Legislation can be a good thing. Safety belt laws, child abuse regulations, The Clean Air Act and the Dram Shop Law have all been good rules implemented by our elected officials to protect our lifestyle. Our elected officials do indeed mandate some pretty good ideas for our American way of life. However, sometimes they miss the mark and go overboard. Not typically due to poor intentions, but rather misinformation and lack of education.

A few years back the macro nutrient phosphorous used for turf applications was pulled from the shelves and out of the hands of both the home owner and also responsible end users in the green industry (through fast action by the Minnesota Golf Association, golf courses were exempt). Although well intended to limit the negative impact upon large and small bodies of water, the legislature reacted more emotionally than scientifically. They passed into law a requirement that will do little if any to prevent the polluting and rapid aging of our ponds and lakes. As scientists we know that most of the contaminants are caused through the natural breakdown of organic matter or the misapplication of nutrients introduced through storm run-off sewers.

Now we are stuck with a law that completely disregards scientific data generated at the University of Minnesota. Information generated through funding from the Minnesota Turf and Grounds Foundation which indicates that healthy turf, grass fertilized with a balance of soil test indicated nutrients, is dense and will provide an optimum filter to capture impurities before they enter the environment through run off. So why were golf courses exempted from this poor legislation? Because they lobbied successfully with the MGA.

Coming down the road will be new laws intended to protect our state resources. More nutrient restrictions, regulations on plant protectants and perhaps even a more stringent limit on the water we have available today. Who is going to help educate our elected officials that we as an industry, an 8.25 billion dollar industry, will be impacted negatively should these mandates be placed willy-nilly?

Who will represent over 54,000 employees in the green industry to limit the regulation of our livelihoods?

Might I be so bold as to suggest we take the bull by the horns and guide our own destiny using the power of numbers, the numbers generated by the members of the Minnesota Turf and Grounds Foundation? Currently we are very successful at achieving our mission of supporting research at the University of Minnesota; kudos to each of the allied associations and their members for their part in promoting the Minnesota Green Industry. Isn't it time to turn that muscle into strength with which to prevent future regulations that could be negative?

Our "association of allied associations" represents a huge block of constituents, the squeaky wheels heard by potential and current legislatures. Together we can impact the outcome of well intended but poorly advised bills. We have already taken a first step in educating the House and Senate through the distribution in April of the 13-page Economic Impact Report and a letter indicating our willingness to inform them of our industry.

This initial thrust is a great door opener, but I feel we need to become an even more prominent player on the Hill. To do this we need to pursue this type of advocacy. If we do not then we will surely be impacted by poor legislation implemented by well-meaning officials. It is my intent over the next two years to develop a stronger relationship between our allied associations to enhance our presence at the Capitol and add many voices when our issues need to be heard.
A Rebuttal to “The Great Ethanol Fallacy”

By DAVID HOWREY
Howrey Construction Company

The article states a national commitment to ethanol for "green" or environmental purposes and for a reduction in our nation’s dependence on foreign oil and says that this is furthest from the truth. While the “green” merits of ethanol can be debated, certainly it is a different product and produced quite differently than that of petroleum and, as such, there are advantages and disadvantages with each. However ethanol is a proven fuel which substitutes petroleum to an increasing extent and thus indeed reduces our nation’s dependence upon foreign oil. And undeniably, the essential monopoly of petroleum for fuel is unhealthy for a free market and has been shown to benefit terrorism and enemies of this country.

Like so many aspects of our society, it is difficult to ascertain the truth in these matters where special interests exist for both camps and “facts” support both extremes and on virtually all aspects of petroleum or ethanol. Certainly ethanol production continues to be an emerging technology and the more recent the research and facts, the more economical and “green” it has become. Both products should enjoy continued benefits in “green” technology and improved emissions as regulated by our bureaucracies. However, it is well known that oil production is limited and costs will continue to increase where available resources become more depleted, diluted, deeper and in more remote or distant offshore locations, whereas, ethanol production is truly renewable, produced by plants and solar energy!

