Tary importance when Dr. Burton Kross presented results of his GCSSA-commissioned Mortality Study last month in Dallas. Kross, an associate professor of epidemiology at the University of Iowa, reported that, historically, golf course superintendents have been more likely to contract certain types of cancer than the general public. While he stressed there is no proven causal relationship between superintendents’ exposure to pesticides, he stated rather definitively that golfers — or course "patrons" — are in no way at risk. This may come as no surprise to industry members in the Dallas audience, but it also struck golf courses with what ironic because pesticide policy — as issued by the federal EPA and various state agencies — is almost completely driven by the perceived effects of chemical exposure on the public at large, not superintendents. In a culture where the broadcast golf balls seem to carry more popular weight than the preponderance of scientific data, it was refreshing to hear Kross dispel an all-too common myth that pesticide use poses a threat to the general welfare. It is precisely this threat that poses a threat to superintendents is not clear, which is why the GCSSA, chemical manufacturers and the golf course industry all support further study. Most everyone acknowledges that chemical handling practices were woefully insufficient during the 1940s, '50s and '60s, when subjects of the Mortality Study — those GCSSA members who died between 1970 and 1992 — tended to follow courses. Further, most everyone agrees that manufacturers have largely corrected what they have accomplished above and beyond the call of duty when it comes to applicator training, specific labeling and proper disposal. The 10 years of research which any product must undergo before EPA approval speaks for itself. The new GCSSA leadership did the right thing by addressing the study pro-actively. Quickly releasing the story to news organizations, soliciting input of other industry leaders. }


death rate in the 1970s and 1980s. Studies of residents of golf courses and golfers' cancer rates support this conclusion. In a culture far too serious to generalize about attitudes and foundations. It is more important than facts. It is more important than the past. Than education. Than money. Than gmail. Than successes. Than other things. Than golf. It is more important than appearance, giftedness or skills. It will make or break a company, a club, a church, a home. The remarkable thing is, we have a choice every day regarding the attitude we want to live for. We cannot change our past. And we cannot change the fact that people will act in a certain way. We cannot change the inevitable. The only thing we can do is play on the one string we have, and that is important how we do it.

**Letters**

HURDZAN ANSWERS EPA CHEF

Michael J. Hurdzan, who heads Hurdzan Golf Course Design, Inc., in Columbus, Ohio, sent Golf Course News this copy of his letter to EPA Administrator Carol Browner.

Dear Ms. Browner: I just finished reading your guest editorial in Golf Course News (January 1994 Issue) and either you or I are very badly informed. You specifically indicated that golf courses are "more frequent sources of recent research findings, including those from the EPA's Cape Cod study," which support my point and vindicate my concern.

I would expect a person of your leadership position to be neither blind, nor a person of any political influence to administrate the EPA. I would further expect you to be more like the blind scales of justice, weighing proven evidence and data with the goal of implementing long-term protection of earth, rather than simply distributing outdated, unbalanced and exaggerated rhetoric. For the sake of science and future generations who depend upon us, let us deal in fact and not scare propaganda.

I look forward to your answer, for if the communication folks of the turf industry are covering up severe or significant environmental degradation or incidents, they need to be taken to task.

As a parent and parent on this spaceship, I want to know if or my child or I may be making mistakes or are acting in an irresponsible manner. These issues are far too serious to generalize about or cover up. Likewise, if we are doing something wrong, we have some recognition and praise.

I am clearly concerned, not just about the perception of golf course environmental continuance, but also the reality of our role. I know of a multitude of positive impacts, and I want to work on reducing negative, not increase the negative ones, but we must be specific.

Please contact me if I can further assist.

Michael J. Hurdzan, president Hurdzan Design Group Columbus, Ohio

BROWNER'S EPA FACTOIDS

To the editor:
The January issue of Golf Course News contained a puzzling juxtaposition of factoids, enviro-political trends and scientific research, of course, finishes third in that lineup. Factoids, as the late Dixie Lee Ray said, are false, exaggerated or misleading beliefs which gain acceptance by frequency repetition. Golfer must learn to recognize factoids and fact. Test Question: By EPA administrator Carol Browner is a good place to start. Each factoid is followed by a factual statement: the "whole truth" as science knows it.

