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This work has been carried out to extend on the interpretation of the Upper Crustal structure under the Eskdalemuir Seismic Array and the surrounding area. A study of the dispersion of short period (about 1 sec.) surface waves from local events at different distances and azimuths was considered, but the lack of events showing such waves turned attention to the study of first P-arrivals from the same sort of events.

The thesis is in six chapters. Chapter I was given with an Introduction. In Chapter II, the general aspects of the geology of the area were discussed very briefly. Previous seismic work around EKA was summarised with special reference to LOWNET and LISPB models.

Seismic array technique, its advantages and methods of array data processing were discussed in Chapter III which also included a brief description of EKA and LOWNET and a detailed description of Broughton Array which was set up temporarily during the course of this work. Chapter IV gives detailed information about the data sources, origin time recording and play-back facilities.

Preliminary results of the analysis of some EKA local events showed some systematic velocity and azimuth variations and this revealed the need for detailed information about the shallow structure under the array itself. Six shots were fired in the vicinity of EKA. Chapter V has been devoted for the presentation
of the results of these shots, their discussion and interpretation. These demonstrated an anisotropy effect in the area of the array.

Chapter VI presents the results of all local events, received at the three arrays, their discussion, comparison and interpretation.

A velocity structure around EKA is proposed which involves (1) a rapid increase of velocity (0.8 km/sec./km) to about 1.6 km depth followed by a slow rate (< 0.003 km/sec./km) to an undefined depth (2) a variation in the initial (zero depth) velocity with azimuth ranging from 5.0 to 4.4 km/sec. parallel and normal to the Lower Palaeozoic strike respectively. The Broughton data were consistent with this model if the Lower Palaeozoic structure under the Midland Valley is essentially flat-lying. The extent to which these conclusions are consistent with previous work is discussed.

Some of the methods of analysis are described in the Appendices (1 - 7), which also include two computer programs with their output results which form the basis for the interpretation and the above conclusions.
Burton & Blamey (1972)\(^{(80)}\).

(2) a computer program which cross-correlates the outputs of different channels with the output of a reference channel, chosen to show a clear Rayleigh arrival and judged to be of high S/N ratio, and thus allowing for more accurate move-out determination and therefore a more reliable calculation of group velocity and angle of approach at the array (a copy of this program will be lodged in the Geophysics data room, Geology Department).

It should be mentioned that the picking of Rayleigh arrival for one of these events was complicated by a possible second S-arrival or an entirely different instantaneous arrival. The location and origin time of another event were doubtful and therefore they were rejected.

Results of the analysis of the other three (although not included in this thesis) showed that:

(1) group velocity–frequency function of the Rayleigh waves of these events strengthen the belief of them being dispersed, see Appendix (7) for an example.

(2) angles of approach at the array were shifted from the direct ray path up to \(15^\circ\) for one case.

(3) Further analysis on the first P-arrivals of these and other events, see Chapter VI, demonstrated the existence of the shift phenomenon.

Search for more local events continued, but unfortunately, no more surface waves were found, and thereafter, analysis was restricted to
first P-arrivals. Results from about 70 events (mainly quarry blasts and natural events) received from 25 different sources at distances ranging between 20 km - 165 km and propagation vector, see Fig. (4-2), ranging between $90^\circ - 210^\circ$, showed that:

1. azimuth anomaly is, to a large extent, systematic.
2. apparent velocity seems to vary with both distance and azimuth.
3. It was also found that the locations of some of these events were doubtful (seen through the very high azimuth anomalies, as high as $30^\circ$ in some cases) and therefore many events were rejected, see Chapter IV.

Azimuth anomalies and apparent velocity variations can be attributed to different causes, mainly anisotropy and lateral inhomogeneity effects. A complex velocity structure of some sort at any depth under EKA could be a reason.

A study of the shallow velocity structure under EKA seemed necessary to find out what effect this structure has on these observed azimuth and velocity variations. Six shots were fired in the vicinity of the array. Results from these shots demonstrated horizontal and vertical velocity variations, see Chapter V.