By volume it is true that 100% gasoline fuel tank would be on the order of 2/3 the size of an 100% ethanol fuel tank in order to achieve the same range, however this is not an indication of “efficiency” and, incidentally, this equates to 50% more (BTU) energy. Perhaps many years ago one gallon of ethanol produced cost one gallon of equivalent energy input; however I have found ratios from 1995 of 1.24 and 2002 of 1.34 and since 2002 and into the future, can we not expect further improvements in the efficiency and production of ethanol, in a free and competitive market?

As voters and taxpayers we should be concerned with any subsidies or in this case, tax benefits and reduced taxes favoring ethanol. It may be interesting to note that the ethanol “subsidy” was introduced in 1978 and at 40 cents and which apparently did not spur the market much and where would such an alternative or competitive product be without such? Petroleum would have less competition. “The ethanol bust” published in February of this year by CNN mentions huge ethanol profits not long ago (disturbing?) but narrow and negligible profits now and numerous cancelled new-plant projects and suggests a possible shake-down in the industry. No, plant investments will not be paid for all too quickly. And these corporations should seek greater efficiencies as a result.

In 2005, UC Berkeley researchers have given ethanol a 10 to 15% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions as compared to gasoline and opined that further improvements to be likely and that producing ethanol from corn uses much less petroleum that producing gasoline!

Most disturbing is that the previously mentioned article found in this publication attacked ethanol with respect to water usage and water quality and in a golf and turf publication! Briefly, we should all be wise stewards towards managing water quality. Irrigation water is indeed a commodity that market forces influence and yet, the greater majority of corn is produced by rain water! Crops (and golf courses) can be better managed for pollutant runoff whether such is used for ethanol production (or pleasure). Similarly, as to the attack on ethanol regarding subsidies or tax incentives, the author of the previous article works for a municipal golf course and we know that such public facilities enjoy the use of public monies or taxes whether in active areas of construction, bonding, maintenance, etc., or in more passive areas of insurance, administration, potential tax exemptions and other areas. Whose ox is goring whose ox?

Let us also consider the end products: ethanol is quickly biodegradable, petroleum products remain a pollutant for a very many years. This fact has enormous consequences to water quality nationally and globally, near term and long term. Pollutant runoff essentially never affects ground water quality and that sedimentation comprises 50% of impaired waters is false. According to the USEPA website, nationally 9.8% of such waters are impaired due to sedimentation and in Minnesota sedimentation is not even listed! The major reasons are pathogens and
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mercury, among others.

We the people have demanded solutions to foreign oil dependence. The federal government has passed laws mandating renewable fuels usage, seven billion gallons for 2008 and increasing annually to 36 billion gallons by 2022. Corn ethanol is now the most mature industry to accomplish such mandates. Other promising means of producing ethanol are emerging as well as other fuel technologies. With careful use of subsidies to encourage research and development and regulations to minimize pollution, and in a free market, all should benefit from corn ethanol and other renewable fuels.

Ethanol from corn is not a fix-all. The “market” to introduce it and rather quickly and massively is based upon government mandates and tax incentives per public and special interest pressures, and this has yielded grain price increases as the major problem. Perhaps the larger issue is in electing thinkers with courage and morals to our Congress and state Houses so that decisions and programs can be introduced per facts and good judgment rather that per the whims of largely an ignorant public swayed by the slanted and deceitful institutions which influence it (i.e. the aforementioned article).

