The Standard Golf Tee Console Collection...Build the perfect one for your course!

Standard Golf gives you more choices than anyone. We’ve got four models of ball washers to choose from when designing your tee consoles, including our new cast aluminum Traditions Series Premier™ and Medalist™ Ball Washers. Trash receptacles? Choose from single or double configurations using the new Litter Mate™ or our classic wire mesh Litter Caddie™. With other items to pick from, such as a variety of stands, spike cleaners, signs and more, the choices seem unlimited! Call 866-SG-EXPRESS to talk with a company representative, or work with your local Standard Golf Distributor. With our selection, we may make choosing the product hard, but choosing Standard Golf is easy.

For toll-free express service, call 1-866-SG-EXPRESS (1-866-743-9773)

Decisions, decisions.
Recently, I was asked a simple question that has a complicated answer: "How did you decide to put a bunker there?" While it seems intuitive, there's a logical thought process. I usually have a target number of bunkers based on course type or construction and maintenance costs. Within those parameters, I view potential bunker locations in terms of natural land forms and the ability to serve multiple functions. Then I consider aesthetics, variety and maintenance. The process is repeated.

**Land forms**

Golfers should see the hazards affecting play. Attractive bunkers are great visual design elements, so why hide them? Achieving visibility requires bunkers to slope toward a golfer's view, so a natural bunker location is one where the natural upward slope faces the golfer. Building up the ground for bunkers is possible on flat or even reverse-sloped ground; but they rarely look as good or natural as ones cut into an existing slope, so I build most of my bunkers where slopes naturally provide visibility with minimal earthwork.

Greens built into hillsides usually result in bunker-friendly slopes on the low side, as well as the high side in some cases. Building greens on raised fill pads on flat sites usually creates good bunker slopes, providing the green shape allows the bunkers to partially face the fairway for visibility. I rarely put bunkers behind moderately elevated fill-pad greens or any green built on a reverse slope because those backing bunkers rarely catch shots, limiting their usefulness.

**Usefulness**

Many aesthetic but out-of-play bunkers have been removed from golf courses and should continue to be removed, especially given the increased standards and bunker maintenance costs. Generally, fewer bunkers are being built compared to a decade ago because fewer courses can afford numerous or random bunkers built purely for aesthetics. In most cases, bunkers should affect play directly and provide aesthetics, safety, drainage and environmental protection. Where multiple opportunities don't exist or where water, specimen trees or unique contours exist, I won't use bunkers. I'll save them for areas devoid of natural features to create similar play interest.

**Strategy**

Hazards should create strategy for good players by placing green and fairway bunkers that relate shots to each other. Following a classic strategic design, fairway and green bunkers are placed on opposite sides of a hole, encouraging players to flirt with fairway bunkers to open the green on the approach. Good strategies can be developed using different bunker relationships, so finding a design that works using mostly natural bunker locations isn't too difficult. Rather than follow the tried-and-true method of bunker left/bunker right, I prefer mixing bunkers with other hazards to make golfers think about where to miss, while offering a variety of recovery shots suited to differently skilled players.

Bunkers usually are more visually dominant than grass hazards, and I use them where I want visual stop signs, intimidation through size or depth, or distance perception.

**Difficulty and speed of play**

Once an architect was told club members had difficulty getting out of the bunkers he designed on their course. The architect apparently didn't consider the difficulty and speed-of-play issues most courses face.

Challenge and difficulty are distinct. Feathering a six-iron fade to a tucked pin technically is the same challenge whether the bunker is two- or 20-feet deep. Fortunately, bunkers don't need to be excessively deep. While some contend short approach shots suggest deeper bunkers proportionally punish missed shots, most prefer all greenside bunkers to be shallow enough to see the pin.

Similarly, locating hazards in areas frequented only by average golfers — specifically slices or sand bunkers short of the green — also slows play. Leftside bunkers should outnumber rightsides bunkers considerably.