Most of the analysed local events originated in the Midland Valley which is separated from Southern Uplands by the major Southern Uplands Fault and where a 6.4 km/sec. refractor is known to exist at a depth of 7 - 8 km, see Bamford et al (1977) and Crampin et al (1970). The existence of such a refractor, at a greater depth (12 km or more) beneath the Southern Uplands, see
Jacob (1969)(31) remains questionable. A seismic array close to the Southern Uplands Fault and to the south side of it could be useful in:

(1) studying arrivals from the different sources received at a different location in the Southern Uplands, particularly those few Southern Uplands sources to help to define any regional anisotropy effects and/or any lateral inhomogeneity in the whole of the Southern Uplands.

(2) Receiving close to the fault from sources in the Midland Valley will help to study the same effects in that region. Sources close to the fault (at distances less than 50 km) will help to reveal more information about the shallow structure, i.e. at depths less than 7 - 8 km.

(3) Accurate travel times will be useful in defining and checking on any proposed structural model.

Broughton Array was set up near the town of Biggar and operated for a period of 65 days using the Geostore recording system, see Section (3.4). During that period and through direct contact with the quarry managers in the area, many recorded events on Broughton, EKA and LOWNET were identified and some of these were timed at the quarries, see Chapter IV. The analysis and interpretation of all local events are presented in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER II

REGIONAL GEOLOGY AND GEOPHYSICAL INTERPRETATIONS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SEISMIC STUDIES (EKA, LSNET, LISPB)

2.1 Introduction

This thesis is concerned with transmission of seismic waves through the rocks of the Midland Valley and Southern Uplands of Scotland. The former is characterised by Upper and the latter by Lower Palaeozoic outcrop. The line of the Southern Uplands Fault separates them from the Rhinns of Galloway in the SW to Dunbar in the NE and represents the southern boundary of the Midland Valley Rift. The general nature and arrangement of the principal rock groups are shown in map Fig. (2-1), section Fig. (2-2) and table (2-1) which includes some relevant physical properties. For a general description of the Geology of Southern Uplands and the Midland Valley, and references to detailed studies, see Greig (1971)(1), Craig (1965)(2) and MacGregor & MacGregor (1965)(3).

2.2 Aspects of the Geology relating to Present Study (From the top)

Quaternary Deposits: represented by peat and boulder clay and occur at the seismometer array sites. At EKA, shot holes were augered or drilled into them without, generally, reaching bedrock, see Chapter V. Thicker unconsolidated deposits may occur on the seabed under the marine shots in the Forth and North Channel. In respect of these shots, therefore, Quaternary deposits will have caused some time delays. Otherwise, other sources and all detectors are sited below these deposits and first arrival ray paths are unlikely to pass through them.
Tertiary Dykes: A group of such dykes pass through Southern Uplands, close to EKA and could indicate some deep structural line. These dykes are of the order of 0.01 km wide, detectable magnetically, and are generally showing negative (reversed) anomalies. Such dykes, however, are too narrow in relation to seismic wavelengths to have any significant effect.

Upper Palaeozoic

Most of the quarries are into sills intruding rocks of this age group, see Section (4.1.3) and Appendix (1). The sedimentary succession and thicknesses are well known to the base of the Carboniferous Limestone Series as a result of coal workings. One of the most regular seismic sources is the N.C.B. opencase at Westfield (N.G.R. 312/670). At least some of the 'natural' events, see Section (4.1.5), are ground tremors brought about by mining operations, see Mashkour (1976)(4).