David J. Oberle
Sales
david.oberle@comcast.net

Excel Turf & Ornamental
A Green Industry Company

4250 Wexford Way, Eagan, MN 55122
Phone: 651-681-8050 • Fax: 651-681-1969

About Excel Turf & Ornamental
Excel Turf & Ornamental provides products and expertise to the entire green industry in the Upper Midwest (Minnesota, Wisconsin and Iowa). Our goal is to provide better agronomic services, better products and the best service to our customers. To contact Excel Turf & Ornamental call 651-681-8050 or email us at david.oberle@comcast.net
MINNESOTA IN THE CROSSHAIRS

Mother Nature

By Paul Diegnau, CGCS
Keller Golf Course, St. Paul

Hopefully, by the time you are reading this, air and soil temperatures will have "normalized," allowing seed and sod to establish in those areas needing assistance. Once again, Mother Nature had the final say regarding the health of Poa annua-laden golf courses in the state. Tees and collars were hit the hardest by most accounts with occasional areas of fairways and greens also taking it on the chin. The culprit was one of the two late April snowfalls we experienced this year. In my conversations with other Superintendents in the state, the damaged areas tended to correlate with areas of shade that held snow cover the longest. Hydrated Poa annua plants combined with a rapid temperature change was the most likely cause of death. Some golf courses also experienced desiccation damage.

Future of PCNB

During a recent follow-up conversation with Jill Bloom, Review Manager, U.S. EPA, I learned that the 2008 spring decision regarding the future of PCNB has been put on hold. It now appears that EPA is re-examining pesticides that are persistent in the environment and potentially bioaccumulative (like PCNB). Their current task is to establish the best way to characterize the risks such products pose. The time frame for a decision is unclear. AMVAC will be the only remaining manufacturer of PCNB. As the sole manufacturer, they control pricing. Prices this fall will be close to double the 2007 price, pushing $40/gallon. If this is in fact true, AMVAC, in my opinion, will have shot itself in the foot. PCNB is a very effective snow mold product that was economically priced. Double the price and many other effective products become competitive. How this shakes out remains to be seen.

Agree to Disagree

In the February issue of Hole Notes I asked readers, if inclined, to submit counter-thought responses on any topic presented in Minnesota in the Crosshairs or anywhere else in the publication. Well, a rebuttal to my February column titled "The Ethanol Fallacy" was received and is printed in this issue on Page 12.

The beauty of living in America is that each and every one of us is entitled to an opinion and the ability to express that opinion. It is also acceptable to agree to disagree. BUT... it is extremely important that these exchanges remain civil and respectful. I will not publicly spar with the author of this piece as we simply disagree on the viability of corn ethanol as an energy source in the 21st century. However, I do take issue with being referred to as deceitful and slanted. Rebuttals are welcome but name-calling is not necessary.

Have a great golf season!!!
Pineapple-Rum Chicken

1 ½ cups Jasmine rice
1 whole pineapple- or pre-chunked chunks in fresh produce section (about a half cup)

3 tbsp. vegetable oil
1 small yellow onion, diced
2 garlic cloves, chopped
Coarse sea salt
½ tsp. crushed red pepper flakes
1/4 cup spiced rum
2 cups chicken broth/stock
4 six ounce chicken breasts, boneless/skinless
Coarse black pepper
1/2 cup fresh chopped leaf parsley
2 tbsp. fresh chopped cilantro leaves

Cook rice according to package directions.

While rice is cooking:
Cut pineapple into bite size chunks. Heat a sauce pan over medium to high heat, add one tbsp vegetable oil. Add onion, garlic, salt (to taste) and crushed red pepper. Stirring frequently cook for approximately 2 minutes. Add pineapple chunks and some of the juice, stir to combine in skillet. Take the skillet off the heat and add the spiced rum, Captain Morgan is one of my favorites. Return pan to heat- be careful, rum can (and sometimes does) flame up. Keep on heat for about one minute to let the alcohol burn off. Add the chicken broth, stir and cook until reduced by 30%. It will thicken a bit as it reduces.

As sauce is reducing, pre-heat a large skillet over medium to high heat with 2 tbsp vegetable oil. Season the chicken to your liking with salt and pepper. Add chicken to hot skillet. Cook until done-about 5-7 minutes on each side (depending on size of chicken breast).

Slice the breasts and return to large skillet, add sauce, stir top combine. Add the parsley and cilantro, remove from heat.

