MSU Extension Publication Archive

Archive copy of publication, do not use for current recommendations. Up-to-date information about many topics can be obtained from your local Extension office.

Test Levels in Soil Profiles of Michigan Corn Fields Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service Research Report L.S. Robertson, D. L. Mokma, D. D. Warncke, Crop and Soil Sciences Issued July 1975 8 pages

The PDF file was provided courtesy of the Michigan State University Library

Scroll down to view the publication.

July, 1975

RESEARCH REPORT 281

FARM SCIENCE

Ordar Immediated

FROM THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION EAST LANSING

Test Levels in Soil Profiles of Michigan Corn Fields

L. S. Robertson, D. L. Mokma and D. D. Warncke¹ Department of Crop and Soil Sciences

INTRODUCTION

Chemical soil tests are used in crop growth problem solving, as a basis for fertilizer and lime recommendations and for monitoring the soil environment. Soil test summaries provide valuable information concerning a rapidly changing environment for plants, animals and man.

The first summary of Michigan soil test levels was made in 1959 and represented a compilation of results from 57 county laboratories (7). At about the same time, detailed studies were made on 92 profiles representing 35 soil series and a wide range in properties (11). Grass was growing where most of the profiles were sampled. This investigation represented the first time soil profiles were systematically sampled for soil test purposes and the first time the soil management group concept (5) was used to summarize soil test results.

By 1962 the Michigan State University Central Soil Testing Laboratory had been established, permitting soil test summaries to be related to soil management groups as well as to counties from which the sample originated (6, 8). In these studies, soil management group assignments were made in the laboratory on the basis of surface soil texture. After 10 years, the test results from the laboratory were again summarized to show how soil test levels had changed with time (4). In general, mineral soils had become more acid and lime requirements had increased. In 10 years, available phosphorus levels increased approximately 100%, and exchangeable potassium levels 50%. In that study, tests were summarized by both soil management groups and by areas in the state. A similar study was made for organic soils in 1973 (9). All the summaries were based on test results from surface soil samples collected by an individual farmer or a farm advisor.

No summaries have been published on tests of soil used for a specific crop, although such data have been compiled (3). Few data are available on test levels in horizons below the plow layer. The purpose of this investigation was to determine test levels in the profiles of soils used for corn production in Michigan. Because corn is the most extensively grown crop, it was assumed that test levels would approximate conditions for other field crops grown in rotation with corn in the southern section of the state.

¹Appreciation is expressed to Drs. E. P. Whiteside and R. E. Lucas for assistance in preparing this manuscript.

PROCEDURES

Soil profile samples were collected in September 1974, with the assistance of a professional soil classifier. The soil series was identified at sampling time. Soil management group assignments were made in the field on the basis of the dominant profile texture and the natural drainage conditions under which the soil developed.

Soil profiles representing specific management groups were collected on the basis of the number of acres of corn and the proportions of each management group in the counties studied.

Before sampling, a minimal standard was established. No less than two profiles were sampled per county and no less than two profiles represented a single soil management group. All counties south of the Oceana-Bay tier were included in this study.

With two exceptions, corn was growing in the fields sampled. In the exceptions, corn was the previous crop.

The specific site within a sampled field represented a location with little or no soil erosion and where the average slope was less than 6%.

Sample A represented the Ap horizon (plow layer). Sample B most frequently represented the Bt horizon, but in some of the more sandy soils represented the upper portion of a thick B horizon. Sample C usually represented the C horizon or parent material, but in some instances represented the lowest portion of a B horizon that could be reached with a 5-ft bucket auger or the underlying material of a two-storied soil.

In the laboratory, the samples were air dried and ground to pass a 10-mesh sieve. The pH was determined with a glass electrode potentiometer using a 1-to-2 soil-to-water ratio. Available phosphorus was evaluated with the Bray P1 procedure (1). Exchangeable potassium was determined by extracting the soil with neutral normal ammonium acetate (1-to-8 soilto-extracting solution ratio, shaken for 5 minutes).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The number of soil profiles sampled and the approximate number of acres of corn grown in each county are shown in Table 1. While there was not a close relationship between the number of acres of corn and the number of soil profiles sampled, there was a strong trend. For example, only two profiles were sampled in Wayne County, which produces the least corn. Six profiles were sampled in Huron County and seven in Sanilac County. These two counties are the largest in the study area and each produces relatively large acreages of corn.