The concealed extent and thickness of underlying Carboniferous lavas are much less well known. Thickness estimates of Old Red Sandstone, especially the Lower, may be subject to large errors because of correlation problems in unfossiliferous, laterally variable alluvial fan deposits and interbedded lavas, see Waterston (1965)(5). Maximum thicknesses are, however, expected to occur close to the rift boundary faults, (George, 1960)(6). Although the Lower O.R.S. rests with strong unconformity on the Southern Uplands Lower Palaeozoic rocks, it appears comparable on the Downtonian of the Midland Valley inliers (Lesmahagow).
A granitic pluton of Lower O.R.S. age intrudes these rocks at Distinkhorn within the Midland Valley. Three similar large plutons intrude the Lower Palaeozoic rocks of the S.W. Southern Uplands. Gravity anomalies over them indicate depth extents of 8–12 km, see Bott & Masson-Smith (1960)\(^7\) and El-Batroukh (1975)\(^8\). Smaller but related bodies of granodiorite occur sporadically along the Northern Belt of the Southern Uplands as far as the east coast. It is geologically and gravitationally possible that these intermediate composition rocks underlie a wide area.

**Lower Palaeozoic**

The Upper Ordovician to Silurian rocks of the Southern Uplands are well compacted and jointed rocks, principally greywackes and shales. Some stratigraphic divisions show large thickness variation across the strike eg the Upper Ordovician greywackes of the Northern Belt, 2400 m thick, are represented by 21 m black shale near Moffat in the Central Belt (Walton, 1965)\(^9\). Except in the aureoles of the granitic plutons these rocks are barely metamorphosed and show well preserved sedimentary structures. Their tectonic structure is renowned for its complexity. Folding may be dominantly isoclinal, (Lapworth, 1882\(^10\); Peach & Horne, 1899\(^11\)) or a combination of essentially monoclinal folds and revised faults (Craig & Walton, 1959)\(^12\).

The foundation on which these sediments were laid may have been an oceanic crust of Arenig age (Wilson, 1966\(^13\); Dewey, 1969, 1971\(^14, 15\)) and the Ballantrae ophiolite a remnant of it (Church & Gayer, 1973)\(^16\). Controversy over the concealed extent of such
rocks and the location of sutures between them and pre-existing continental blocks or directly between these blocks has recently been reviewed by Moseley (1977)\(^{17}\).

Crust of continental thickness (30 km) now exists throughout the region (Bamford et al, 1976)\(^{18}\), see also next Section. Within that crust, however, gravity (McLean & Qureshi, 1966\(^{19}\); Powell, 1971\(^{20}\) and El-Batroukh, 1975\(^{8}\)) and Seismic (Bamford et al, 1976\(^{18}\); Bamford et al, 1977\(^{21}\)) evidences show a dense, high velocity basement at shallower depth under the Midland Valley (7–8 km) than under the Southern Uplands (12 km or more). Whether rocks like those under the Midland Valley exist under the Southern Uplands remains in doubt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era</th>
<th>System, etc.</th>
<th>Sediments</th>
<th>Contemporaneous Intrusive</th>
<th>Physical Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quaternary</td>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>Glacial marine deposits 0.1 km</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G = 2.02-2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>Perman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G = 5.6-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesozoic</td>
<td>Carboniferous</td>
<td>S.S., shales</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G = 2.6-2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permian</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G = 2.02-2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Basalts</td>
<td>Basalts</td>
<td>G = 2.6-2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Volcanic necks, basic sills, dykes</td>
<td>Volcanic necks, basic sills, dykes</td>
<td>G = 2.6-2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Andesites</td>
<td>Andesites</td>
<td>G = 2.6-2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table (2-1)** Succession, rock types, thicknesses and relevant physical properties

(See references 8, 22 and 23)
Scale 1: 625000

Fig. (2-1) Geological map of Southern Central Scotland.
**INDEX**

PH  Paleozoic cover
SC  Slightly to strongly folded L. Paleozoic strata
GC  Strongly folded L. Paleozoic strata
C   Intrusions of granitic & dioritic composition

---

Fig. (2-2) Diagramatic section across the Midland Valley and Southern Uplands showing the general relations of the main structural units - (from tectonic map of Great Britain & Northern Ireland, 1st ed., 1966).
2.3 Previous Seismic Work at EKA

Eskdalemuir Array was originally designed with distant sources in mind and has proved to be a powerful instrument in the studies of Mantle velocity structure. Several workers have pointed out that the array could also be used effectively for detailed crustal investigations but so far, it should be mentioned, however, that most of the seismic structural work, if not all, which has been carried out at the station has been concentrated mainly on deep crustal and mantle investigations. There is no detailed seismic study of the shallow structure under Eskdalemuir. Nevertheless, models have been published by different authors and certain assumptions have been made for the velocities of the shallow structure.

