

to come and when the final results are arrived at it will be from the superintendent level that the continuing implementation will be made.

However, the club official and golf association 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 maintenance 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 superintendents 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 appealing, 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 constantly looking for possible improvements in his management of the budget dollar. The days have long passed when superintendents 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 members of the Greenkeepers' Club of New England realization that to make an intelligent 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 maintenance work — that it is possible for a very efficiently operated course to cost \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year more to maintain than another course in the same district where conditions are much different. Club officials, not knowing the different conditions which are primary subjects for comparison, may be inclined to compare the bare costs which are basically the secondary factor in the comparison.

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 mowing 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 comparison of maintenance costs is impossible.