

## Book C

### Field-Recorded Seismic Sections

By  
**Robert W. Lankston**  
May 1, 2023

The field recordings from the 1970 Wold-Crosby Flathead Lake seismic survey were scanned in 2006 at 600 dots per inch (dpi). The files were very large, and I downsized them for this archive in 2013 by a 50% scaling to 300 dpi. I still have the 600 dpi files should you want them.

Line I was too long to fit on the scanner. Therefore, Line I was scanned into two files labeled I1 and I2. The two scans overlap slightly. Line Q, though presented on the [Silverman et al. \(1971\)](#) map as a single line, was actually recorded in three segments, and the field-recorded sections are labeled Q1, Q2, and Q3. One should study the three Line Q sections to understand how the three segments relate to each other. While the line on the Prael track line map suggests a continuous line, the three segments probably are not really connected. Transcribing the sextant readings for the respective line segments to the basemap probably had uncertainties of 100's of feet. The Silverman et al. map indicates a Line M and a Line MW (M west). However, only one field recording is labeled M, and it is presumed to include both segments. The mapped gap between Line M and Line MW probably suggests a time when the survey boat was adrift while repairs to the air gun were made. This is a case in which annotations on the field recording may give a clue to the difficulties of field operations.

The set of field recordings also includes two that are labeled B. The scanned files for these are labeled B1 and B2. File B1 is presumed to contain the actual data for Line B. Comparison of the Line B data from the USGS archive tape with the field-recorded seismic section verifies this.

The timing lines on most of the field recordings are at 25 ms intervals. The timing line interval should be checked, though. The two-way time to the water bottom reflector can be calculated from depths on the [bathymetric sections](#) or depths taken from the Silverman et al. (1971) map. The calculated two-way time should be consistent with the interpreted time on the field-recorded seismic section and the corresponding [redisplayed seismic](#) section.

Line Jw is a prime example of the difficulty in determining time zero and the timing line interval. Longer lines, along which the water bottom event varies across one or more timing lines, are easier to resolve.

The timing lines on the field-recorded sections have lateral gaps at five-minute intervals (Simpkin, 2007). Near the bottoms of the field recordings are notations of clock time. These times appear to be the times of sextant positioning sightings. Except for Line B, the field sections indicate the date on which the line was recorded. Interestingly, the lines do not seem to have been recorded in a particularly systematic order.

The width of the chart paper for the original field-recorded sections (time dimension) was 19 in (Simpkin, 2007). In the original sections, the timing lines are approximately 1 in apart. At some unknown time, approximately 7 in of the original paper sections were removed from the bottoms of most of the field sections.

[Line J](#) is a notable exception. Only 2 in appear to be missing from the Line J section. The crease along which the Line J field-recorded section is now folded can be seen in the scanned image. This crease is near the point at which the other sections were trimmed. I believe that the sections were actually trimmed as opposed to the paper sections tearing apart, quite literally, through wear and tear along the crease with the bottom piece then being disposed of. Someone clearly took the time to transcribe the information that was at the bottoms of the original recording to the upper parts that remained after the trimming.

The removal of so much of the paper section resulted in the loss of geologic data in areas of the lake with deep water. The line name, recording direction, and time annotations are presumed to have been transcribed faithfully from the removed strip to their current locations on the sections. As mentioned above, the two field sections for Line B do not have a date. Whether this was an oversight during field operations or an oversight after the section was trimmed and the annotations were being transcribed is not known.

Some of the sections have interpretation lines, i.e., faults and horizons, or numbers that indicate the arrival times of events marked on them. Except for the interpretations drawn on some of the field recordings, the sections are remarkably “clean” considering their age.

Most of the scans of the field recordings have a corresponding scan of a redisplay of the data. Notable exceptions include:

- the file labeled B2 in the set of field sections has no counterpart in the redisplayed set.
- the short western extension of Line J across Indian Bay is labeled Jw on the Silverman et al. (1971) base map and on the field recording. The redisplayed section is labeled Je.
- Lines K, Q3, S, and T have two redisplayed sections. The second version of Q3 is labeled Q4 in the redisplayed set. Lines K, S, and T each have a version 1 and a version 2, i.e., K1 and K2, and so forth.
- The redisplayed section for Line G does not cover the full length of the field recorded section. The line was recorded from east to west, and the redisplay ends on the west near Cedar Island.

Except for lines such as Q that were recorded in segments, the file names in the archive reflect the line name annotations on the original documents.

No original section exists for Line H. According to the Prahls base map, Line H extended from the survey crew's base of operations at Yellow Bay westward across the lake. Line H passed north of Wild Horse Island and Cromwell Island. The [Book G narrative](#) indicates that the Line H documents were missing as of January 12, 1993. Wold, evidently, had a copy of the Line H redisplayed section when he prepared his 1982 report. His interpretation of Line H is in his Figure 4.

## References Cited

Silverman, A. J., Pevear, D. R., and Prah, S. R., 1971, Bathymetry of Flathead Lake, Montana: unpublished. (URL: <http://scholarworks.umt.edu/flathead/15/> )

Simpkin, P., 2007, personal correspondence

Wold, R. J., 1982, Reflection seismic study of Flathead Lake, Montana, USGS Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MF-1433: US Geological Survey. (URL: <https://pubs.usgs.gov/mf/1433/plate-1.pdf>)

## Citing this Narrative

For “books”, i.e., the ScholarWorks term for a folder or a directory, ScholarWorks will display a Recommended Citation for the entire book. Some of the books (directories) in this collection have what ScholarWorks calls “supplemental material” (files). ScholarWorks does not suggest a citation for the individual files, and you may have occasions when you want a reader to be able to find exactly what you are talking about in your own work.

Therefore, I am suggesting a citation for this narrative. My suggested citation is in a little different form than the ScholarWorks form, but that is not critical. Every medium has its preferred format. The important components of a digital citation are the author(s), the title of the work, the year of creation, the name of the collection in which the work appears, and the URL of the work. The following meets those specifications.

Lankston, R. W., 2023, “C. Field-recorded seismic sections – narrative by Robert W. Lankston” in *1970 Flathead Lake Seismic Survey*. URL: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?filename=25&article=1001&context=flathead&type=additional>

You can find the URL for my narrative by moving your mouse to the Download button next to the narrative title in the list of files for the book. Right click the mouse and, in the pop-up options box, choose to copy the link address. Then, the address is in your clipboard, and you can drop the text string of the address into your work.

I would suggest the same citation format and the same technique for capturing the URL of the supplemental files that form the heart of the content of this book, i.e., the individual seismic sections. For the Line A seismic section, specifically, the citation could look like:

Crosby, G. W., and Wold, R. J., 1970, “C. Field-recorded seismic sections – Line A field recording” in *1970 Flathead Lake Seismic Survey*. URL: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?filename=0&article=1001&context=flathead&type=additional>

In this case, the authors are those who collected (created) the seismic data, and the date is when the data were collected. The authors of the files, other than my narrative, are listed after the book title on the ScholarWorks page, and the year of creation is listed in the Date field below the list of available files. Those author and date fields are ones that I set when I enter the metadata for the book.

**Feedback**

The standard ScholarWorks format limits how/when an author's email address is displayed. With the author convention that I use, my email address is not displayed for books such as Book C. Actually, my email address is not even in the book metadata. If you need to contact me regarding the content, a broken URL, and so forth, you can use:

[rwlankston@gmail.com](mailto:rwlankston@gmail.com)

*Last Update: 5/30/2023 2:54 PM*