**Aesthetics and psychology**

If artistically arranged and well located, bunkers frame holes and greens, act as directional devices and lead the eye. Bunkers built without proper support, behind trees or on a hill are partially hidden and less attractive and shouldn't be built. Bunkers visually covering the fairway or green often make holes feel less comfortable while slowing play. Why force bunkers in where they don't fit?

Generally, small spaces require small bunkers or a consideration of other hazards. Single bunkers usually need attractive or dramatic shaping. Where room permits, bunker clusters are attractive and different if they're randomly spaced.

**Variety**

Golf holes look too much alike more often than they look too different, often because of the notion that similar bunkers create a theme.

Bunkers should have a style, but within that style favor creating visual variety by varying bunkers in number, size, pattern and placement. I purposely design some fairways and greens without bunkers and others with several. I alternate from lightly to heavily bunkered holes. If the construction budget or course type demands it, several greens or fairways will have one bunker only. I strive for variety, combining sand with other types of hazards.

**Review and repeat**

The short version of the bunker design process is:

1. Decide how many you want.
2. Find natural landforms that cry out for bunkers. Make the most of those.
3. Find areas where bunkers serve strategic, aesthetic and other useful purposes.
4. Use less natural but workable areas to create man-made variety.
5. Avoid using indifferent locations that cause excessive difficulty, maintenance problems or slow play.
6. In special cases, ignore rules one, three, four and five.
7. Review the plan and tweak it to assure the course has bunkers and they won't cause excessive difficulty or slow play.

I repeat steps two through six several times until, paraphrasing Charles Blair Macdonald, "I am confident they are perfect and beyond criticism." But that never happens.

Architects have lower "batting averages" than Major League Baseball players when it comes to bunkers, as more courses have redesigned bunkers throughout time than not. Because bunkers generate so much debate and discussion, they have survived golf's migration from their natural environs of the Scottish links land to remain a staple of golf course design. GCN
Few challenge the concept that the golf course superintendent is the most, if not the only, essential individual working at golf course properties, where the success and welfare of each golf course program is unequivocally determined by how well the golf course superintendent performs his/her job. The troubling question every GCSAA member should be asking is: Why if the individual golf course superintendent is held in such high esteem isn't the profession itself held in similar esteem?

Why do superintendents have to ask for privileges that are extended routinely to sister professionals in golf? Why are superintendents granted written contract security less frequently than sister professionals? Why do superintendents attend fewer board meetings than sister professionals? Why is it generally acceptable for golf course superintendents to be summarily dismissed, but unacceptable for sister professionals to be similarly dismissed? When was the last time we saw a golf professional or club manager locked out of his/her office and/or denied access to course property? Why do superintendents have to fight for fair separation packages when dismissed when sister professionals don't?

Some might think only the less experienced and more vulnerable superintendents suffer the above indignities. This isn't the case, however, because for more than 20 years, I've watched the very best superintendents get pushed around with equal impunity. Why does a 2004 Golf Course News survey indicate that 58 percent of the most essential individuals working at the nation's golf courses do not feel secure in their jobs? Could there be a greater disconnect?

The definitive reasons why superintendents are shown the lack of respect they deserve are: (1.) because the golf course superintendent profession hasn't effectively dealt with these issues; and (2.) because if employers know they can get away with it, they'll continue to do it until the root causes of the problem are addressed.

The two root causes why the golf course superintendents' profession has failed to gain the national respect it deserves are: First, no one represents the profession per se to ensure it's presented in the proper light. I realize most people, including GCSAA members, believe that because the vast majority of superintendents and assistants are GCSAA members, the association represents the profession. However, this is a misread because the GCSAA is a membership organization that by definition tends to the needs of its individual members and not those of the profession as a whole, which are two different things.

Looking at this another way, while the GCSAA has been consistently effective tending to its members throughout the years, it has yet to accept the responsibility to shape the profession, itself. This is understandable because the GCSAA's charter purpose didn't include this responsibility. However, because the need for the profession's effectiveness has grown throughout the years, we're now at the point where there's no one else to pass the baton to except the GCSAA. Accordingly, because their profession virtually has gone unattended, the indignities suffered by superintendents to date will only continue to escalate further until the GCSAA realizes the welfare of its members is forever entwined with the respect, or lack thereof, accorded their profession.