In their study of two British Earthquakes recorded at Eskdalemuir, Key et al (1964)\(^{(24)}\) have recognised different phases arriving at the station, \(P_n\), \(P^*\) & \(P_g\) and \(S_n\), \(S^*\) & \(S_g\). Using velocity filtering technique they concluded that deduced velocities of different phases do not agree with the calculated phase velocities. They attributed this to tilts in the layers below the array.

Agger & Key (1964)\(^{(25)}\) have analysed EKA records of an earthquake epicentred in Paisley, near Glasgow. They gave a 5.75 km/sec. phase velocity across the array for \(P_g\) & \(P^*\) arrivals and 7.80 km/sec. for \(P_n\). \(S_g\) & \(S^*\) have been found to travel across the array with a phase velocity of 3.5 km/sec. and \(S_n\) with a velocity of 3.9 km/sec.

In July 1962, a refraction shooting program using 320 lb depth charges was carried out for the calibration of Eskdalemuir Array.
Shots have been fired in the Irish Sea and the North Sea, see Fig. (2-4a). Records of these shots from Eskdalemuir and Rockhope, Durham, have been analysed by Agger & Carpenter (1964-5). From a plot of the reduced travel time, and choosing an arbitrary velocity of 8.0 km/sec., against range, their results seemed to fall into two distinct groups which they identified as $P_g$ and $P_n$. Their deduced velocities at Eskdalemuir were:

### $P_n$ including second arrivals at ranges $110 \leq \Delta \leq 130$ km.

- Western (10 observations) $7.84 \pm 0.09$ km/sec.
- Eastern (4 observations) $7.68 \pm 0.19$ km/sec.
- All (14 observations) $7.90 \pm 0.12$ km/sec.

### $P_g$ essentially first arrivals for $\Delta < 130$ km and second arrivals otherwise.

- Western (8 observations) $6.10 \pm 0.09$ km/sec.
- Eastern (7 observations) $6.04 \pm 0.23$ km/sec.
- All (15 observations) $6.09 \pm 0.06$ km/sec.

Combining all the data to get more first arrival $P_g$, and attempting a least square solution they gave $P_g$ velocities as first arrival $6.47 \pm 0.59$ km/sec., and second arrival $6.29 \pm 0.10$ km/sec.

Using the time-term approach they found:–

- $P_n$ (16 shots): $7.99 \pm 0.1$ km/sec;
- $P_g$ (23 shots) $6.12 \pm 0.06$ km/sec.

They referred also to the existence of another phase with a velocity of 7.75 km/sec. arriving from some shots between $P_g$ and $P_n$ which they associated with $P*$ of Key et al (1964).
Fig. (2-3) Seismic velocity model around Eskdalemuir

based on shots fired in the Irish Sea and North Sea.

After Agger & Carpenter (1964-5)(26).

Unfortunately, however, the nature of the experiment did not allow much to be said about the shallow structure since the ranges are relatively large. In their model the authors chose a 4.7 km/sec. sedimentary layer underlain by a crystalline rock layer of 6.12 km/sec. velocity. Both layers have uniform velocities and variable thickness and underlain by a uniform Upper Mantle of 7.99 km/sec. (See Fig. 2-3). Again the authors attributed the differences between the calculated $P_g$ and $P_n$ velocities and the phase velocities across the array to irregularities beneath the array itself.
Key (1967)\(^{27}\) gave an investigation of signal generated noise recorded at Eskdalemuir using velocity filtering technique and considering the assumption that P-waves arriving at an irregular surface of topography at an angle of incidence of a few degrees, can generate local noise (surface waves) which cannot be distinguished from the primary signal on one station records. For theoretical treatment see Hudson (1967)\(^{28}\).