The number of soil profiles collected per soil management group was proportional to the approximate

Table 1. Number of soil profiles sampled and approximate number of acres of corn grown per county^(a)

County	Number of soil profiles sampled	Acres of corn 1000	County	Number of soil profiles sampled	Acres of corn 1000	
Allegan	3	71	Livingston	3	33	
Barry	2	37	Macomb	3	21	
Bay	5	19	Mecosta	3	23	
Berrien	2	33	Midland	3	17	
Branch	3	83	Monroe	3 ^(b)	46	
Calhoun	3	77	Montcalm	3	42	
Cass	2	50	Muskegon	2	12	
Clinton	4	63	Newaygo	4	21	
Eaton	3	65	Oakland	2	13	
Genesee	3	33	Oceana	2	11	
Gratiot	4	72	Ottawa	2	38	
Hillsdale	3	78	Saginaw	4	43	
Huron	6	107	Sanilac	7	89	
Ionia	3	63	Shiawassee	3	50	
Ingham	3 ^(b)	66	St. Clair	2	38	
Isabella	4	56	St. Joseph	3	60	
Jackson	2	61	Tuscola	6	69	
Kent	2	38	Van Buren	3	34	
Kalamazoo	4	50	Washtenaw	5	61	
Lapeer	6	52	Wayne	2	4	
Lenawee	3	109				

(a)Michigan Agricultural Statistics.

^(b)One profile represents 1974 soybean crop.

number of acres within each group in the southern section of Michigan (Table 2). In this study, the number of samples representing organic soils overemphasizes the importance of this group of soils in corn production. Also, no profiles from the Oc management group were collected because only a few acres are present in the state and they are not used extensively for corn production.

To better illustrate how soils were grouped, the soil series name of the profiles sampled in each management group are shown in Table 3. Several series were sampled more than once. For example, the Kalamazoo series was sampled in five counties. The soil

Table 2. Number of soil profiles collected to represent each soil management group

		Natural drainage Somewhat				
Dominant soil profile texture	Symbol	Well drained a	poorly drained b	Poorly drained c		
Clay, 40-60%	1	3	3	3		
Clay loam	1.5	6	6	7		
Loam	2.5	15	13	12		
Sandy loam	3	17	3	3		
Loamy sand	4	10	5	3		
Sand	5	4	4	4		
Two-storied soils	3/2		2			
	4/1, 4/2	2	3			
	5/2	2				
Organic soils	M, M/m, M/4, M/3			5		

		Well	Natural drainage Somewhat poorly	Poorly
Dominant soil profile texture	Symbol	drained a	drained b	drained c
Clay, 40-60%	1	Kent St. Clair	Nappanee Selkirk	Charity Hoytville
Clay loam	1.5	Morley Nester	Blount Del Ray Pert	Lenawee Pewamo Sims
Loam	2.5	Celina Dighton Guelph Isabella Kidder Miami	Capac Conover Londo Sanilac Shebeon	Brookston Kilmanagh Parkhill Tappan
Sandy loam	3	Emmet Fox Hillsdale Kalamazoo Lapeer Warsaw	Locke Matherton	Barry Sebewa
Loamy sand	4	Boyer Montcalm Oshtemo Spinks	Brady Gladwin Otisco Thetford Wasepi	Deford Gilford
Sand	5	Chelsea Croswell Graycalm Rubicon	AuGres Tedrow	Granby Roscommon
Two-storied soils	3/2		Metamora Macomb Rimer	
	4/2 5/2	Metea Melita Ottawa	Selfridge	
Organic soils	M/4 M M/m M/3 M/3			Adrian Carlisle Edwards Linwood Palms

Table 3. Soil series sampled in each soil management group

series in Table 3 are considered to be a good representation of the soils where corn is grown in Michigan.

So that tests for other elements can be related to those described in this report and to future soil test inventories, a description of each profile sample site is included in Appendix A.

SOIL pH

A summary of the soil pH levels is shown in Table 4. The median, not the mean, was the average used because of problems associated with manipulating logarithms (pH is a logarithm).

The pH levels ranged from 4.6 in an Ap horizon to 8.6 in the parent material of another soil. In general, the average pH levels were significantly higher than those reported in previous surveys (4, 9). An explanation of this situation is not evident because the use of lime on acid soils in Michigan has not increased greatly since the 1972 survey.

