from the body. An attempt to repair with tape or glue is an exercise in futility. The survey soon looks more disreputable than before. I'm not asking for leather-bound; soil science is hide-bound enough. But really, wouldn't it be great to see a survey that had more class and durability than poster paper?

How about improving the cover with a splash of color? Even the most drab looking kinds of soil are not just plain black and white. A few years ago, a couple of surveys in Florida were published with a blowup color photo covering the entire front cover, and a much better cover material was used. Though the innovation was quickly discontinued, these remain the best looking surveys I've ever seen. Sure, we all know this costs more, but wouldn't it be well worth it? Another idea that would be cheaper and not require that hard-to-find, top-quality cover photo, would be to use an attractive shade of green or other color on a glossy or plasticized cover material. Knowing the time and expense that goes into a survey and knowing its value as the only source of such information, it seems only reasonable to expect a survey to be published with a cover that will enhance the subject matter and stimulate greater product use. Sounds like a sales pitch, doesn't it? Then again, what else should it be?

Another turn-off is in the title itself. The word survey means one thing to soil scientists, another thing to engineers, and nothing at all to the layman. Since the term resource has come more into vogue in recent years, I suggest a title such as Soil Resources of Blank County; or better yet, Soil Resource Inventory of Blank County. Of course there are other possibilities, but something along this line better represents what a published soil survey is all about.

I assume that other soil scientists have had similar thoughts on this, therefore I hope I have your support. I am asking the USDA Joint Committee on printing, which has full control of publication of soil surveys, to give these few suggestions their total attention and thorough consideration. If they will do this, I say for all of us, Thank You, Thank You!

Verification of Saline Mapping Units for a Soil Survey

J.L. Richardson and D.D. Patterson

Mapping units are normally separated by readily observable soil and/or landscape criteria. These criteria often reflect land use and soil potential. Some soil properties influence use, management, or productivity but are unrelated to a visible landscape feature or to a readily observable pedon characteristic. Salinity in fine-silty and coarse-silty lacustrine soils in eastern North Dakota is an example.

In Grand Forks County, ND, several mapping units were recognized and mapped on the basis of assumed differences in salinity (Doolittle et al., 1981). Plant density and height and the general appearance of vegetation in the field were used to delineate areas of these mapping units because field-visible morphologic criteria were absent or not consistently expressed. Complicating the field separation were (i) field observations could not be scheduled to coincide with times of peak vegetative growth on all salt-affected soils; (ii) differential salt
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