Second, as a result of the intense political infighting that occurred within the GCSAA during the early 1980s, a political message was delivered to future generations of GCSAA members that basically stated the governing rules of the association had been set for the foreseeable future and they weren't to be messed with. To assure there would be little messing around, the GCSAA bylaws were arbitrarily amended at the time to require a stifling two-thirds vote of members to amend any bylaw provision. (See my November 2005 GCN column.)

A direct by-product of these maneuverings is that subsequent GCSAA boards have been hesitant to pursue meaningful policy change because the combination of the inevitable politics that attaches to every policy-change issue, together with the need to achieve a difficult-to-obtain two-thirds approval vote of the membership consistently has offered little hope for success. As a result: Natural leadership types within the membership avoid board of director service because they realize there will be little opportunity to make a difference; archaic election procedures continue; board performance becomes less transparent; and members have yet been given their first opportunity to vote on a 25-year-old volatile relocation issue.

Is it any wonder why the indignities that have been fostered on superintendents for decades go unchallenged and will continue to go unchallenged until enough members get upset enough to forge change. This goal will be realized only through a concerted chapter level campaign.

Recommended change

To bring life and respect to the golf course superintendent profession:

1. The GCSAA must pursue the one proven way to develop respect for a profession – through education. One of the most consistent problems superintendents have always had is that the vast majority of their employers don't have a basic understanding of how and why they do their jobs. Through history, effective teachers at every level always have been universally respected. So, too, will the golf course superintendent profession be respected – putting an end to all the present day indignities – once it establishes itself as a worthy and dedicated teacher of the brethren. (See my July 2006 GCN column for a profile of recommended educational programming.)

2. The GCSAA must upgrade its election procedures to ensure that more of its better-qualified members see the call to duty and become more willing to pursue committee and Board service throughout the Association. (More on this in a future column.)

3. GCSAA members must marshal their forces to eliminate the mandatory two-thirds approval vote needed to amend the association's bylaws. Until this happens, the GCSAA, its members and the profession will be locked in a 1980s time frame forever.

The ball is now on the GCSAA membership's side of the court. Until members realize an indignity fostered on one superintendent is an indignity fostered on all superintendents, they'll remain outside of golf's inner family looking in.
Please listen carefully

Here's an imaginary, but probably not unrealistic, conversation between a golf course superintendent and one of his employees:

Employee: "I'm really upset! Mr. Jones from the green committee scolded me about that problem spot on the eighth green right in front of several members."

Superintendent: "You shouldn't be upset. He's on the green committee, and he's concerned about a legitimate problem."

Now answer three questions about this conversation: What's the employee concerned about? What did the superintendent really listen? What's the problem? The superintendent (a) didn't hear the employee's real concern, and (b) he interjected his opinion when the employee had begun to discuss what had happened. The employee is left feeling the superintendent isn't concerned about his opinions or feelings. Unfortunately, the result is the employee is likely to become less open, more uncertain and less motivated.

Let's look at a more productive response:

Employee: "I'm really upset. Mr. Jones from the green committee scolded me about that problem spot on the eighth green right in front of several members."

Superintendent: "It sounds like you're angry with Mr. Jones for making you look bad in front of members."

Employee: "Yes, because he's on the committee, he knows how hard we've worked on that green."

Superintendent: "What do you suggest we do?"

Employee: "Pay more attention to the eighth green and fix the problem."

In this version, the superintendent didn't seem to talk much. The role was listening to the employee talk through his concerns and feelings. By listening and facilitating, the superintendent enabled the employee to validate a concern about Mr. Jones' comments, work through his anger and propose a solution. In this version, the employee concludes there was a good discussion and feels the incident is closed, maintaining or increasing his motivation.

This example highlights two key points about listening: One, listen carefully to understand exactly what's being said, and two, active or empathic listening enhances communication.

