THE FLORIDA GREEN

2003 Photo Contest Results

This is part two of presenting the four category winners of the 2003 photo contest.

Category 2 -
Formal Landscape.

2004 Photo Contest Categories

Category 1 - Wildlife on the course: includes any critter on the course that walks, flies, swims, slithers or crawls.

Category 2 - Formal Landscaping: includes annuals and ornamental shrubs and trees planted in formal beds on the course or club entrance.

Category 3 - Native Areas: includes beds of native plants including trees, shrubs and grasses used in naturalized areas to reduce turf inputs and aquatic vegetation plantings used to create habitat and protect water quality.

Category 4 - Scenic Hole: includes any view of a golf hole (panoramic or close up) that demonstrates the scenic beauty of a golf course.

Easy Rules

1. Media: Color prints, slides or digital files. Prefer prints. Only one entry per category. Digital image entries must be taken at a resolution setting of 300 dpi or higher and saved as highest-quality jpeg or tif format images. Images taken, saved and sent at lower resolutions will not qualify for the contest. If you’re not sure, send a print instead.

2. Photo must be taken on an FGCSA member’s course by an FGCSA member or a member of his staff.

3. Attach a label on the back of the print or slide which identifies the category, course and photographer.

DO NOT WRITE DIRECTLY ON THE BACK OF THE PRINT.

Each print shall be attached to an 8.5” x 11” sheet of paper using a loop of masking tape on the back of the print. Slides should be in plastic sleeves for easy access for viewing. Digital images must be accompanied by the same information in an email or document on a CD.

4. A caption identifying the category, course and photographer should be typed or printed on the sheet of paper below the mounted print.

5. Judging will be done by a panel of FGCSA members not participating in the contest.

6. Mail entries in a bend-proof package marked “PHOTOS DO NOT BEND” to Joel Jackson, 6780 Tamarind Circle, Orlando, 32819. Entries postmarked after August 1, 2003 automatically will be entered in the 2004 Photo Contest.

The green-and-white Boeing 717 dropped down from our cruising altitude as we descended toward the Rochester, N.Y. airport. Rolling green hills and beautiful farmland filled the landscape as far as the eye could see. This aerial precursor of bucolic beauty could not fully reveal what lay ahead for us in our visit to Alan Weitzel’s family homestead in western New York State. Alan is the director of Dade County’s golf course maintenance operations.

Susi and I were met at the airport by Alan Weitzel’s mother Josephine and close family friend Larry Matzlin. After collecting golf bags and luggage, we began our 20-mile journey to the southwest for the town of Caladonia. What we had seen from the air was even more beautiful on the ground. Gentle rolling hills, two-lane country roads, farms and trees about 30 percent into their color change of yellow, brown and red.

As we approached the Weitzel home adjacent to the Caladonia Country Club, there was the third hole, the second green and then the clubhouse. The building is every bit of 150 feet long. The main dining room was upstairs in the old dairy barn and the first floor houses another dining area, locker rooms and pro shop. A two-story addition to the original building includes a new men’s locker room, conference room, offices upstairs and downstairs, and a 60-cart storage area. There is also an open-air bar and grill downstairs about 75 feet from the ninth green.

Upon our arrival at the club, we were met by Alan’s father Bob, who was busy paying off the lucky winners of a two-day Calcutta tournament that had concluded on Sunday. Bob was in a very good mood because it seems he had a piece of the third- and fourth-place AS IT LIES
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things would you like your chapter to do for you? Surveys require some soul searching that many turfgrass managers just don’t want to contemplate.

Don’t get me wrong. Superintendents plan ahead all the time. But it seems like the planning is focused on one area - avoiding problems, not solving them. We have become so successful at putting out fires that we have forgotten how to employ fire prevention on a larger scale. Fire prevention depends on education and learning good techniques and those in turn depend on good data about the fire potential in your area of expertise.

Data for regulators to make informed decisions on pesticide risk assessment can come from surveys on the topics or products of concern.

The U. S. Environmental Protection Agency is responsible by law for reassessing all the chemicals we use on our golf courses. If these assessments of risk and benefit are done using outdated or overly conservative computer models and assumptions (as unfortunately they are) then the fate of some of the most broad-spectrum and economical products is determined by the application of faulty data. How is EPA to know any better?

Recently Dean Graves at the Chevy Chase CC in Washington, DC held a Regulator Day at his course and gave about 70 EPA regulators a tour and discussion of golf-course maintenance practices. When a particular product was being discussed, it turned out that EPA, based on a computer model, was figuring twice the number of applications on twice the number of acres that Graves was applying in real life. EPA admitted their models and assumptions were off base but, without data, they didn’t have any way of changing or correcting the model. That’s why we need to have some data-gathering surveys on pesticide use, and you’d better be willing to chime in or learn to do without some of your key products.

We need to fill the data gaps at EPA by conducting surveys that report our chemical use by product, amount, frequency and treatment area. Sounds like a lot of surveys doesn’t it? I can see you screwing up your face right now.

But come on. You probably know, off the top of your head, how many pounds, gallons, quarts, pints and ounces you apply to your greens, tees and fairways per acre. I know you know how many acres of each you have to maintain, and you also know about how many times a year you apply certain products.

Putting all the information down on paper will go a long way to helping local, state and federal environmental protection agencies do two things. First it will put our actual use of products into a ball park they can envision, and, second, it will help to defuse the ranting and raving from environmental activists about all the tons of stuff we use.

My personal experience in the past has been that I have gotten minimal feedback on products like Dursban, Nemacur and MSMA when I sent out simple surveys to characterize use amounts and treated acreage. I don’t mind telling you it is discouraging when we try to make our case and defend a product and you won’t take the time to total up your application amounts and acreage. I get very frustrated when products are cancelled because of political expediency or by risk assumptions based on faulty data. But in the absence of good, verifiable, current information, I don’t blame EPA entirely for the results. We the end users have a bigger stake in the fate of the products we use than anyone else. The manufacturer will naturally come down on the economic side of the product. The regulators will use the most conservative, worst-case scenarios if they don’t have better data. Where are they going to get that data? They should get it from you so the data will be correct and meaningful.

The GCSAA Environmental Institute for Golf will be making an effort to fill those data gaps at EPA in the days ahead. When that survey comes in the mail or by e-mail, either fill it out or forfeit your right to complain about losing another efficient and effective product that helps you do your job.