The surface layers of well-drained "a" soils tended to have lower pH levels than those of naturally poorly drained "c" soils. Also, the coarse-textured surface layers tended to have lower average pH levels than the fine-textured surface layers of the well-drained soils.

With only one exception, the median pH of the Ap horizon of the naturally poorly drained mineral soils was greater than 7.0, and with only two exceptions this was the situation for the somewhat poorly drained "b" soils.

The average pH tended to increase with increased depth in the profile. This situation undoubtedly reflects the relatively young nature of Michigan soils, as well as the fact that the parent materials of many Michigan soils are calcareous.

When the soil management group is estimated in the laboratory it is difficult to distinguish between natural drainage classes. The statement made in a previous summary that "soil pH tends to be highest in the clay and clay loam soils and lowest in the loamy sand and sandy soils" is valid only for the naturally well-drained soils (4).

The range in pH levels within any single soil management group was relatively wide, but no wider than expected. Undoubtedly the management used on some of the more sandy, poorly buffered, well-drained soils caused a decrease in pH, thus expanding the natural range in pH levels.

AVAILABLE SOIL PHOSPHORUS

Wide ranges in available soil phosphorus were found in this study (Table 5). Test levels range from 1 lb/acre in several of the subsurface horizons to 315 lb/acre in an Ap horizon. This suggests that a significant increase in available phosphorus levels has occurred.

With three exceptions, the average phosphorus levels were much higher in the Ap horizon than in lower horizons. With one exception, the average levels in the well-drained soils were higher in phosphorus than in the somewhat poorly and poorly drained soils. This in part reflects the longer use of fertilizers since some of the more naturally poorly drained soils have only recently been brought into intensive production. The test levels for phosphorus

Table 4. The pH range and median levels in profiles of soil management groups

			pH range and median level ^(a) Natural drainage Somewhat				
		Profile	Well drained	poorly drained	Poorly drained		
Dominant profile texture	Symbol	sample	a	b	С		
Clay, 40-60%	1	A B C	7.1-7.6 (7.3) ^(a) 5.4-7.4 (6.7) 7.9-8.1 (8.0)	5.8-5.9 (6.6) 5.7-6.7 (6.5) 7.9-8.0 (8.0)	6.6-8.0 (7.6) 7.1-7.8 (7.7) 7.6-8.1 (8.1)		
Clay loam	1.5	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 5.9\text{-}7.7 & (7.3) \\ 5.6\text{-}7.9 & (7.1) \\ 6.7\text{-}8.3 & (8.1) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.2\text{-}8.0 & (6.9) \\ 6.6\text{-}7.8 & (7.5) \\ 7.8\text{-}8.4 & (8.2) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.5\text{-}8.1 & (7.5) \\ 7.4\text{-}7.8 & (7.6) \\ 7.4\text{-}8.2 & (8.0) \end{array}$		
Loam	2.5	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 5.5\text{-}7.7 & (6.8) \\ 5.1\text{-}7.9 & (6.8) \\ 5.7\text{-}8.3 & (8.0) \end{array}$	5.6-8.3 (7.4) 4.9-8.1 (7.6) 7.1-8.4 (8.0)	$\begin{array}{c} 7.0\text{-}8.0 & (7.6) \\ 7.0\text{-}8.0 & (7.6) \\ 7.7\text{-}8.2 & (8.2) \end{array}$		
Sandy loam	3	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 5.2\text{-}7.3 & (6.0) \\ 4.8\text{-}7.2 & (6.0) \\ 5.2\text{-}8.4 & (6.2) \end{array}$	6.0-7.7 (7.6) 5.3-7.8 (7.0) 5.9-8.2 (8.2)	$\begin{array}{c} 7.3-7.9 & (7.4) \\ 7.9-8.1 & (8.1) \\ 8.3-8.4 & (8.4) \end{array}$		
Loamy sand	4	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 5.8\text{-}8.1 & (6.6) \\ 5.6\text{-}7.8 & (6.9) \\ 6.0\text{-}8.0 & (7.3) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.4-7.5 & (7.4) \\ 6.5-8.1 & (7.5) \\ 6.6-8.6 & (8.4) \end{array}$	5.0-7.4 (6.7) 5.5-8.5 (7.1) 4.9-8.2 (7.8)		
Sand	5	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 4.6\text{-}8.1 & (6.5) \\ 5.7\text{-}8.0 & (7.2) \\ 5.6\text{-}7.8 & (6.7) \end{array}$	5.8-7.6 (7.3) 5.8-7.8 (7.4) 5.8-8.2 (6.8)	$\begin{array}{c} 6.5\text{-}7.6 & (7.4) \\ 6.8\text{-}8.0 & (7.6) \\ 6.8\text{-}8.1 & (7.8) \end{array}$		
Sandy loam over loam	3/2	A B C		$\begin{array}{c} 7.6\text{-}7.8 & (7.7) \\ 7.6\text{-}7.9 & (7.8) \\ 8.1\text{-}8.5 & (8.3) \end{array}$			
Loamy sand over clay to loam	4/1, 4/2	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 5.8\text{-}6.4 & (6.1) \\ 6.4\text{-}6.6 & (6.5) \\ 7.8\text{-}7.8 & (7.8) \end{array}$	5.8-7.8 (6.3) 5.2-7.9 (7.3) 7.0-8.4 (8.0)			
Sand over loam to clay loam	5/2	A B C	$\begin{array}{ccc} 5.7\text{-}6.4 & (6.1) \\ 5.4\text{-}5.7 & (5.6) \\ 6.1\text{-}6.1 & (6.1) \end{array}$				
Muck	M, M/m, M/3, M/4	A B C			5.7-7.0 (5.9) 4.8-7.1 (5.9) 5.6-7.6 (7.3)		

