The rag-to-riches-to-rags story of Landmark Land Co. appears to have ended in mid-September when RTC-DOOM, the government's liquidator, took over operations at Landmark offices in Carmel, Calif., and Oak Tree Estates, Calif.

This means you and I — via the long arm of federal law — now control the fortunes of all Landmark properties, including the PGA West, Kiawah Island and Oak Tree. That's right — our government now pays the salaries of these prestigious golfing venues, and we pay federal salaries with our tax dollars. What a country!

The moral of this story is pretty simple: No matter how good things appear, don't open a savings & loan because 1) You're not the president's son; and 2) The rules of government can change in mid-stream.

The latter hazard befell Landmark, which opened Oak Tree Greens were opened for play in 1978, the 6 and 7 fairways were number 2 and 3 fairways were converted to solve a long-standing construction problem. Furnace Creek can no longer lay claim to be the only sand, hence the logical name, DG (decomposed granite) which is extemely high in mineral content and freezing.

Continued on next page

DESSERT COURSES

To the editor:
I read with great interest the article about Furnace Creek Golf Course in your August 1992 Golf Course News. United States Gypsum Company (USGA), the remaining company-owned mining towns in the West, I have been town manager of Empire, Nev., the past 12 years. One of my responsibilities has been the maintenance and upgrading of the nine-hole Burning Sands Golf Course.

The course was started 30 years ago by a group of volunteers who divided into three teams, each to construct a green. Each green had their own identity and had around three times to get in their nine holes. The fairways were sand, hence the logical name, Burning Sands.

Over the years, improvements were made and greens added. The number 2 and 3 fairways were seeded in 1978, the 6 and 7 fairways in 1984. The 1, 2, 3 and 4 greens were opened for play in their present state in 1980.

We have many of the same conditions, problems and solutions as Furnace Creek. The soil in the alkaline water is extremely high in mineral content (non-potable) and maximum flow is only 275 GPM, the winds blow usually from the west, and temperatures vary seasonally from 100 degrees to 105 degrees Fahrenheit down to as low as 15° F at night in the dead of winter, though winter daytime temps usually are above freezing.

My goal, had the same problems with our sand traps. Available sand is DG (decomposed granite) which crusts over after it gets wet, and good sand merely blows away.

After reading the article and discussing it with the local golf club, we decided to try turf bunkers and columbia sand in the number 4 and 7 bunkers. If this is readily accepted by the local golfers, the others will be converted to a long-stand- ing practice of putting greens. Furnace Creek can no longer lay claim to being the only course with turf bunkers.

We have a feature I'm sure no other course can claim: it is open to the general public and it is free ... no greens fees! And, there is no reservation requirement and no waiting list. Though it is open year-round, there is no maintenance after the grass goes dormant.

Kenneth McCurdy, Town Manager
The United States Gypsum Co.

HURDZAN ON TRACS

To the editor:
While I preach "bearing the cross" on the U.S. Golf Association's recommended green construction methods, I am also "calling to arms" over the proposed TRACS service.

I take serious issue with several statements and concepts of TRACS and I am not let them pass without comment. My understanding of TRACS is from a recently published article — a November 1991 letter sent to me by the president of the American Society of Golf Course Architects by the national director of the USGA Green Section.

Perhaps the root of my discontent is the statement that reads "The green section's reputation as... unbiased source of scientific literature is...". In my experience these words are completely unfounded, for the USGA Green Section has proven itself repeatedly to be a very biased source of information, especially when it comes to green construction methods. Nor are they scientific professionals. Why? When it suits their position.

My point is that the USGA is NOT a point source of information on the construction of golf courses for it lacks the necessary experience, exposure, and down-the-troughs knowledge of most long-termers in that area. They are designers, not builder or designer. Every day I am discovering new methods, concepts, and materials which improve the science and art of golf course construction, and I am certain that this is true of my colleagues as well. Who, then, will be the members of what is best — the USGA TRACS representative? What are his or her qualifications that permit him to reach such conclusions?

But let us suppose that this USGA TRACS representative does possess this ultimate data bank of knowledge — whom, or what replaces him when this super-talented person moves on, but the program remains as valid as ever in the eyes of the consumer? Will the program fold, will USGA search for another such qualified expert, or simply lower the professional quality of his successor and hence, the level of service? People move, programs don't, so we in the industry will be stuck with this initiative for a very long time.

