What's Audubon and what's not

This month's front-page story on the once-and-future golf course in Jacksonville, with its complex, compelling political battles, was long enough without delving into the curious relationship between theESI and its need for a set of criteria. It has been a chapter of the Audubon Cooperative Sanctuary System (ACSS) participation doesn't necessarily earn your course a place. The system founder - has thrown its full support to ACSS. In "Audubon" in their title, and only one - New York Audubon, that ACSS classification doesn't necessarily earn course environmental legitimacy outside the golf universe. In his signature program, Audubon International, the golf-oriented umbrella organization founded by New York Audubon. I tell everyone interested in our Signature Program, during the first visit: If you think that because you follow our program you're going to be the primary supply channel for accessories in Louisiana. Letters

DISTRIBUTORS WILL SURVIVE THROUGH SERVICE

To the editor:

I would appreciate the opportunity to respond to your article "Manufacturers hedge bets on distribution" [GDN April 1996]. I strongly oppose the statement by Mr. Phillips that "ten years from now, golf courses will likely purchase their accessories directly from the factory." I feel that the professional turf equipment distributor will still be the most important link for accessories for the same reasons we are now: the local distributor's ability to most effectively and cost-effectively market and deliver these products to the customer.

My company is fortunate to distribute Standard Golf and Par Aid accessories in Louisiana and Mississippi, and through aggressive stocking and marketing strategies, we have shown significant increases in the access of our customers for golf course accessories in the past several years. I will not argue that every distributor aggressively stocks and services each customer's needs, but in our market we do not have the luxury of selling every customer a "$15,000 mower" on every sales call. Those customers, however, will not buy even a $100 unit if, among other things, water coolers, etc., which allows us the opportunity to serve their needs between capital expenditures.

Because the cost of entry to become a golf course accessory "manufacturer" is minimal, there has certainly been an exponential increase in the number of companies marketing these products in a variety of ways (distribution, sales reps., factory direct, etc.). The majority of golf courses in Louisiana and Mississippi trust the quality of Standard Golf and Par Aid accessories and the service and support they receive from their local full-service turf-equipment distributor.

Independent turf-equipment distributors exist only because we can sell more of a manufacturer's product in a given market more cost-effectively than can the manufacturer. And I believe that, while some exceptions will continue, we will continue to be the primary provider of golf course accessories in the future.


LISTENING TO ALL VOICES

To the editor:

Thanks for being sensitive to our needs and issues; and, to the voices that are still trying to define what constitutes REAL golf course management (Determined: All sprinklers are not created equal," GDN April 1996). You and Golf Course News are a class act in producing the copies of the April issue and a note of thanks was special. Because we are certain that sprinkler systems, from residential through golf courses, are really the Achilles Heel of the green industry, more information will be shared. Enclosed are a few pictures. We think this is a great and worthwhile industry. Our concern: too much "lip service," not enough "hands on."

Al Kline, CGCS

UNM Championship GC
Traverse City, Mich.

NAME DESIGNS MORE COSTLY

To the editor:

Peter Blais' cover story for April, "Name designers pull higher dues and green fees," restates the obvious part of the story. But what about the other side of the ledger? So-called "signature" designs cost more to build than other courses, too. It's much more than the difference in the architects' fees. The architects named tend to require higher budgets across the board — in everything from earth moving to building irrigation to sod — than those of us who the study didn't represent. I am just one example, we completed Stonewall, near Philadelphia, three years ago for a budget of $1 million, whereas Tom Fazio had estimated the construction of a course on the same site at $4.1 million (not counting the difference in our respective fees).

As a result, while many "signature" courses are forced to charge higher fees, they don't necessarily make a higher profit than anyone else's designs. And when the development costs are higher, the risk of catastrophic failure is much greater.

We've never had a golf course go through the Resolution Trust Corp. — a statement few of those "signature" designers can match. I hope Mr. Hirsh will take these factors into account before he pronounces his study complete.

Tom Doak, president Renaissance Golf Design, Inc.

STUDY'S AUTHOR RESPONDS

Dear Tom Doak:

I just received the copy of your letter to Hal Phillips. You're right! The cost of your letter is more than that of other "non-signature" facilities ("Study shows: Name designers pull higher dues and green fees," GDN April 1996). Not only that, but many are more expensive to maintain and something like, with any type of investment, there are problems associated with increased costs. While we would like to consider the cost of the courses in ultimately analyzing the value of "signature" architectures, the combination of adjustments for time and size of construction and resulting small size of the sample (due to the necessity of limiting the study to local markets) makes the consideration of cost difficult at best.

This study to our point has only indicated that, in the markets studied, greens fees and dues were higher. Other things that need to be addressed are absorption period of memberships (or daily-tee play), effect

After tough winter, the virtue is communicating patience

A new Dutch proverb tells us "A handful of patience is worth more than a bushel of brains."

GCSAA President Bruce Williams concurred in saying that golf course superintendents should not feel rushed into applying this fertilizer or that chemical to hasten winter-damaged turfgrass back to its green, lush old self (see story page 1). Now we can hope golfers in the Northern Central United States can do the same: Be patient. Last year was not always the case, and in the wake of major turf damage, a number of Midwestern superintendents lost their jobs. Why, they had the audacity to control the weather.

"Unfortunately," Williams said, "when spring ends, people historically watch the Masters on television, or return home from winters down South and expect the courses up here [Illinois] to look like the ones they left down South: in wonderful condition.

The problem is — from Illinois and Kansas to Minnesota and Michigan — it has been a cold, wet, raw winter. The farmer has seen a distant dream. So how do superintendents counter the prevailing attitude in many places (usually private clubs) that they should be little gods creating perfect playing fields?" Williams said, "so the best thing we can do is be patient and use public-relations skills ... to encourage members to be patient." If a course has a newsletter, use it. If it has bulletin boards, use them. If it has signs to place out on the course, make them. One-to-one contact with members can't be beat.

Michigan may have gone one better. "Golfers here seem to be quite understanding," said Gerry Faubel from his club in Saginaw. He credited Michigan State University and the Golf Association of Michigan (GAM) for approaching the
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