The author demonstrated the lack of coherency of the P-signal, at the various seismometers, a few seconds after the first P-arrival, by subtracting the waveform of each individual signal from the normalized delayed sum-all signal, using records from an underground explosion (Bilby). This lack of coherency was associated with the arrival of another phase which was found to be of surface wave character. A detailed azimuth and velocity search for discreet signals in the 2-5.5 km/sec. velocity range which was carried out on the coda of the recording of an explosion in E. Kazateh, revealed a large number of noise sources. Key\(^{27}\) associated these sources with the relatively steep surface gradients associated with high ground, the coast line and the sea-bed depression around Eskdalemuir. He gave a more detailed study of signals arriving from an event in Kamchataka, to conclude that noise signals have been originated from P-waves crossing a deep and narrow valley called Moffat Water (running in a NE-SW direction, 13 kms from the cross-over point of the array and with a bearing of 315\(^{0}\)) at the point where the valley cuts through a basalt and dolerite dyke.

Hudson (1967)\(^{28}\) discussed the mathematical aspects of the
application of the theory of scattering of a plane wave by a surface obstacle to a three-dimensional surface of any shape. He made a comparison of the theory with data from four events which allowed him to get an estimate of the breadth of the scatter. From a study of a relief map of the area surrounding the array, he showed that the Moffat river valley is the steepest piece of terrain for some miles in either direction, and this corresponds with the fact that the scattered signal from Moffat Water is the most prominent on Eskdalemuir records. Therefore, he concluded that the scattering is due to the steep nature of the sides of the valley.

Bott (1968)\(^{29}\) in a review of geophysical surveys and their interpretation for the study of the geological structure of the Irish Sea basin, referred to the model of Agger & Carpenter\(^{26}\), commenting that the variations in sediment thickness are in broad agreement with the gravity interpretation described in his paper. He reported also that the most important conclusion from Agger & Carpenter's work is that the crust appears to be thinner than the normal continental crust and also appears to be about 4 km thinner than beneath the Southern Uplands of Scotland.

Blundell & Parks (1969)\(^{30}\) gave a comprehensive review of the seismic explosion studies for the crustal structure around the British Isles. They summarised the results of all previous work in Fig. (2-4). With regard to Agger & Carpenter's\(^{26}\) work, they commented that "unfortunately, the experiment was not designed to obtain crustal information and the two stations were so situated in relation to the pattern of shots that the control of the velocity
(A) Locations of seismic measurements. The broken line represents the 1000 m sea depth contour.

(B) Schematic diagram to summarize various representations of the crustal structure in the vicinity of the British Isles: (1) Line E-9, Lat. 46° 08'N, Long. 15° 21'W (Ewing & Ewing 1959), (2) Station 16, Lat. 47° 45'N, Long. 13° 20'W (Hill & Laughton 1954), (3) Station 9, Lat. 48° 20'N, Long. 11° 20'W (Hill & Laughton 1954), (4) Line D-12, Lat. 46° 53'N, Long. 9° 30'W (Ewing & Ewing 1959), (5) Line E-10, Lat. 54° 59'N, Long. 14° 06'W (Ewing & Ewing 1959), (6) SW Approaches (Bunce et al. 1964), (7) South Irish Sea, (8) Northern England (Agger & Carpenter 1965), (9) North Sea (Collette et al. 1965) and (10) North Germany (Willmore 1949). The numbers represent seismic velocities in km/s.

Fig. (2-4) Summary of previous seismic studies for the crustal structure around the British Isles as given by Blundell & Parks (1969)(30)
of Pn and Pg arrivals was poor. The line of charges fired in the Irish Sea was effectively unreversed and the requirement of interchange was not achieved. In addition, Agger & Carpenter had no short range observations. In view of all these uncertainties, the geological significance of the variations of crustal thickness in their model are very doubtful."