Many people don't fully listen to what's being said or ask follow-up questions to elicit greater understanding or additional information. More often than not, when someone initiates a conversation, he has spent time thinking about the idea, the issue, the concern or the situation. Interjecting off-the-cuff ideas and responses before someone completely explains their thinking loses the fruits of the time spent with that individual and diminishes the quality of the interpersonal relationship.

In the first example conversation, the superintendent didn't hear what the employee was communicating, and the premature response brought the conversation to an unsuccessful end. In the second version, the superintendent heard the employee was talking about his feelings from the incident with Mr. Jones, not about the problem on the eighth green, and continued the conversation with a satisfactory resolution.

No interruptions please

Even worse than not completely listening, people often interrupt others because they think they already know what's being said. Sometimes people hear what they want to hear, not what's being said. In the following dialogue, a superintendent has just told her staff that an employee has been injured and the maintenance staff must work extra hours. Bob, the employee she expects to resist the most, approaches her after the meeting:

Bob: "I'm concerned about the extra work because I'm taking a course and have some other plans but …"

Superintendent (interrupting): "I knew you would be a problem. We all have to do our share. We have no choice."

Bob: "Please, let me finish! What I'm trying to say is that I want to do my part. I'm even willing to do more than my share. However, it's important to me that my time is scheduled so I can finish my class and attend my sister's wedding."

Superintendent: "Oh! That's great. We can arrange that."

In the end, the outcome of this conversation was positive even though it was awkward. The superintendent made an incorrect assumption about what Bob wanted to say. Think what might have happened had Bob not persisted.

When supervising others, the consequences of failing to allow an employee to fully express ideas, opinions and feelings and/or to not listen completely are often two-fold. First, the conversation isn't brought to a successful conclusion. Second, you've communicated the message you don't want to listen, and even more significant is future ideas, concerns and feelings might never be communicated.

Active or empathic listening enhances communication. Our tendency is to view listening as a passive activity. A more active approach to listening can be a proactive way to enhance communication with employees. The listener takes active responsibility for understanding the content and feelings behind what's being said. The listener's underlying theme is to use active listening to help others solve their problems.

What's your response?

Let's look at another example. An employee approaches you and says: "I knew you wouldn't listen. The deadline to finish fertilizing the fairways isn't realistic." The typical response would be to insist the deadline is realistic. An active listening response, however, would be: "I sounds like you're concerned about meeting the deadline." The advantage of this response is two-fold. First, you show understanding for the employee's position. Second, you and the employee can talk about the employee's feelings and meeting the deadline. The active learning approach opens the door for communication rather than contributing to a budding confrontation.

An open communication climate is created through active listening. The listener better understands what a person means and how the person feels about situations and problems. Active listening is a skill that communicates acceptance and increases interpersonal trust between employees and their supervisors. The chance of an employee leaving a conversation perceiving he has been treated fairly is heightened by the use of active listening.

My challenge to you is establish a realistic goal for the percentage of the time you'll listen with nothing else in mind.
Here's Johnny... and John

THEY'RE NOT SUCH AN ODD COUPLE AFTER ALL

by PAT JONES

In the back of my mind, I knew John Harbottle and Johnny Miller were probably aware that I'd been occasionally... perhaps... kind of... just a wee bit critical of Mr. Miller and his comments about "grain" on putting surfaces and other maintenance matters during his golf broadcasts on NBC.

When they agreed to conduct a joint interview with GCN about Timilick Tahoe, their newest collaboration, which is in California, I wondered if that might be uncomfortable and how they'd handle it. Also, I thought a limited design partnership between a serious architect and a TV commentator might be... well, kind of an odd-couple thing. You know... the "celebrity" designer who "partners" with a legitimate craftsman in name only. Well, I was wrong on both counts.