Place chicken on bed of jasmine rice and top with liberal amounts of sauce.

For a little flavor twist add a small splash of liquid smoke or just cook the chicken over a charcoal grill.

This will serve about four people. Enjoy!
Introducing Toro® DPA cutting units! With its “one click” bedknife-to-reel adjustment, Toro DPA cutting units are designed to adjust and cut as one consistent reel. Each component is precision manufactured, and only Toro’s patented DPA cutting unit ensures the aggressiveness of cut remains constant over the life of the reel, giving you a consistent cut across all three cutting units, day after day. Toro DPA cutting units, helping you achieve the consistency you need across all three reels.
The all-new Reelmaster® 5010 series fairway mowers from Toro® deliver exceptional quality of cut and aftercut appearance. Dual Precision Adjustment (DPA) cutting units make adjustments simple and more accurate. The cutting edges stay sharp two or three times longer, resulting in less maintenance. Optional accessories further enhance performance. An ergonomic operator station results in ease of use and provides improved operator comfort. The new Reelmaster 5010 series is designed to keep you out of the shop and out on the fairway.

Hundreds of improvements.

The all-new Reelmaster® 5010 series fairway mowers from Toro® deliver exceptional quality of cut and aftercut appearance. Dual Precision Adjustment (DPA) cutting units make adjustments simple and more accurate. The cutting edges stay sharp two or three times longer, resulting in less maintenance. Optional accessories further enhance performance. An ergonomic operator station results in ease of use and provides improved operator comfort. The new Reelmaster 5010 series is designed to keep you out of the shop and out on the fairway.
Are You Sabotaging Your Career?

By BRENT FILSON
The Filson Leadership Group

My experience working with thousands of leaders worldwide for the past two decades teaches me that most leaders are screwing up their careers.

On a daily basis, these leaders are getting the wrong results or the right results in the wrong ways.

Interestingly, they themselves are choosing to fail. They’re actively sabotaging their own careers.

Leaders commit this sabotage for a simple reason: They make the fatal mistake of choosing to communicate with presentations and speeches -- not leadership talks.

In terms of boosting one's career, the difference between the two methods of leadership communication is the difference between lightning and the lightning bug.

Speeches/presentations primarily communicate information. Leadership talks, on the other hand, not only communicate information, they do more: They establish a deep, human emotional connection with the audience.

Why is the latter connection necessary in leadership?

Look at it this way: Leaders do nothing more important than get results. There are generally two ways that leaders get results: They can order people to go from point A to point B, or they can have people WANT TO go from A to B.

Clearly, leaders who can instill "want to" in people, who motivate those people, are much more effective than leaders who can't or won't.

And the best way to instill "want to" is not simply to relate to people as if they are information receptacles but to relate to them on a deep, human, emotional way.

And you do it with leadership talks.

Here are a few examples of leadership talks.

When Churchill said, "We will fight on the beaches ..." That was a leadership talk.

When Kennedy said, "Ask not what your country can do for you ... " that was a leadership talk.

When Reagan said, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!" That was a leadership talk.

You can come up with a lot of examples, too. Go back to those moments when the words of a leader inspired people to take ardent action, and you’ve probably put your finger on an authentic leadership talk.

Mind you, I’m not just talking about great leaders of history. I’m also talking about the leaders in your organizations. After all, leaders speak 15 to 20 times a day, everything from formal speeches to informal chats. When those interactions are leadership talks, not just speeches or presentations, the effectiveness of those leaders is dramatically increased.

How do we put together leadership talks? It's not easy. Mastering leadership talks takes a rigorous application of many specific processes. As Clement Atlee said of that great master of leadership talks, Winston Churchill, "Winston spent the best years of his life preparing his impromptu talks."

Churchill, Kennedy, Reagan and others who were masters at giving leadership talks didn't actually call their communications "leadership talks," but they must have been conscious to some degree of the processes one must employ in putting a leadership talk together.

