

NGF report reveals a host of hidden trends worth watching

There is always room between the lines, even when the lines are crammed with numerical analysis. Case in point: The "Golf Facilities in the U.S." report just released by the National Golf Foundation (see page 1).

The report doesn't spell it out, but it doesn't take a genius to see that golf course development continues to defy nationwide lending trends. When the bulk of last year's new courses were conceived, in 1991-92, *recessionitis* gripped American financial institutions, and few — especially golf course projects — could secure funding.

But somehow these projects *were* financed and built, which proves a couple things: That funding was probably secured from local sources, and golf's perceived "profit potential" remained high through the worst of economic times.

Despite the recession, despite the difficulty in securing financing, despite overbuilding in certain metropolitan areas, and despite the supposed prevailing wisdom that said golf can't possibly maintain its current course-a-day pace — loads of folks believed they could make money by building daily-fee golf courses.

They still believe it. There are 671 courses now under construction, about half of which will come on line during 1994.

That brings us to another trend: While golf courses are being opened at record pace, an overwhelming portion of them — 80 percent — are public.

Public-access golf development — daily-fee and municipal — is dwarfing private course construction. Why? Because the demand for public golf is clearly there and money to finance new private courses isn't. Apparently, lenders believe there are enough private courses — and they're probably right.

A full two-thirds of the nation's 14,000-odd golf courses are now public-access. And get this: 80 percent of the 1,360 that opened between 1990 and '93 are either daily-fee or municipal.

I believe these two figures will meet during the next



Hal Phillips,
editor

Continued on page 31

Okay, the game's over... Close down the courses

Editor's note: I am herewith adding one more acronym to the industry parlance. *AHA!* now stands for American hyper-activist. That is the type of person who will stop at no deviant behavior (like spiking trees or pouring chlorine on a golf course) to stop another person from imposing his will on the environment.

"To a pure ecologist, there's no such thing as a pest. Instead, they're competing organisms," said Prof. Karl Danneberger. That pure ecologist could easily fit the mold of the *AHA!*

Some people make things happen. Some people ask, "What happened?" In the ongoing battle against certain vocal hyper-activists (*AHA!*), it seems the golf industry too often throws up its hands and collectively sighs: "What happened?"

Thank God for those stalwarts who don't — who stand up, present the facts (not the *AHA!*'s factoids) and stomp down on opinion with science. But let's, for a moment, play **What If**.

The proposition: What if Golf Nation collectively succumbed to all the *AHA!* demands and declared: "Okay. The game's over. The gig's up. We're tossing in the towel."

"No more fighting in board meetings and the courts to win approval for golf course developments. No more clashes over fertilizer and pesticide use. Go ahead, folks. Outlaw fertilizers, fungicides, insecticides, rodenticides. Close down golf courses the country over."

All you *AHA!*s out there, here's a sampling of what would happen if you had your way:

- **Get out the help wanted ads and dig deeper into that bottomless welfare till:** Golf course operations pay \$6.1 billion annually to more than 380,000 full- and part-time employees.

- **Get ready to ante up more of your paycheck; you won't miss it:** Golf courses five years ago paid \$1.8 billion in federal taxes, \$530 million in state taxes and \$350 million in local taxes.

And Clinton economic adviser Laura D'Andrea Tyson told congressmen the United States is "an undertaxed nation." There is "no relationship between a nation's tax burden and its rate of economic growth," she said (*Reason*, Aug.-Sept 1993).

- **Discover some new technologies and open some busi-**



Mark Leslie,
managing editor

Continued on page 32

Letters

EPA CHIEF BROWNER REFUTED BY RISE

To the editor:

The guest commentary by U.S. EPA administrator Carol Browner in the January issue of *Golf Course News* contains a surprising amount of misinformation regarding golf course use of pest control.

We share the Administrator's interest in a clean environment, as well as in the safety and health of all our citizens, including golfers. And, we support her recommendations regarding Integrated

Pest Management (IPM) — practices to which members of RISE ascribe.

Unfortunately, however, many of Ms. Browner's comments skirt the facts, deal heavily in innuendo, and serve only to raise unwarranted fears. Presumably, her commentary is written to advance a questionable agenda which stresses reduced pesticide use solely for reduced use's sake, rather than a program which emphasizes responsible use and reduced risk. One would like to believe that these comments were

BROWNER POINTS? ...HARDLY

To the editor:

Your newest guest commentator, Carol Browner, shows great ignorance about the golf course industry in her January piece. She should get her facts and her thinking straight! "Thousands of geese" dropping dead could not possibly fit onto one green! It is a typical exaggeration for the sake of scaring her audience.

Ms. Browner's admonition that "pesticide run-off can severely threaten the drinking water supply," is old hat to golf course superintendents. Obviously, in her ignorance she has never heard of the Cape Cod Study or Dr.

