

Responsibility, Respect, Rights; Supts.' 3 R's.

By JAMES A. REID

Supt., The Suburban Club of Baltimore County, Pikesville, Md.

VERY FEW golfers are even faintly aware of the great responsibility of the golf course superintendent. But when a golfer does think about it he is inclined to say, as I heard a man remark recently, that the superintendent is the most important fellow in the golf business.

His judgment rather astonished me. I am a superintendent yet I'd never thought especially about the highly essential nature of my work.

But, come to think of it, without a good superintendent you do not have a good course; you do not have a good club. Without a good club there aren't the numbers or character of membership to finance maintenance of a good course. The clubhouse suffers, business in the pro shop is bad, the caddies and other employees are dissatisfied.

To do his job a superintendent must be a leader, tactfully but definitely. He must sell himself and his ideas to the members and always strive to improve everything about the course because when he improves the course he improves and benefits each element of the club.

Departmental Friendship

This can't be done without genuinely and deeply friendly relations between the superintendent, the professional and the manager. The superintendent may be honestly aware of his basic value to the club but if he gets any delusions of grandeur he's a lost man. He needs the cooperation of the professional, particularly, in selling his ideas to the members.

The pro has most frequent and closest contact with the members. The members want to play golf under the best possible conditions. It is no concern of theirs if heavy rains fall on three or four consecutive days, if the greens are diseased, if a hot, dry spell or hot, humid weather, or anything else beyond the superintendent's control reduces pleasure of playing the course.

When a member comes out for his game and the course isn't as it normally is, then the pro's informed statement of the causes

will ease the situation. The pro can tell the members what to expect and why.

And in the matter of costs and the help situation the manager's understanding comment will help club officials appreciate the facts. Certainly if anybody around a club knows any better than the superintendent what a difficult task it is to maintain high operating standards with an uncertain quality of labor and high costs, it is the manager.

Fundamentally it is tough for the superintendent to get his story across to players because the average golfer is in a business removed from the effect of climatic conditions on his product. He knows that when it's hot he won't sell overcoats and when it's cold he won't do record business on ice cream cones, but he doesn't realize that growing grass involves not only weather but complex factors of diseases and insects and chemical treatments which, if they go wrong can do untold damage to a course.

Mysteries in Grass

Nor does the golfer who may be allergic to sugar or pepper ever think that equally mysterious factors determine what fertilizers grasses require, and how and when to apply them.

Beyond the scope of the golfers are the problems of what grass to use. We have to solve that as superintendents. And sometimes we don't get the right answer. I know of one man who buys hundreds of pounds of grass seed every year. In my judgment, he'd be much better off if he spent the same money on fertilizer. How to get the best results for the money is always the main responsibility of the superintendent. That's always a heavy responsibility. We in course maintenance have a lot of different ideas but we all are aiming at the same target; better golf courses.

We can go just so far by our individual efforts. We need all the help we can get in carrying our responsibilities.

The green-chairman should insist on his superintendent being a member of local and national course superintendents' organizations. The good derived from these associa-

tions and personal contacts with other superintendents who have solved problems cannot be estimated in dollars and cents. It's well known that whenever two or three golf course superintendents are together they talk shop and that shop talk is profitable to the clubs for which those men work.

When we were kids we learned the three R's. Now as men in charge of golf courses we have three other R's to learn:

Respect of our members;

Rights of men in our profession;

Responsibilities entrusted to us by club officials and members whose enjoyment of golf is determined by the results of our work.

Managers' Largest Convention Elects McGuffey President

Thomas C. McGuffey, Missouri Athletic Club, St. Louis, was elected president of the Club Managers' Assn. of America at the organization's 27th annual meeting, held at Atlanta (Ga.) Biltmore hotel, Feb. 7-10.

The CMAA elected Howard M. Grenard of the University Club, Detroit, Mich., as its vp; and to the sec.-treas. position elected Clyde S. Mingleddorf of the Atlanta (Ga.) AC.

Directors elected: Ken Meisnest, Washington AC, Seattle; Corwin Gelwick, Gainesville (Fla.) G&CC; Royce Chaney, Northwood Club, Dallas, Tex.; Richard E. Daley, Army and Navy CC, Arlington, Va.; Edward Sandrow, LuLu Temple CC, North Hills, Pa.

Hold-over directors: Carl Jehlen, Baltustrol CC, Springfield, N. J.; Erich Kruger, University Club of Los Angeles; S. H. Sheets, Evanston GC, Skokie, Ill.; and Albert M. Deichler, Jr., City Midday Club, New York.

The convention was the largest the association ever held, with 717 being registered. Entertainment features which the managers put on at their annual meetings as demonstrations of the finest in club affairs, set another new high.

Atlanta managers gave visiting managers and their wives the Southern Hospitality full treatment.

Among the guest speakers were Horton Smith, PGA pres., who was introduced by Bob Jones, and Norman Johnson, pres., Golf Course Supts.' Assn. Jones was hailed by the managers as the ideal American club member.

The usual sectional meetings of country club and city club managers were held with the country club managers' education con-

ference being at the East Lake CC. John Pomeroy, Red Run GC, Royal Oak, Mich., and Don Edic of the Country Club of Detroit (Mich.) presented ideas that have been successful in club programs and facilities for getting additional revenue. Byrne Bauer of the Louisville (Ky.) CC spoke on club public relations, detailing how the publicity of a club discreetly and steadily handled by a manager did much for the club's prestige, business and membership desirability.

Edward C. Lyon, Elmira (N. Y.) CC, told of successfully handling the many problems that arise in operation of a smaller city's country club and how to keep some of these problems from coming up. The techniques of handling club employer-employee relations so a high standard of service may be maintained without costs getting out of line was treated by John Outland, Dallas (Tex.) CC.

The exceedingly practical round table discussion at which managers discussed their operating problems was conducted by J. Dave Anderson, advisor, curricula of club management, University of Florida.

Club Accounts Analysis Shows Income Need

WITH rising costs many golf clubs are wondering whether to increase dues and house charges or to increase revenue by establishing a monthly minimum charge system.

Although no nation-wide survey has been made the monthly minimum charge system for house accounts seems to be growing. Available testimony indicates the system works out O.K. after a brief period of re-adjustment and is a satisfactory answer to getting house volume to point that allows at least an even break on operating costs.

Echo Lake CC, Westfield, N. J., a representative NY Metropolitan district club, made an analysis of house accounts that disclosed the following figures:

Out of 325 members
3 or 9.2% spent nothing per year
10 or 3% spent less than \$25 per year
30 or 9.2% spent more than \$25 but less than \$50 per year
255 or 78% spent over \$50 per year
Of the 100 Associate or Pool members
48 or 48p% spent nothing per year
14 or 14% spent less than \$25 per year
20 or 20% spent \$25 but less than \$50 per year
18 or 18% spent over \$50 per year.