Blundell & Parks' experiment was carried out in 1965 and designed to permit the use of the time-term approach for the interpretation of the data. Their main goal was to study the crustal structure in the Irish Sea area. Recordings from 25 depth charges were carried out at three temporary stations in Wales and one in Ireland, the Rookhope Borehole, and the Eskdalemuir Array. Their results show that Pn was observed only at EKA and Rookhope and, as a result, the control on velocity is poor and the uncertainties in determining the time-terms are therefore large.

Their model of the crust in the region of the South Irish Sea is as follows: The upper 4 km contain a variety of rocks including considerable thickness of young sediments with a velocity of 5.4 km/sec. overlying a layer of heterogeneous rock to a depth of about 24 km with a Pg velocity, on average, of 6.1 km/sec., underlain by a layer of uniform material with the rather high velocity for P* of 7.3 km/sec. Because of the uncertainty in the velocity of Pn, the authors placed no great confidence in the figure of 30 km which they proposed for the base of the Crust.

Jacob (1969)(31) gave the results of the analysis of 71 Eskdalemuir
events, most of which were quarry blasts, see Fig. (2-5a). Using an array processing computer program, designed to make allowance for the curvature of the wave-front and the altitude variations between the seismometers, see Appendix (4), and calculating the distances between the shots and the array from the P-S time intervals, the author produced the apparent velocity-distance graph shown in Fig. (2-5b). The graph shows that the data is split into two sets. The first set lies approximately in the range 5.5-6.0 km/sec. indicating that the phase velocity is increasing gradually with range. The second group has a less definite trend in velocity with range, in the interval 50 < Δ < 160 km, with an average phase velocity of 6.44 km/sec. None of this group has less than 6.2 km/sec. velocity.

Applying Wiechert-Herglotz inversion method (reviewed and compared with other methods of determining velocity structure by Johnson & Gilbert (1972)(32) ) to the first group (slow), the author indicated a gradual increase in velocity from 5.54 km/sec. at the surface up to 5.94 km/sec. at a depth of about 12 km. To account for the other group (fast) the author produced the model shown in Fig. (2-6a) which gave the reduced travel-time curve of Fig. (2-6b). For this structure, the 6.44 layer will give a second arrival in the range 49 < Δ < 83 km and first arrival when Δ ≥ 83.

The author considered two points to deduce a generalised picture of the structure in the area. Firstly, the closest source of his fast group is at 56 km range at the time when such a range is expected to give a second arrival from the 6.44 layer. Jacob reported that
Fig. (2-5) (a) Location of all events with respect to EKA
(b) Apparent velocity Vs. Distance

After Jacob (1969)(31).
Fig. (2-6) (a) Velocity-depth function under EKA.
(b) Reduced T-X graph for the above model
After Jacob (1969)(31).
if a calculated first arrival at 5.7 km/sec. velocity has not been missed, then the closer fast sources may be sited in an area where the fast layer comes closer to the surface. Secondly, since both fast and slow groups occur in the 100°-160° azimuth interval, this would rule out anisotropy as a solution. Therefore the author suggested that the structure could be represented by a saddle of high velocity rock with a depth of 12 km below EKA shoaling to the NE and probably also to SW and deepening to the SE and NW. He documented his suggestion by recalculating the reduced travel-times for the Agger & Carpenter's shots (which are shown as dots on Fig. (2-6b)) to deduce that the early arrival times support the suggestion that the 6.44 layer may shoal towards the NE and SW.

It should be mentioned, however, that the author did not give an explanation for the appearance of slow and fast sources (see Fig. 2-5) at almost same azimuths and ranges. Something which in a sense does not agree with his model.

