets the tone for the rest of the auction. Partner can show three-card spade support, or a fifth club, or a heart stopper. Anything he does other than 3♦ or 3♠ will elicit a 3♦ rebid from me.

**STEVE WHITE:** 2♥. Better than any alternative. Partner might pass 3♦ when holding three spades. Even if I knew for certain that partner has only two spades, forcing to game isn't too bad.



*Howard Wachtel was the odd man out; he chose 2NT, knowing full well that our side might lack a heart stopper (or that he may have wrong-sided it.) Again, this is not recommended playing "bridge." But at "matchpoints", if 2NT is where we belong, can you think of any other reasonable way to reach it after this start? Me neither.*

**PETE FILANDRO (CONT.):** ...As an aside, Nick, if this was a sneaky poll on whether 3♦ is, in the D4MSC's "popular tournament convention" system, played as forcing or invitational, then I vote for invitational. So does Ray Raskin. Poor Ray had essentially this very auction at the Wilmington Sectional in June. Playing with an infrequent partner, he passed South's 3♦ rebid. He found partner was in the forcing camp with 17 HCPs!

*Pete didn't specify whether this was Ray 1.0 or Ray 2.0. I think I'd need a reboot too if partner put down a 17-point dummy.*

**IMPS, N-S Vul.**

♠-Q852 ♥-AQ9 ♦-AJ8 ♣-QJ3

<u>South</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>North</u>	<u>East</u>
--	2♥	2♠	Pass
??			

#### 5: *What call do you make?*

CALL	PANEL	SOLVERS	AWARD
3♥	2	7	20
3NT	3	2	18
4♦	0	1	12

**BOB BROWNE:** 3♥. Showing a good hand and (presumably) a fit. I'm a little strong for a direct 4♠; even opposite many minimum hands for North, slam is at worst on a finesse. I'm not sure what I'll do next round, but you didn't ask for that!

*Honestly, I was originally going to make this a two-part question: if you choose 3♥, then what is your call after (pass) - 3♠ - (pass) - ???. Trouble was, that would open the Large Economy Sized can of worms that is Fast Arrival vs. Slow Arrival. We'll save that for another day. Here, uncharacteristically in a bidding forum, we have our choice of attractive options. Drawing a clean majority:*

**PETE FILANDRO:** 3♥. I consider 3NT to be masterminding, but still an acceptable second choice. More importantly, 3NT would stymie a slam investigation. Partner could have considerable extra values but lack the spade length or strength needed to jump to 3♠ immediately, or to double planning to bid spades next.

**CONNIE GOLDBERG:** 3♥. It's very tempting to bid 3NT, but 3♥ doesn't give up on notrump. For now, I'm showing about a three-and-a-half-spades bid. If partner bids only 3♠, I'll bid 3NT. If he insists on spades, we should survive.

DAVE WACHSMAN: 3♥. Forcing to game and allowing partner to cue-bid the ♣A if he holds it. From there, we can control-bid to the best contract, potentially via a Grand Slam Force.

BILL SCHMIDT: 3♥. I don't plan to go past 4♠ unless partner gets excited.

*I agree with 3♥, but I recognize that getting to slam might be a challenge. The South hand has plenty of high cards but nothing resembling a source of tricks. I'm banking on the ancient principle that the person with shortness in the preemptor's suit must strive to act. If partner is minimum, he'll have shape, and in that case I have as many as six working cards for him. If partner lacks shape, he'll have strength, and we might make a slam (perhaps 6NT) on brute force alone.*

*Our other main faction sees 4-3-3-3, two heart stoppers, and five quacks. They add that up and arrive at:*

**DON DALPE:** 3NT. Automatic at matchpoints, but even at IMPs it still seems right. So much of my big hand is in hearts that a spade slam would be hard to bid, even if it makes.

**RAY RASKIN:** 3NT. The most likely safe contract.

**RICK OLANOFF:** 3NT. As the Hog would bid.

JOHN SCHWARTZ: 3NT. Well, I do have a balanced hand with two stoppers. Maybe nine tricks are the limit in spades and notrump.