(a)Median level in parentheses.

* Dominant profile texture	Symbol	Profile sample	Pound: Well drained a	s per acre P, range and mea Natural drainage Somewhat poorly drained b	n ^(a) Poorly drained c
Clay, 40-60%	1	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 12-105 & (60) \\ 8-14 & (11) \\ 1-4 & (2) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ccc} 24\text{-}33 & (28) \\ 1\text{-}21 & (12) \\ 3\text{-}13 & (6) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccc} 23-69 & (48) \\ 2-4 & (3) \\ 1-1 & (1) \end{array}$
Clay loam	. 1.5	A B C	10-181 (63) 3-49 (19) 2-23 (8)	$\begin{array}{ccc} 6\text{-}135 & (56) \\ 3\text{-}36 & (11) \\ 1\text{-}9 & (3) \end{array}$	3-172 (43) 2-10 (6) 1-113 (18)
Loam	2.5	A B C	$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	$\begin{array}{rrrr} 4\text{-}128 & (75) \\ 4\text{-}50 & (12) \\ 1\text{-}12 & (5) \end{array}$
Sandy loam	3	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 13-315 & (103) \\ 4-246 & (38) \\ 1-50 & (18) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ccc} 6-71 & (42) \\ 4-46 & (19) \\ 1-21 & (8) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ccc} 10\text{-}25 & (19) \\ 3\text{-}7 & (5) \\ 1\text{-}3 & (2) \end{array}$
Loamy sand	4	A B C	$\begin{array}{cccc} 23\text{-}216 & (87) \\ 5\text{-}62 & (24) \\ 2\text{-}26 & (12) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ccc} 20\text{-}71 & (45) \\ 6\text{-}146 & (46) \\ 1\text{-}50 & (15) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{rrrr} 8\text{-}105 & (49) \\ 6\text{-}34 & (16) \\ 5\text{-}25 & (14) \end{array}$
Sand	5	A B C	$\begin{array}{ccc} 45\text{-}259 & (111) \\ 18\text{-}82 & (46) \\ 8\text{-}24 & (15) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{rrrr} 8-59 & (37) \\ 8-22 & (14) \\ 1-12 & (6) \end{array}$
Sandy loam over loam	3/2	A B C		$\begin{array}{ccc} 17\text{-}29 & (23) \\ 6\text{-}7 & (7) \\ 2\text{-}2 & (2) \end{array}$	
Loamy sand over clay to loam	4/1, 4/2	A B C	$\begin{array}{ccc} 13\text{-}49 & (31) \\ 3\text{-}78 & (41) \\ 1\text{-}13 & (7) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ccc} 58\text{-}132 & (89) \\ 14\text{-}25 & (18) \\ 5\text{-}8 & (6) \end{array}$	
Sand over loam to clay loam	5/2	A B C	43-102 (73) 11-46 (29) 10-33 (22)		
Muck	M, M/m, M/3, M/4	A B C			$\begin{array}{ccc} 13-143 & (51) \\ 6-49 & (18) \\ 3-13 & (5) \end{array}$

Table 5. Available phosphorus levels in the profiles of soil management groups

(a)Mean level in parentheses.

in the surface soil appear to be increasing rapidly due to the use of very high rates of commercial fertilizer and livestock manure (4).

