

THE GAME OF GOLF IS PLAYED ON GRASS

Thatch Development - Results from the sand site managed as a green indicate the colonial bentgrass varieties (Tracenta and Bardot), the browntop variety (BR 1518) and the creeping varieties (UM 84-01 and Lopez) develop at the least amount of thatch with depths of 0.87, 1.02, 0.75, 0.79 and 0.80 in., respectively. the creeping varieties TAMU 88-1, cobra, Emerald and SR 1020 have the most thatch development with 1.09, 1.07, 1.05 and 1.05 in., respectively.

Annual Bluegrass Invasion - Results from the sand site managed as a green indicate the colonial bentgrass varieties (Tracenta and Allure), the dryland variety (BR 1518) and the creeping varieties (National and 88 CBE) have the highest percentage annual bluegrass invasion with 36.7, 45.0, 46.7, 35.0 and 26.7 percent (%), respectively. The creeping varieties (SR 1020, Putter, Cobra, TAMU 88-1 and Pennlinks) have the the lowest percentage annual bluegrass invasion with 3.7, 4.0, 4.0, 5.0 and 6.0 percent (%), respectively.

In summary creeping bentgrass (*Agrostis palustris* Huds.) has better quality, more thatch development and less annual bluegrass invasion than other bentgrass species at this location. the increased thatch development in creeping species is undoubtedly due to its stoloniferous nature. Less thatch development was observed on the sand site than on the soil sites for all bentgrass species.

Since the available data is limited, the results reported here should be viewed only as preliminary. Varieties may perform differently in the years to come as they are subjected to a wide range of climatic, management and pathogenic stresses. Accordingly, no specific recommendations on choosing any of the tested varieties can be given at this time.

¹ Research Associate and Turfgrass Advisor, respectively; University of California Cooperative Extension

When the golf course is in good shape, everything at the club seems to go well. How obvious...or is it!

Why is it, then, that today's golf course superintendent must compete—perhaps struggle is a better word—for the machinery, manpower, materials, and the “the budget” to do his or her job? Sometimes clubs and courses appreciate the obvious. If the golf course is in good shape, the rest of the facility hums. People bring guests who pay guest or green fees. This factor impacts favorably on the food and beverage portion of the club, and it helps the facility's cash flow. Members and guests buy logo shirts and sweats, benefiting the golf professional. Everyone is happy and the club or facility is healthy.

Consider what happens, though, when several greens or fairways are lost, tees are divoted and devoid of turf, the roughs and stream banks are not well cut, and trash, tree limbs, and litter are scattered about the course, who is happy then? Would you bring guests or sponsor business outings at your club or course? Probably not, or only with a multitude of apologies and excuses.

With less play, food and beverage sales suffer and golf carts go unrented. Golfshirts remain on the shelves and everyone begins to rumble. Attention is then focused on you guessed it, the golf course superintendent.

Do you think a golf course superintendent wants to present a shabby golf course? Is that individual, as a professional, pleased with what he or she sees out there? No, not in the least. so why does it happen?

I submit it often is a question of budget priorities. The golf course is not getting its fair share of the golf course income.

Specifically, what percentage of course income is being used to maintain the golf course? Do you think it is 20%. 33% or 50%?

Figure it out. If the club has an income of, say, \$2 million per year and the golf course maintenance budget is \$4000,000 per year, then the maintenance budget is 20% of the entire club or golf course income. Twenty percent does not sound like very much, and often it isn't enough. Where is the other 80% going?

Shouldn't it be a goal to allow the golf course to be maintained at a level where all the departments are humming and everyone is happy?

Only you can know. It bothers me that course maintenance budgets often do not receive their fair share of the club income, and when the course is not perfect, the superintendent is criticized. I submit the real culprit is the budget policy—not providing what is needed to do the job well.

Perhaps a better sales pitch is needed. I hope these comments will help people realize the obvious...the game of golf is played on grass, and providing properly for its maintenance should be a course's number one priority.

Article written by Stanley J. Zontek, Director, Mid-Atlantic Region USGA Green Section. Article taken from Hole Notes, Minnesota GCSA, June 1992.

PRS
SINCE 1941

PUMP REPAIR SERVICE CO.
SALES • SERVICE • REPAIRS
ALL PUMPING SYSTEMS

Representative for:
SYNCRIFLO PACKAGE PUMPING SYSTEMS

405 ALLAN STREET
P.O. BOX 34327
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94134

Dave Archer
(415) 467-2150

AUTOMATIC RAIN COMPANY
Landscape and Irrigation Supplies

CONCORD (415) 825-3344	MENLO PARK (415) 323-5161	PLEASANTON (415) 484-1170	SAN JOSE (408) 287-7882
SALINAS (408) 757-1045	VACAVILLE (707) 447-7773	SANTA ROSA (707) 584-7272	NAPA (707) 255-7575
MERCED (209) 383-3330	FRESNO (209) 431-8007	SAN RAFAEL (415) 454-4313	

MANUFACTURING
RAMACHER
COMPANY

TURF EQUIPMENT

Joseph R. Seimas
Sales Representative

P.O. Box 506
5023 N. Flood Rd.
Linden, CA 95236

Bus. 209 887-3815
FAX 209 887-3248
Res. 209 832-1169
Cellular 408 483-2482