Then there is the problem of professional and public liability that this TRACS representative will assume each time he or she gives such advice. I am sure that he expert who establishes quality-control procedures also recognizes the liability exposure that goes with it. It assures you that lawsuits involving golf course construction are not rare, and anyone offering to establish quality controls in fact will be the epitome of liability insurance. (It takes being involved in a major lawsuit to drive home this point.)

The statement that "Under no circumstances will we (USGA) be involved in golf course design work" makes me smile and question if the USGA understands what golf course design work really is. Where does the "design" come from construction technique, or does the USGA not recognize that "form must follow function which must follow budget"?

In an attachment with the sub-heading "potential services", he offers that the USGA will "establish quality-control programs for the construction of greens, tees, bunkers, as well as the installation of drainage and irrigation systems." (The only thing missing was cart paths, dams, and bridges and those are the only services for which I could suggest our clients to hire outside consultants.)

Has USGA written these "quality-control programs", and, if so, where are they available? These "quality-control programs" are essentially a list of specifications that accompany the detailed drawings and, in fact, these "quality-control programs" may even dictate design-s. "These quality-control programs" have not been written, then the result can only be conflicts between a designer's specifications and, in fact, these "quality-control programs". The only way these "quality-control programs" can work is if they are universally agreed upon by all designers and the "maintenance" and common specifications.

Then in this same attachment the USGA offers to "identify qualified and experienced contractors, architects, consultants, and any
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Architectural cooperation yields advances in irrigation technology

By J. MICHAEL POELLOT

Management and distribution of water is one of the more challenging issues of our time. And, since working with large parcels of land is at the core of golf course design and maintenance, the golf industry is inextricably connected to it.

Golf course designers are continually faced with two questions. First, what to do when there's too much water. Occasionally, there is the potential for flooding, and the localized effects can be devastating. Secondly, what to do when there's not enough. The decisions we make regarding irrigation, drainage and collection of water have a potential impact on the environment and the allocation of one of our greatest natural resources.

The government is exerting increasing control over the golf industry. More than ever, we're being held legally and ethically responsible for the results of our design and construction choices. I see this as a positive step toward redirecting the overall efforts of the golf course industry in a more environmentally conscious direction.

Over the last 20 years a schism developed within the ranks of golf course architecture. On one side, there was the designer-label breed of golf course designers. They were often more concerned with outdoing each other and building signature courses that attested to their unique styles than they were with protecting the environment.

On the other side, there were the golf course architects with landscape architecture degrees. Schooled in the principles of harmonizing with the environment, they sought to allow the site to dictate the course design and to protect the land as much as possible.

Pressing environmental issues have brought these two factions together. The efforts that the golf industry as a whole has made to deal with the complexities of water-related issues have resulted in many positive technological strides. These advances are likely to enhance our ability to protect and even improve our water supply.

Examples of progress include:

- Taking a team approach: In order to ensure that the integrity of the land and its water supply is protected, today's golf course architects and builders are using the expertise of specialists from a variety of fields.
- Complex technological issues require input from civil, soil and hydrological engineers as well as specialists in agronomy, turfgrass management, land planning and irrigation. Their skills are combined to create golf courses which are not only beautiful, but environmentally sound.
- Pesticide/fertilizer safety: Ground water accounts for 50 percent of our drinking supply. So, naturally we're all concerned about maintaining its purity. Over the last several years, there's been a great deal of negative publicity about the dangers that pesticides and fertilizer runoff from golf courses pose to the potable water supply.

In reality, there's little scientific evidence to support these assertions. Certainly there have been isolated incidents where a superintendent has made a mistake in administering pesticides, and wildlife has suffered. Overall, however, this has been the exception, not the rule.

Relative to the amount of acreage involved, the quantity of fertilizer used to maintain a golf course isn't that great. Of 150 acres, six to seven acres are greens and tees, requiring the largest amounts of pesticides and fertilizer. Beyond that, about 50 acres are fairways, requiring some fertilization. The balance of the land needs very little pesticide or fertilizer.

If you compare the amount of fertilizer used on golf courses to that used on...