Johnny Miller is, quite simply, a golf legend. A junior golf prodigy and Brigham Young University graduate, Miller broke into the big time with a surprise second-place finish at the Masters in 1971 at the ripe age of 23. Two years later, he captured his first major with a win at the 1973 U.S. Open. He sizzled in 1974 and 1975, winning an amazing 12 events. He went on to take his second major championship at the British Open in 1976. Eventually, he retired from the regular Tour with 24 victories. He is the voice of NBC golf and arguably the most candid commentator sitting in any television tower today. ("Lousy shot, huh, Roger?") When he's not announcing, or skiing or fishing, he designs golf courses. He's credited with a few beauties, including Thanksgiving Point in Lehi, Utah; Entrada at Snow Canyon in St. George, Utah; and my personal favorite Badlands Golf Club in Las Vegas. Oh yeah, he's in the World Golf Hall of Fame, too.

Harbottle isn't necessarily one of the best-known architects in the country, but some think he's one of the best in the West. A Pete Dye protégé whose parents were outstanding amateur players (they're both inductees into the Pacific Northwest Golf Association's Hall of Fame), the 46-year-old is a member of the American Society of Golf Course Architect's board of governors and has worn the society's Don Ross plaid for more than 15 years.

In his career, Harbottle has designed 17 new facilities, including the highly rated Olympic Course at Gold Mountain in Bremerton, Wash., but also had plaudits for his redesign work at Los Angeles County Club's North Course and other classics. He's no stranger to partnering with Tour players, having collaborated with players/comedians Fuzzy Zoeller and Peter Jacobsen.

Does that last point suggest it takes a sense of humor to work with sometimes irascible Johnny Miller? Let's find out.

Q: How did you two hook up?

JM: We first hooked up on a resort course that's now called Genoa Lakes in Nevada. The owner was the guy who founded Tombstone Pizza. Johnny was brought into the project along the way, and I loved working with him. He's personable and low-key. When the owners of Timilick came to me and asked about bringing in a high-profile player, I recommended Johnny immediately.

Q: Working with John has been a really nice thing, and we'll do more courses in the future. He doesn't need me, but when the developer is selling homes, it helps to have a name attached. I could just do that and show up once, but that's not my style.

OK John, what's Mr. Miller really like?

He's exactly what you'd think from watching him on TV. He's completely honest and totally passionate. And he doesn't give himself enough credit for what he knows about architecture.

Johnny, how much time do you spend on a site?

I try to get there when they need me. I'll probably go more than required. I enjoy going to Truckee, Calif., near the Timilick project. The have great fishing flies at the local hardware store. The area is pristine and so beautiful. Other developers and course designers have been like that with John.

That's a pretty honest approach. Johnny, what do you bring to the process?

Two heads are better than one as long as the egos don't get in the way. It makes for a good product. I've been doing this since the early '70s. I've learned from so many people. I've worked with maybe a dozen different architects. Collaboration is a way for me to learn the craft a bit better.

My expertise is visual. That's why I'm a good announcer. I'm the ultimate nitpicker. I have a good eye for what makes sense. He's got the eye of the tiger. Best of all, we never B.S. each other.

Mr. Harbottle. He's so dedicated to his work. I have complete confidence in him. I've worked with some designers in the past and always had to look over my shoulder. I worried about things such as bunker placement, wind, etc. - the 90 million little technical details that make a great course. I'd think, 'He's not that great a player and doesn't get it.' It's never been like that with John.
designers in the area have done a great job. I'm hoping the market stays strong. Not that I'm going to make any more money on the project, but we just want it to be a success.

Q: What do you disagree about?
JH: We don't disagree a lot. But I remember at Genoa (Nev.) Lakes Golf Club, Johnny wanted to add a (longer) back tee on the 18th. He just mentioned the idea to someone, and it later got back to me he had the impression I wasn't listening. We went back and added it, but now we spend a lot of time talking about every aspect so we resolve stuff like that in advance.

JM: It's funny because I came in halfway through that project. It's like going to the hospital where John and his wife just had a baby, and I come waltzing in and criticize how the baby looks. He could have said, 'Hey, it's my baby' and tell me where to go. But, after a day or two, he listened, and we found a solution. I won't force him to make a change, but I also won't ask for something flippantly.

Some of the best designs in the country come out of collaborations. What I always say about ideas is that, if you're open to them, you'll learn stuff you never would have. In the process, you go into a whole new 'room' of knowledge. You can learn much more.

Q: How would you describe the design at Timilick?
JM: It's a mountain course, but it doesn't have the supersevere contours of most mountain courses. The back nine has great terrain - large rock outcroppings and pretty spectacular stuff. There's a rippling water feature through holes 17 and 18. We aren't trying to build the next U.S. Open site, so it's a little longer than 7,000 from the tips. It's got a great feel about it - a great spirit about it. It's a nice mix of different design features. It'll be in the 'pretty hard' category.

JH: We have a common design philosophy that combines risk/reward with dramatic bunkering. That allows you to challenge a good player, but not kill the average one. Timilick is going to be a great example of that.

Q: What newer courses have you visited recently that you admire?
JH: I don't visit new courses too much. I don't want to be influenced. Give me the old stuff. I played Royal County Down in Ireland (during the 2006 Ryder Cup), and it might be the best course in the world.

JM: John's right. The really phenomenal courses are there already. Pebble Beach is probably the only true 10 on the scale when you combine beauty and great golf. I agree County Down is right there, too. That said, I love Bandon Dunes. Timilick is pretty close to a nine on the scale. There's nothing that replaces a good piece of land. No matter what you do, there's nothing that can equal a great site. You're excited because you know you can't screw it up.

Q: John, do you sometimes get "pooh-poohed" by others because you're now working with a "celebrity" design partner?
When I first got out on my own, I wanted...
to show what I could do, but the owner brought in a ‘celebrity.’ I didn’t want to share the limelight and resented it. As I’ve gotten older, I feel I’ve made my name. My feathers are much less ruffled by the idea. Particularly when it’s someone like Johnny who’s a good person and contributes to the project.

It’s just business. Sometimes the developer gets nervous partway through a project and wants the celebrity. The bank might even make financing for the project contingent on it. We’re all affected by brands and ‘signature’ status. It doesn’t mean you can’t do a great job, but when you’re investing millions, you can’t ignore the appeal of the ‘name’ a celebrity brings to the table.

John, you’ve helped design 17 courses and worked with many superintendents. What separates the good from the great?

That’s an easy question. Owners will ask you what to look for in a superintendent, and I tell them to ask their job candidates, ‘If you come across a problem, where do you turn?’ The best one’s will say they never stop asking questions and learning. Those that just want to sit around and do what they’ve always done won’t make it. Plus, I always respect guys who spend a lot of time on the course. A good friend of mine, a great superintendent, walks his course every morning.

Will this be an ongoing partnership?

JH: We don’t have a company, per se, and I’ll keep doing my own stuff. But, he’d still be the first guy I’d recommend. Johnny gets it.

Johnny, many folks criticize you for talking about ‘grain’ or other maintenance issues. How do you respond?

Hey, the truth will set you free. I never, ever have a problem with talking about grain on a Bermudagrass green that tilts to the west or the southwest. I do my homework. I’m not just some flippin’ guy on the air who has no clue about how grass grows.

You’re kind of walking into the lion’s den by agreeing to speak at the Golf Industry Show next year. Are you ready for it?

I hope they give me some trouble. I’m looking forward to it. The improvement in course maintenance in my lifetime is just incredible. It’s an art form. When I came on tour, the only course that was in really good shape was Firestone Country Club in Akron, Ohio. I don’t think these young guys on the Tour today have any idea of how great the conditions are now.

Will you say that on the air?

Yup. There aren’t too many guys who come close to me in the department of shooting from the hip. GCN

John Harbottle can be reached at harbottlede sign@mindspring.com. Johnny Miller can be reached at info@johnnymillerdesign.com.
Design case study

All about the water

A DEVELOPMENT TEAM OVERCOMES LIMITED RESOURCES AND LAND RESTRICTIONS TO BUILD AN UPSCALE COURSE IN CANADA