The great difference in phosphorus levels between the surface and subsurface samples illustrates the importance of preventing soil erosion. White and Doll concluded that about 10 lb/acre of P_2O_5 are required to increase phosphorus soil test levels 1 lb (10). Thus, for example, if the surface soil in management group 1a were to be eroded away, an average of 490 lb of P_2O_5 would be required to build the phosphorus levels of the subsoil up to the original level of 60 lb. This is equivalent to more than one-half ton of 0-46-0 per acre.

The average test levels in the well-drained soils were high enough, with one exception, for at least 90 bu/ acre of shelled corn to be produced without the use of phosphate fertilizer (2). This is significant in light of the current worldwide phosphate fertilizer shortage. This situation stresses the importance of basing phosphate use on a good soil testing program.

EXCHANGEABLE SOIL POTASSIUM

As with phosphorus, the test levels for potassium covered a wide range varying from 9 to 720 lb/acre (Table 6). The low level probably represented a situation where the subsoil was naturally low, but the high level undoubtedly reflects an accumulation of potassium from the use of large amounts of manure or fertilizer.

In contrast with the phosphorus test levels, there was no consistent difference in average potassium test levels in the three drainage classes. But corn grown on the fine-textured soils (1 or 1.5) would not be expected to respond to potassium with such high average test levels.

The average levels of exchangeable potassium tended to decrease with depth in the profile except on soils with two-storied parent materials. This again suggests that erosion would cause a significant loss of available nutrients.

The levels of exchangeable potassium in the finertextured soils tended to be much higher than in the coarser-textured soils. This was in agreement with the findings of Doll *et al.* (4).

TRENDS IN SOIL TEST LEVELS

This study was not designed to evaluate trends in soil test levels, but attempts to do this will undoubtedly

			Pound Well	ds per acre, range and m Natural drainage Somewhat poorly	nean ^(a) Poorly	
Dominant profile texture	Symbol	Profile sample A B C	drained a	drained b	drained c	
Clay, 40-60%	1		187-480 (347) ^(a) 151-300 (210) 109-190 (150)	$222-392 (309) \\178-252 (214) \\142-175 (156)$	267-720 (516) 200-491 (355) 130-387 (283)	
Clay loam	1.5	A B C	150-442 (265) 150-265 (213) 130-240 (152)	253-533 (360) 116-303 (204) 107-196 (150)	120-549 (284) 120-307 (206) 142-491 (259)	
Loam	2.5	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 71\text{-}373 \ (201) \\ 80\text{-}293 \ (154) \\ 33\text{-}140 \ (97) \end{array}$	70-686 (235) 109-387 (166) 50-400 (118)	80-526 (225) 70-220 (145) 90-180 (121)	
Sandy loam	3	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 76\text{-}627 \ (270) \\ 44\text{-}396 \ (148) \\ 9\text{-}420 \ (88) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 124\text{-}240 \ (175) \\ 110\text{-}196 \ (160) \\ 22\text{-}80 \ (49) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccc} 100\text{-}278 & (173) \\ 50\text{-}160 & (103) \\ 30\text{-}70 & (45) \end{array}$	
Loamy sand	4	A B C	$55-360 \ (159) \ 36-142 \ (69) \ 10-142 \ (50)$	$98-265 \ (164) \ 18-89 \ (53) \ 11-80 \ (39)$	$\begin{array}{c} 175-300 & (220) \\ 22-120 & (74) \\ 11-70 & (37) \end{array}$	
Sand	5	A B C	$\begin{array}{cccc} 55\text{-}131 & (78) \\ 44\text{-}169 & (72) \\ 33\text{-}87 & (59) \end{array}$	44-90 (68) 22-70 (43) 11-60 (38)	$\begin{array}{ccc} 44\text{-}120 & (76) \\ 11\text{-}22 & (18) \\ 9\text{-}22 & (18) \end{array}$	
Sandy loam over loam	3/2	A B C		110-133 (122) 89-120 (105) 53-110 (82)		
Loamy sand over clay to loam	4/1, 4/2	A B C	$\begin{array}{c} 130\text{-}300 \hspace{0.1 cm}(215) \\ 44\text{-}130 \hspace{0.1 cm}(87) \\ 98\text{-}130 \hspace{0.1 cm}(114) \end{array}$	50-293 (178) 20-220 (105) 76-267 (141)		
Sand over loam to clay loam	5/2	A B C	278-400 (339) 50-62 (56) 20-142 (81)			
Muck	M, M/m, M/3, M/4	A B C	=		55-640 (317) 53-267 (146) 11-142 (100)	