RUI MARQUES: 3NT. Protecting my heart holding and trying to capitalize on my 4-3-3-3 shape.

*3NT is safe and reasonable, but it's still a bit of an underbid. Ideally we could use 4NT here as an invitation to six, though in this day and age of Blackwood Über Alles, I wouldn't spring that on partner without a thorough discussion. 3♥ followed by 4NT would then be key card-asking.*

HOWARD WACHTEL: 4♦. Control-bidding for slam with spades as trump, explicitly denying a club control. 3♥ should be a Western cue-bid.

*That'll work fine if that's your partnership agreement. I think most Norths would treat an undiscussed 4♦ as a splinter, though. Summing up deftly for the majority is our side's "closer":*

STEVE WHITE: 3♥. If the only issue was which game to play, I would bid 3NT even though it would leave partner with no clue as to my spade support. 3NT will almost never be significantly worse than 4♠. "Which game" is not the only choice, however. Slam is likely enough that I want to explore it.



*Ray Raskin led all respondents with a fine score of 98 points, with Don Dalpe close behind at 96. Dave Wachsmann had 96 to lead the Solvers.*

## 2016 District 4 MSC Challenge - Final Results

*It was a three-way race to the finish, but Don Dalpe edged out Pete Filandro by one point to win the 2016 Panelists Challenge, 283 to 282. Connie Goldberg was third at 277.*

*In the 2016 Solvers Challenge, the race was closer still. In the bridge equivalent of a photo finish, Rui Marques withstood a late run by both Dave Wachsman and Bill Schmidt to hold on for the win, 276 to a pair of 275s. Rui will join the Panelists in 2017.*

*As always, thanks very much to everyone who participated this year. Beginning in January, the D4MSC goes monthly...but, in an effort to retain the Director's tenuous grasp on his sanity, there will be just one problem each month. We'll still run the **District 4 MSC Challenge** for the Panelist and Solver with the highest cumulative score for the calendar year -- if you happen to miss a month or two, you'll receive your lowest award from the other ten or eleven months.*

*We'll also be rolling out an online entry system where you can submit your answers and comments, which Allison and I hope will increase participation. All District 4 members are eligible, and remember: if you are among the District's Top 100 masterpoint holders, you're automatically a Panelist.*

### Panelists

1. Don Dalpe	283
2. Pete Filandro	282
3. Connie Goldberg	277

### Solvers

1. Rui Marques	276
2T Dave Wachsman	275
2T Bill Schmidt	275

## September 2016 Scoring

PANELISTS	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE
DON DALPE	4♠	Pass	Dbl.	2♥	3NT	96
PETE FILANDRO	4♠	Dbl.	4♣	3♦	3♥	91
CONNIE GOLDBERG	3NT	Pass	Dbl.	2♥	3♥	94
RICK OLANOFF	4♣	3♥	4♠	3♦	3NT	88
RAY RASKIN	4♠	Pass	4♠	2♥	3nt	98

SOLVERS	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE
BOB BROWNE	4♠	Pass	4♦	2♥	3♥	94
BARRY COHEN	4♣	Dbl.	4♣	3♦	3♥	87
BILL FOSTER	4♥	Pass	Dbl.	3♦	3♥	88
RUI MARQUES	3NT	Dbl.	Dbl.	2♥	3NT	90
BILL SCHMIDT	4♣	Dbl.	4♠	3♦	3♥	92
JOHN SCHWARTZ	4♣	4♦	4♠	3♦	3NT	84
DAVE WACHSMAN	4♠	3♥	4♠	2♥	3♥	96
HOWARD WACHTEL	4♠	Pass	5♣	2NT	4♦	76
STEVE WHITE	4♠	3♥	3NT	2♥	3♥	88
NICK STRAGUZZI	4♣	3♥	4♦	3♦	3♥	



### D4MSC CHALLENGE CHAMPIONS

	<u>PANELISTS</u>	<u>SOLVERS</u>
2015	<i>Ray Raskin</i>	<i>Rick Olanoff</i>
2016	<i>Don Dalpe</i>	<i>Rui Marques</i>
2017		