Here's how to start. If you plan to give a leadership talk, there are three questions you should ask. If you answer "no" to any one of those questions, you can't go one.

You may be able to give a speech or presentation, but certainly not a leadership talk.

Do you know what the audience needs?

Winston Churchill said, "We must face the facts or they'll stab us in the back."

When you are trying to motivate people, the real facts are THEIR facts, their reality.

Their reality is composed of their needs. In many cases, their needs have nothing to do with your needs.

Most leaders don't get this. They think that their own needs, their organization's needs, are reality. That's okay if you're into ordering. As an order leader, you only need work with your reality. You simply have to tell people to get the job done. You don't have to know where they're coming from. But if you want to motivate them, you must work within their reality, not yours.

I call it "playing the game in the people's home park." There is no other way to motivate them consistently. If you insist on playing the game in your park, you'll be disappointed in the motivational outcome.

Can you bring deep belief to what you're saying?

Nobody wants to follow a leader who doesn't believe the job can get done. If you can't feel it, they won't do it.

But though you yourself must "want to" when it comes to the challenge you face, your motivation isn't the point. It's simply a given. If you're not motivated, you shouldn't be leading.

Here's the point: Can you TRANSFER your motivation to the people so they become as motivated as you are?

I call it THE MOTIVATIONAL TRANSFER, and it is one of the least understood and most important leadership determinants of all.

There are three ways you can make the transfer happen.

* CONVEY INFORMATION. Often, this is enough to get people motivated. For instance, many people have quit smoking because of information on the harmful effects of the habit.

* MAKE SENSE. To be motivated, people must understand the rationality behind your challenge. Re: smoking, people have been motivated to quit because the information makes sense.
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* TRANSMIT EXPERIENCE. This entails having the leader's experience become the people's experience. This can be the most effective method of all, for when the speaker's experience becomes the audience's experience, a deep sharing of emotions and ideas, a communing, can take place.

There are plenty of presentation and speech courses devoted to the first two methods, so I won't talk about those.

Here are a few thoughts on the third method. Generally speaking, humans learn in two ways: by acquiring intellectual understanding and through experience.

In our schooling, the former predominates, but it is the latter which is most powerful in terms of inducing a deep sharing of emotions and ideas; for our experiences, which can be life's teachings, often lead us to profound awareness and purposeful action.

Look back at your schooling. Was it your book learning or your experiences, your interactions with teachers and students, that you remember most? In most cases, your experiences made the most telling impressions upon you.

To transfer your motivation to others, use what I call my "defining moment" technique, which I describe fully in my book, DEFINING MOMENT: MOTIVATING PEOPLE TO TAKE ACTION.

In brief, the technique is this: Put into sharp focus a particular experience of yours, then communicate that focused experience to the people by describing the physical facts that gave you the emotion.

Now, here's the secret to the defining moment. That experience of yours must provide a lesson and that lesson is a solution to the needs of the people.

Otherwise, they'll think you're just talking about yourself.

For the defining moment to work (i.e., for it to transfer your motivation to them), the experience must be about them. The experience happened to you, of course. But that experience becomes their experience when the lesson it communicates is a solution to their needs.

Can you have the audience take right action?

Results don't happen unless people take action. After all, it's not what you say that's important in your leadership communications, it's what the people do after you have had your say.

Yet the vast majority of leaders don't have a clue as to what action truly is.

They get people taking the wrong action at the wrong time in the wrong way for the wrong results.

A key reason for this failure is they don't know how to deliver the all-important "leadership talk Call-to-action".

"Call" comes from an Old English word meaning "to shout." A Call-to-Action is a "shout for action." Implicit in the concept is urgency and forcefulness. But most leaders don't deliver the most effective Calls-to-action because they make three errors regarding it.

First, they err by mistaking the Call-to-Action as an order. Within the context of The Leadership Talk, a Call-to-action is not an order. Leave the order for the order leader.