Watschke's work at Penn State.

Golf course superintendents practiced IPM long before the word was invented. We chuckle when the GCSAA and the USGA come on the bandwagon and obviously convince the EPA what a good bunch we are. Now that you have a president who plays golf and we a prime minister who does likewise, we no longer have anything to worry about. Except that both gentlemen of the same stripe tend to make appointments based on quotas rather than merit.

Ah well, we'll survive!

Gordon Witteveen
Golf Course Superintendent
Board of Trade Golf Club
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

More letters on page 30

submitted, under Ms. Browner's name, by a writer totally unacquainted with the extensive amount of EPA and industry-required pesticide testing and the proper practices followed by golf course management.

- Many may not know — but Ms. Browner certainly should — that all pesticide products used in the United States must have EPA registration and bear an EPA-approved label. To gain EPA registration, each product must undergo eight to 10 years of stringent scrutiny involving as many as 120 separate laboratory and field tests. On average, only one in 20,000 chemicals makes it through this intensive testing. Many of these tests — especially those involving laboratory animals — are specific for the human health and environmental concerns to which Ms. Browner refers. The EPA-approved label sets out the proper, legal instructions for pesticide use which golf course applicators, and other users, follow.

- Ms. Browner's statement that "heavy pesticide use doesn't just affect golfers..." deals in innuendo,

not fact. There is no evidence that pesticide use on golf courses is heavier than that needed for specific pest control, as recommended on the EPA label. Nor is there any evidence that golfers — or their children "who walk the course" — are affected by golf course pest control.

- Ms. Browner's comment that "... pesticide run-off [from golf course] can severely threaten the drinking water supply of the nearby community," is not backed by EPA's own studies. In its extensive survey of the nation's rural and urban drinking water, EPA reported that "concentrations of pesticides... detected were usually well below levels of health concern," and that "greater than 99 percent of the wells tested are free of any pesticide traces exceeding safe drinking water standards." There is no evidence that pesticide run-off from golf courses threatens community water supplies.

The Administrator's concern for a healthful, safe environment is proper and appreciated. That is a goal to which the pesticide industry subscribes, as well, and one to which we are committed.

Allen James
Executive Director
RISE (Responsible Industry
for a Sound Environment)

GOLF COURSE NEWS

THE NEWSPAPER FOR THE GOLF COURSE INDUSTRY

Publisher
Charles E. von Brecht

Editorial Director
Brook Taliaferro

Editor
Hal Phillips

Managing Editor
Mark A. Leslie

Associate Editor
Peter Blais

Contributing Editors
Terry Buchen, CGCS
Vern Putney

Editorial Advisory Board
Raymond Davies, CGCS
Virginia Country Club
Kevin Downing, CGCS
Willoughby Golf Club
Tim Hiers, CGCS
Collier's Reserve
Dr. Michael Hurdzan
Hurdzan Design Group
Mary P. Knaggs, CGCS
Hazeltine National GC
Roger Maxwell
Management Consultant
James McLoughlin
The McLoughlin Group
Kevin Ross, CGCS
Falmouth Country Club
Brent Wadsworth
Wadsworth Construction

Production Manager
Joline V. Gilman

Circulation Manager
Brenda Boothby

Editorial Office
Golf Course News
PO Box 997
38 Lafayette Street
Yarmouth, ME 04096
207-846-0600; Fax: 207-846-0657

**Advertising Office
National Sales:**
Charles E. von Brecht
227 Second Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
813-898-7077; Fax: 813-825-0923

Western Sales:
Robert Sanner
Western Territory Manager
2141 Vermont
Lawrence, KS 66046
913-842-3969; Fax: 913-842-4304

Marketplace Sales:
Mary Anderson
813-898-7077; Fax: 813-825-0923

Golf Course Expo Sales
Michael Lafaso
207-846-0600; Fax: 207-846-0657

Subscription Information
Golf Course News
P.O. Box 3047
Langhorne, PA 19047
215-788-7112

United Publications, Inc.
Publishers of specialized business
and consumer magazines.
Chairman
Theodore E. Gordon
President
J.G. Taliaferro, Jr.

NGF CHARTER
MEMBER
NATIONAL GOLF FOUNDATION

BPA
INTERNATIONAL

Copyright © 1994 by United
Publications, Inc. All rights
reserved and reproduction, in
whole or in part, without written
permission from the publisher is
expressly prohibited.

DR. KROSS RESPONDS TO HARVEY

Dear Mr. Harvey:

Last evening I received a telephone call from my brother-in-law, a farmer in western Iowa. He heard your radio report this week describing our mortality study of golf course superintendents. He asked me how did our study determine that pesticides were killing birds and humans on golf courses. I knew something was wrong, so I obtained a transcript of your commentary (see GCN, Feb. '94, page 13).