1) EPA factoid: The use of pesticides in the United States is excessive and harmful. (Ms. Browner and colleagues must accomplish a sharp reversal of the pesticide-intensive policy of the past 50 years.)

February. In the past four decades, we have developed increasingly sophisticated programs of integrated pest management. Technologically-enhanced agriculture has virtually eliminated soil erosion, runoff that can severely threaten drinking water supplies. Is the attitude we want to be the "whole thing" as science knows it. Continued on page 13
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consideration now is given to
building the golf course but not
resulting from costs incurred in
received by the golf course.
are large users of pesticides.
Ms. Browner says: "Today's
golf courses use a large quantity
of pesticides. In fact, golf courses
use four to seven times more pes-
ticides per treated-acre than farms.")
FACT: Golf courses are not
large users of pesticides in abso-
lute terms. How could they be?
They comprise less than 1 per-
cent of a national total of 450 acres
of farmlands and golf courses. The
per treated-acre use of pesticides
comparison is preposterous and
insulting to anyone with a knowl-
dge of how statistics are derived
— at least the USGA gives a
method for computing your in-
dex!
2) EPA factoid: Golf courses are large users of pesticides.

Ms. Browner suggests that imaginative course operators and owners "can create rich wildlife
habitats.")

The "Endangered Species Ex-
pansion Forecast" article by Joe
Dysart suggests that Senate Bill
191 will add to the imbalance of
animal rights versus human
rights.)
RESPONSE: "It is demeaning
beyond belief to consider man-
kind simply another species of
animal, no better and no worse
than the wild beasts." (Dixie Lee
Ray.)

4) Scientific research: "Michi-
gan State research shows insig-
nificant amounts of fertilizer reach
ground water.
COMMENT: Interestingly
enough, the choice of "Off the
Record" had some special mean-
ing in this instance. Science
finishes third, and, of course, it is not
even "on the record."
Our enviro-vice president has
predicted "an environmental ho-
locust without precedent." Per-
haps our enviro-vice president and
our EPA Administrator should
take better care of our "avid golfer"
president by warning him to stay
away from the golf course?

David L. Collins, member
Royal Town Planning Institute

EPA factoid letter
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nected approaches to value,
reflective of market behavior
most accurately.
Assuming that a value
conclusion has been developed,
we realize that this includes
income from and value attrib-
uted to items such as food and
beverage sales, pro shop
revenues, golf carts and other
personal property and business
items not directly attributable
to the land and improvements
(real estate). These items
cannot be assessed as real
estate and must be extracted
from the overall value to
produce a value conclusion for
the real estate.
Real estate taxes often can
amount to an expense in excess
of $100,000 for golf properties
and the author has seen
assessments of more than
double the property value.
When capitalized, this potential
tax savings can result in a
substantial increase to your golf
course's bottom line as well as
an increase in the value realized
from the property upon any
future sale.
Pursuing a fair assessment
will offer a number of chal-
enges: First, as a golf course
(or especially a private club)
you will be an easy target. This
means that you should have as
much information supporting
your appeals as possible and that
your consultants be experienced
experts in golf property
valuation and tax assessment
and litigation.
Secondly, you may be in a
state which has assessment
laws and procedures which
might preclude the valuation
from being done in the most
accurate and technically correct
manner.
Third, any estimate of
personal property and business
value is subject to close scrutiny
because there are no techniques
for valuing them which have
been universally accepted or
applied.
On the other hand, there are
few experts in golf property
valuation and often a property
assessor who wishes to avoid
future confrontations will be
more receptive to a well
prepared case in order to more
effectively value other golf
properties in his or her jurisdic-
tion in the future.

As you know, some greens are
more challenging than others.