Second, leaders err by mistaking the Call as theirs to give. The best Call-to-action is not the leader's to give. It's the people's to give. It's the people's to give to themselves. A true Call-to-action prompts people to motivate themselves to take action.

The most effective Call-to-action then is not from the leader to the people but from the people to the people themselves!

Third, they error by not priming their Call. There are two parts to the Call-to-
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action, the primer and the Call itself. Most leaders omit the all-important primer.

The primer sets up the Call, which is to prompt people to motivate themselves to take action. You yourself control the primer. The people control the Call.

The primer/Call is critical because every leadership communication situation is in essence a problem situation. There is the problem the leader has. And there is the problem the people have. In many cases, they are two different problems. But leaders get into trouble regarding the Call-to-action when they think it's only one problem, mainly theirs.

For instance, a leader might be talking about the organization needing to be more productive. So, the leader talks PRODUCTIVITY.

On the other hand, the people, hearing PRODUCTIVITY, think, YOU'RE GOING TO GIVE ME MORE WORK!

If the leader thinks that productivity is the people's problem and ignores the "more work" aspect, h/she's Call-to-action will probably be a bust, resulting in the people avoiding committed action.

Let's apply the primer/Call dynamic to the productivity case. The leader talks PRODUCTIVITY: but this time uses a PRIMER. The primer's purpose is to establish a "critical confluence" - the union of your problem with the problem of the people.

In this case, the leader creates a critical confluence by couching productivity within the framework of MORE MEANINGFUL WORK.

The primer may be: LET'S GET TOGETHER AND SEE IF YOU CAN COME UP WITH AN ACTION PLAN THAT WILL ENSURE THAT THE PRODUCTIVITY GAINS YOU IDENTIFY AND EXECUTE WILL ENABLE YOU TO WORK AT WHAT'S REALLY MEANINGFUL TO YOU.

Note what we've done: The primer is LET'S GET TOGETHER AND SEE IF YOU CAN COME UP WITH AN ACTION PLAN.
The actual Call is from the people to themselves: LET'S INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY BY WORKING AT WHAT'S MEANINGFUL.

With that Call, the leader moves from just getting average results (YOU MUST BE MORE PRODUCTIVE: i.e., you're going to solve MY problem) to getting great results (YOU COME UP WITH WAYS TO TIE PRODUCTIVITY INTO MEANINGFUL WORK: i.e., you're also going to solve your problem.)

So, here's what the leadership talk Call-to-action is truly about: It's not an order; it's best manifested when the people give themselves the Call, and it is always primed by your creating the "critical confluence" - they'll be solving their problem as well as yours.

The vast majority of leaders I've worked with are hampering their careers for one simple reason: They're giving presentations and speeches -- not leadership talks.

You have a great opportunity to turbo charge your career by recognizing the power of leadership talks. Before you give a leadership talk, ask three basic questions. Do you know what the people need? Can you bring deep belief to what you're saying? Can you have the people take the right action?

If you say "no" to any one of those questions you cannot give a leadership talk. But the questions aren't meant to be stumbling blocks to your leadership but stepping stones. If you answer "no," work on the questions until you can say, "yes." In that way, you'll start getting the right results in the right way on a consistent basis.

* * * *

(Editor's Note: This article was re-printed with permission from the Filson Leadership Group, Inc. 2005 © The Filson Leadership Group, Inc. All rights reserved.)
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**Golf and Give Back**

The 5th Annual Golf Scramble for Scholarships

Monday, July 7, 2008 | University of Minnesota | Les Bolstad Golf Course | Falcon Heights, MN

$125 per golfer or $400 per 4-person team
Includes 18 holes of golf, cart, meal and lots of fun!
These prices are for registration by May 31.
After this date add $25 per golfer.

Register Online!
For more information and to register, visit www.cfans.umn.edu/golf or contact Mary Buschette at (612) 624-7215 or mbuschette@umn.edu
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College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences