to come and when the final results are arrived at it will be from the superinten-
dent level that the continuing implementa-
tion will be made.

However, the club official and golf as-
sociation level must not be discounted for
from here will come the information on
what is needed to be known, at this level,
and in what form so that golf mainte-
nance costs may be tied in with other
operating costs to give a true over-all
picture. The "why" of golf maintenance
costs has been presented inadequately so
that when the problems of club finances
are being studied and policies determined
the golf course is usually the goat.

The building up of a fund to guarantee
the successful completion of this study
may appear to be the major difficulty.
It is not intended to infer that this is not
a real problem but when the solicitation
campaign is backed by solid proof that
this study is wanted and needed and that
a sound program for procedure has been
drawn up, resistance to co-operating
through grants-in-aid will be definitely
reduced.

Because it is at the superintendent level
that much of the eventual benefit will be
realized, here too, must come not only
organizational support but also money
backing. The Golf Course Superintendents
Assn. must lead the way in both and
must expect to put up a worthwhile
amount of money. The many sectional
associations of golf course superintend-
ents will have to fall in line behind the
major association.

The Green Section can well afford to
make a grant-in-aid. The business side of
golf is very much the concern of the
Green Section and while the diversion of
some money from turf research to cost
research may not be immediately appeal-
ing, the long view will show that from
this study must come more members for
the USGA and consequently an increased
budget for the Green Section.

The various district golf associations
ought to see that to co-operate through
grants-in-aid will be the best method for
them to support the study and that they
can help further by securing donations
from their member clubs. The financial
burden can be lightened by grants-in-aid
from the manufacturers and dealers in the
maintenance equipment and materials
field and also by the manufacturers and
distributors of playing equipment.

GOLFDOM has offered the impetus for
a study of course maintenance costs and it is now up to all the levels of interest to
pick up the offer and develop the project.
Where this start will come from remains
to be seen but certainly the Golf Course
Superintendents Assn. will be serving its
members and clubs in seriously examining
the opportunity now spread before it.

Intelligent Comparison of
Course Costs Tough Job
By JOHN L. COUNSELL
Supt., Salem (Mass.) Country Club

No element in golf management has
received as much studious attention as the
comparison of golf course maintenance
costs has received from the men responsible
for course operation.

Almost every superintendent of a golf
course sees so many more things he'd
like to be able to do to his course, if the
money were available, that he is con-
tantly looking for possible improvements
in his management of the budget dollar.
The days have long passed when superin-
tendents hesitated to compare costs. For
years we have been trying to learn how to
do the work better and at less cost, or fight
the problem of rapidly mounting costs.

And this search has brought to mem-
bers of the Greenkeepers' Club of New
England realization that to make an in-
telligent comparison of course costs you
have to know practically as much about
the other course as you do about your
own when you are striving to make a
close comparison.

It is my conviction — and it's shared by
many of my associates in course main-
tenance work — that it is possible for a
very efficiently operated course to cost
$10,000 to $15,000 a year more to main-
tain than another course in the same
district where conditions are much dif-
ferent. Club officials, not knowing the
different conditions which are primary
subjects for comparison, may be inclined
to compare the bare costs which are basi-
cally the secondary factor in the com-
parison.

Here are a few of the varying factors in
determining course maintenance costs
that come to my mind:
1. Area of greens, fairways, tees, traps
   and rough.
2. Standard of maintenance (and how
   are you going to compare that?)
3. Number of daily rounds of golf, and
   length of season.
4. Soil and climatic conditions.
5. Club accounting systems (No two
   are exactly alike.)
6. Fairway watering — increased mow-
ing and fertilizing costs.
7. Variations of salaries and wages in
different areas.
8. Equipment. (Is it sufficient and
   modern?)
9. House and grounds (area and type
   of planting.)
10. Chemical treatments (for weeds,
diseases and pests.)

Unless one can get data that can be
uniformly and closely compared on these
10 factors an accurate over-all compari-
on of maintenance costs is impossible.