Table 6. Exchangeable potassium levels in profiles of soil management groups

(a)Mean level in parentheses.

be made. Therefore, the data have been regrouped to be most comparable with test levels previously reported (4).

In Table 7, soil profile textures of clay, 1, and clay loam, 1.5, have been combined. In agreement with the procedure used in the soil testing laboratory, the loam, 2.5, profile texture was labeled 2. For each profile texture, the three drainage classes were combined into one average.

In this study, the average levels for pH in 1974 of all soil groups were equal to or higher than those reported in 1971. Average phosphorus levels were higher in the finer-textured soils and lower in the coarse-textured soils in 1974. Except in sand soils, 5, potassium levels were higher in 1974.

LIME AND FERTILIZER REQUIREMENTS FOR CORN

If test levels in the surface soil can be used to evaluate fertilizer and lime requirements of corn grown in Michigan, certain conclusions concerning current requirements of fertilizer and lime can be drawn.

Only 20 out of 135 fields tested had a pH below 6.0. Therefore, assuming that maximum corn production can be obtained at pH 6.0 or above, only 15% (300,000 acres) of an estimated 2 million acres is in immediate need of lime.

Table 7. A comparison of soil test levels in surface soilsof this study with those determined in 1971

Management group symbol	pl	Ŧ	Soil tes	t levels		к
	1971	1974	1971	1974	1971	1974
1	6.4	7.1	41	51	215	322
2	6.6	7.1	51	65	200	220
3	6.4	6.4	87	84	193	245
4	6.3	6.8	101	69	169	170
5	6.1	6.8	116	63	144	74

In regard to phosphate fertilizers with yield goals in the range of 120 to 150 bu/acre, no yield increases can be expected when test levels are above 80 lb. Of the 135 fields tested, 40 had tests above this level. This is equal to 30% of the fields or 600,000 acres. All are currently receiving significant amounts of phosphate fertilizer. If phosphate fertilizer shortages are critical, this represents 600,000 acres where yields would not be significantly reduced if no phosphate was used.

To achieve the state average of 80 bu/acre, a minimum test level of 40 lb of phosphorus is required if no fertilizer is used. Of the 135 samples tested, 79 had levels in excess of 40 lb. This is equal to 59% or equivalent to 1,800,000 acres that could produce 80 bu without phosphate fertilizer.

Regardless of texture, any soil that tests in excess of 240 lb/acre of potassium should contain ample potassium to produce 100 or more bu/acre of shelled corn. In these studies, 51 samples tested in excess of 240 lb/acre. This is 38%, which is equivalent to 760,000 acres.

These data illustrate well that if farmers used fertilizer on the basis of soil test information, current fertilizer shortages would be less severe. Less fertilizer would be used on high testing soils and more would be available for low testing soils.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Soil profile samples were collected from 135 locations and tested in the Central Laboratory of Michigan State University. If soil samples submitted to the laboratory by farmers and others are representative of soil conditions in Michigan and if the sampling procedure used in these studies is also representative, it is logical to conclude that test levels for pH, available phosphorus and exchangeable potassium are continuing to increase at a rapid rate.

Generally, test levels are now high enough that soil testing should be used as much to predict a lack of response from commercial fertilizer as to determine how much and what kind of fertilizer and lime should be used. This is a significant change from the past and also a pertinent consideration in today's economy, where fertilizer shortages are real and prices are rapidly increasing. Within every soil management group in southern Michigan there was a wide range in test levels, thus emphasizing that, in addition to the kind of soil and expected yield, soil testing is important in determining today's fertilizer needs.