Your commentary is inaccurate and misleading with respect to our study. Our study did not collect any data about pesticides and birds. Moreover, as clearly stated in our press release (copy enclosed), our statistical mortality study was not capable of supporting or refuting a cause-and-effect relationship between pesticides and cancer. Indeed, my recommendations about smoking cessation and minimizing pesticide exposures are prudent public

health strategies for golf course superintendents and the general public.

Mr. Harvey, I am very concerned about your misrepresentation of our study. The public does need to be informed about important environmental and occupational health issues. The media are important partners in discriminating accurate results of research studies. I request that you broadcast a corrected version of your commentary about our study. Thank you.

Burton C. Kross, PhD, PE
Principal Investigator

Golf Course Superintendents Association of
America Mortality Study
Associate Professor, University of Iowa

Ed. The above letter was reprinted with the author's permission. Dr. Kross reports receiving no response from Harvey, who has never returned a call to Golf Course News, either.

Old friend Paul Harvey continues to take pot shots at the turf industry, then hide away in his Chicagoland bunker. Following his Feb. 8 attack, the master of oversimplification has not responded — by phone or post — to *Golf Course News*, RISE, mortality study author Dr. Burton Kross, or the myriad superintendents who've objected to his war of disinformation. Two letters — as yet unanswered — appear on either side, proving that intelligent dialogues can be very one-sided.

RISE CHIEF JAMES TAKES HARVEY TO TASK ... AGAIN

Dear Mr. Harvey:

There you go again!

In your Feb. 8 broadcast you again make quantum-leap assumptions regarding health and pest control on the nation's golf courses.

Shame for using your popular program to raise unwarranted fears with erroneous and unsupported comments. Specifically, in this instance:

1. "... a study commissioned by [Golf Course Superintendents Association of America] is reporting that not only are golf course pesticides killing the birds, but they're killing golf course superintendents, also." Paul Harvey News, Feb. 8, 1994.

- The GCSAA-commissioned study by a University of Iowa Medical Center research team, headed by Dr. Burton Kross, had nothing to do with deaths of birds — nor did it find that pesticides are "killing golf course superintendents". Those are your words and your conclusions, not the researchers.

- The study, as noted both by Dr. Kross and GCSAA, did not draw any cause-and-effect relationships.

- As described by both, the study was a preliminary statistical summary of 618 golf superintendent death certificates across the entire nation over a 22-year period, and (quoting Dr. Kross) "cannot be interpreted to mean that golfers are at risk."

- The statistical summary showed higher-than-normal deaths due to lung and brain cancers, both related to extended years of cigarette and cigar smoking. Other cancers — pancreatic, large intestine, prostate, non-Hodgkins lymphoma — also were noted as higher than that of the average population. A number of specialists, such as Dr. Anthony B. Miller, preventive medicine, University of Toronto, note that many other cancers, such as stomach, kidney, bladder and pancreas, have been directly linked to smoking, as well. Additionally, two recent reports in *The Journal of the National Cancer Institute* list smoking as an important factor in colon cancer.

- As noted in our enclosed statement, the specialty pesticide industry welcomes further research into any human health concerns. What we can't welcome — are efforts to elevate highly preliminary, unproven research into speculative assumptions that raise unwarranted fears among golfers — or any segment of our population.

Allen James
Executive Director
RISE (Responsible Industry
for a Sound Environment)

Ed. The above letter was reprinted with the author's permission. James has yet to hear back from Harvey.

ACCLAIM[®]

1EC HERBICIDE

Regardless of the crabgrass preemergence herbicide you use, you'll probably still have to deal with escapes just a few weeks later — and throughout the season.

Starting with the first escape, apply regular low rate treatments of Acclaim and get season-long crabgrass control that no pre alone can match. It controls growth from the 1-leaf stage up to multi-tillered crabgrass.

Acclaim can be spot sprayed to control crabgrass on

tees, along cart paths and in other "HOT SPOTS". And, it lets you reseed fescue and ryegrass immediately after the spray dries*. It can be safely used on bluegrass, ryegrass, zoysiagrass, fine fescue, tall fescue, even bentgrass fairways and tees. Be ready with Acclaim at the first sight of crabgrass...because no pre is perfect.

*Wait 3 weeks for bluegrass, zoysiagrass, bentgrass fairways and tees.

Hoechst
Roussel

Follow label directions carefully. ACCLAIM and the name and logo HOECHST are registered trademarks of Hoechst AG. The name and logo ROUSSEL are registered trademarks of Roussel Uclaf S.A. Marketed by Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Company, Somerville, NJ 08876-1258. © 1994

BECAUSE NO PRE IS PERFECT.