REFERENCES

- 1. Bray, R. H. and L. T. Kurtz (1945). Determination of total organic and available forms of phosphorus in soils. Soil Sci. 59:35-45.
- Christenson, D. R., R. E. Lucas and E. C. Doll (1972). Fertilizer recommendations for Michigan. Mich. State Univ. Ext. Bul. E-550.
- 3. Doll, E. C. (1972). Unpublished data.
- Doll, E. C., J. C. Shickluna and J. F. Demetrio (1972). Levels and changes in soil tests in lower Michigan 1962-71. Mich. Agr. Exp. Sta. Res. Rpt. 197.
- Mokma, D. L., E. P. Whiteside and I. F. Schneider (1974). Soil management units and land use planning: Mich. Agr. Exp. Sta. Res. Rpt. 254.
- Shickluna, J. C. (1962). The relationship of pH, available phosphorus, potassium and magnesium to soil management groups. Mich. Agr. Expt. Sta. Quart. Bul. 45:136-147.

- Shickluna, J. C. and R. L. Cook (1959). Michigan soil test summary. Mich. Agr. Exp. Sta. Quart. Bul. 41:550-561.
- 8. Shickluna, J. C. and R. E. Lucas (1963). The pH, phosphorus, potassium, calcium and magnesium status of organic soils in Michigan. Mich. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul. 45:417-425.
- 9. Warncke, D. D. and E. C. Doll (1973). Organic soil test levels and changes in Michigan 1962-1972. Mich. Agr. Exp. Sta. Res. Rpt. 233.
- 10. White, R. R. and E. C. Doll (1971). Phosphorus and potassium fertilizers increase soil test levels. Mich. Agr. Exp. Sta. Res. Rpt. 127.
- Whiteside, E. P. (1959). Grouping soils for fertilizer recommendations. Proc. Mich. Fert. Conf. Dec. 10-11. Mich. State Univ.

APPENDIX A. LOCATION OF SOIL PROFILE SAMPLE SITES

County	Township	Section	Quarter section	Soil series	Soil management group	County	Township	Section	Quarter section	Soil series	Soil management group
Allegan	Wayland Wayland Lee	23 35 17	NW SW NE	Granby Spinks Tedrow	5c 4a 5b	Lenawee	Riga Fairfield Seneca	13 22 28	NW NE NE	Hoytville Nappanee Blount	1c 1b 1.5b
Barry	Rutland Woodland	34 23	NE NE	Ottawa Miami	5/2a 2.5a	Livingston	Conway Handy	35 1	SW NW	Miami Brookston	2.5a 2.5c
Bay	Frankenlust Frankenlust Frankenlust Hampton Merritt	7 8 2 30 9	NW NE NW NE SW	Metamora Londo Tappan Parkhill Selfridge	3/2b 2.5b 2.5c-c 2.5c 4/2b	Macomb	Washington Bruce Bruce	6 7 3 15	NW SE NW	Fox Lapeer Miami	4a 3a 2.5a
Berrien	Berrien Bainbridge	$1 \\ 16$	NW SW	Kalamazoo Chelsea	3a 5a	Mecosta	Millbrook Hinton	16 17 16	SE SE SW	Montcalm Rubicon	2.5a 4a 5.3a
Branch	Butler Girard Sherwood	33 34 22	SE SE NE	Barry Locke Hillsdale	3c 3b 3a	Midland	Porter Porter Jasper	34 18 30	NW SE NW	Selfridge Crosswell Capac	4/2b 5a 2.5b
Calhoun	Albion Eckford Pennfield	14 6 36	NW NE SW	Matherton Kalamazoo Kalamazoo	3b 3a 3a	Monroe	LaSalle LaSalle Whiteford	31 31 18	NE NE SE	Pewamo Pewamo St. Clair	1.5c 1.5c 1a
Cass	Marcellus Volinia	32 31	SW SW	Kidder Kalamazoo	2.5a 3a	Montcalm	Bloomer Bushnell Reynolds	10 10 15	SW SE NW	Nester Otisco Montcalm	1.5a 4b 4a
Clinton	Bath Dewitt Greenbush Greenbush	19 13 28 24	NW NE SW SW	Miami Conover Adrian Gilford	2.5a 2.5b M/4c 4c	Muskegon	Holton Moorland	2 32	SW NE	Selkirk Deford	1b 4c
Eaton	Carmel Carmel Eaton Rapids	7 10 18	SE NW NW	Sebewa Miami Carlisle	3c 2.5a Mc	Newaygo	Ensley Ensley Grant Grant	3 19 24 35	SW NW NE NE	Emmet AuGres Edwards Roscommon	3a 5b M/mc 5c
Genesee	Argentine Gaines Clayton	9 27 26	SE NE NW	Lenawee DelRey Brookston	1.5c 1.5b 2.5c	Oakland	Addison Oakland	36 13	SE NE	Macomb Hillsdale	3/2b 3a
Gratiot	Washington Washington Washington	$14\\12\\10$	SE SW SW	Sims Pert Hovtville	1.5c 1.5b 1c	Oceana Ottawa	Greenwood Greenwood Polkton	352	NW SE NE	Kent Isabella Nester	1a 2.5a 1.5a
Hillsdale	Emerson	34	SW	Parkhill	2.5c	Saginaw	Wright Swan Creek	30 9	NW NE	Sims	1.5c
Timbure	Litchfield Litchfield	27 32	SW SW	Hillsdale Brady	3a 4b		Chesaning Swan Creek Blumfield	33 6 4	NW SE SE	Sims Tedrow Parkhill	1.5c 5b 2.5c
Huron	Sebewaing Fairhaven Oliver Colfax Sheridan Sheridan	$24 \\ 24 \\ 14 \\ 5 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 \\ 12 $	NW NE NW SE SE SE	Kilmanagh Shebeon Sanilac Shebeon Granby AuGres	2.5c 2.5b 2.5b 2.5b 5c 5b	Sanilac	Greenleaf Greenleaf Evergreen Evergreen Evergreen Buel	$ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 25 \\ 24 \\ 36 \\ 36 \\ 36 \\ 5 \end{array} $	NE NW SW NW SW NE	Guelph Melita Montcalm Parkhill Capac Alcona	2.5a 5/2a 4a 2.5c 2.5b 3a
Ionia	Berlin Berlin Sebewa	24 36 31	SW SW NE	Brookston Conover Miami	2.5c 2.5b 2.5a	Shiawassee	Marlette Burns	35 32	SE SW	Capac Conover	2.5b 2.5b
Ingham	Vevay LeRoy	4 20	NE SE	Conover Brookston	2.5b 2.5c	St. Clair	Vernon Mussey	24 4 19	NW NW	Celina Pewamo	2.5c 2.5a 1.5c
Isabella	Lincoln Lincoln Lincoln Bolland	24 14 17 21	NE SE SW NW	Nester Gladwin Graycalm Menominee	1.5a 4b 5a	St. Joseph	Mussey Colon Nottawa Nottawa	28 7 15 19	SE SW NW NW	Blount Kalamazoo Warsaw Oshtemo	1.5b 3a 3a 4a
Jackson	Blackman Parma	19 24	SW NW	Spinks Hillsdale	4/2a 4a 3a	Tuscola	Millington Watertown Watertown	5 23 10	SE SW NE	Spinks Kalamazoo Guelph	4a 3a 2.5a
Kent	Alpine Lowell	32 34	SE NE	Nester Conover	1.5a 2.5b		Almer Almer Columbia	$\begin{array}{c} 22\\ 10\\ 35 \end{array}$	NE NE NW	Boyer Londo Parkhill	4a 2.5b 2.5c
Kalamazoo	Charleston Comstock Pavilion Pavilion	32 36 11	NE SW SW	Kalamazoo Warsaw Granby	3a 3a 5c	VanBuren	Hartford Geneva Geneva	12 36 12	NE NE NE	Metea Rimer Granby	4/2a 4/1b 4c
Lapeer	Lapeer Lapeer Lapeer	10 15 10 3	SE NW SW SW	Palms Morley Blount Kidder	M/3c 1.5a 1.5b 2.5a	Washtenaw	Salem Superior York Augusta Lima	34 2 12 18 23	SW NE NE SE NE	Morley St. Clair Oshtemo Blount Miami	1.5a 1a 4a 1.5b 2.5a
	Imlay Almont	15 24	SE	Nappanee Sebewa	M/3c 1b 3c	Wayne	Northville Van Buren	13 17	NW SW	Wasepi Thetford	4b 4b