Corbishley (1970) has shown that if the slowness of the Jth event recorded within the Kth distance from an array, h, is \( \frac{dT}{dR} \), then at the ith seismometer a site correction \( R_{hi} \) incorporating both a constant and an azimuthally varying term can be defined from the residuals \( E_{hi} \) by fitting a sine curve using least squares.

\[
R_{hi} = S_{hi} + hij = A_{hi} + R_{hi} \sin (\alpha_{hj} + E_{hi}) \quad \cdots (2-1)
\]

Where \( \alpha_{hj} \) is the azimuth of the jth event from the array h and
$S_{hi}$ is a correction associated with each seismometer and $A_{hi}, R_{hi}$ and $E_{hi}$ are constants.

In a following publication, the same author derived average slowness curves ($dT/d\Delta$) for $D = 30^\circ - 104^\circ$ using data from 478 earthquakes and underground explosions recorded at the four U.K.A.E.A. arrays. Slowness curves were corrected for station bias by means of equation (1). As far as Eskdalemuir station is concerned, two main conclusions were reached at:

1. Corrections for individual seismometer sites are related to the altitudes of these sites.
2. The teleseismic data strengthens the assumption of a three plane-layered model of Agger & Carpenter.

Willmore (1973) gave a review of seismic studies around the British Isles from 1965. He concluded that the main features of that work are: (1) The Mohorovicic discontinuity is shallowing towards the west (2) There is some indication of an increase of $P_n$ velocity with range (3) also indications of lower-crust velocities ranging from 6.9-7.3 km/sec. have been found in some parts of the area.
2.4 **LOVNET MODEL (MIDLAND VALLEY)**

One of the main objects of LOVNET is to study the crustal structure of the Midland Valley using time-term analysis, see Section (3.3). A time-term survey in the area has not been completed yet (Neillson, Oct. 1977, personal communication). Crampin et al (1970) reported: "Despite the varied geology in the area, the variation in time-terms between sites is small enough to yield some estimate of crustal structure from a preliminary plot of travel-times."

Their travel-time results of some recorded explosions are shown in

![Travel-time diagram for explosions recorded on LOVNET. Parameters of Model for Midland Valley are given inside the box.](image)

*Fig. (2-7)* Travel-time diagram for explosions recorded on LOVNET. Parameters of Model for Midland Valley are given inside the box.

Fig. (2-7) from which they derived average time-terms, velocities and thicknesses. From these results they suggest a three-
horizontally layered model with the parameters shown in box Fig.
(2-7). They indicated, also, that first arrivals from the 6.4 km/
sec. layer are received at distances of about 50 km.

2.5 LISPB RESULTS (RECENT PUBLICATIONS)

The Lithospheric Seismic Profile in Britain, referred to as "LISPB"
was completed in summer 1974. A full description of the experiment
with some preliminary results have been given in Bamford et al
(1976)(18). Recent results concerning the Upper Crustal Structure
of northern Britain have been given in Bamford et al (1977)(21).

In their model (Fig. 2-8) for Midland Valley, the authors(21) gave
a 4-5 km/sec. velocity for a top most layer of varying thickness
(\leq 3km). This layer corresponds to Old Red Sandstone/Lower
Carboniferous sequences and is underlain by a 5.7 - 5.9 km/sec.
velocity, Lower Palaeozoic layer with a definite discontinuity at a
depth of the order of 7-8 km where the velocity increases to 6.4 km/
sec. Both boundaries are reported to be sharp discontinuities.

Refractions from the 6.4 km/sec. layer are seen at distances of
about 50 km in the Midland Valley but not seen in the Southern
Uplands until beyond 120 km and then with high apparent velocity
(6.7 - 6.9 km/sec.) The upper crustal velocity structure in the
Southern Uplands therefore consists of two layers. A thin top
layer (5.0 km/sec.) followed by 5.8 - 6.0 km/sec. material to depths
greater than 10 km - all, presumably, Lower Palaeozoic type rocks.
The top of the 6.4 km/sec layer beneath the Midland Valley slopes down to the south near the S.U. fault at an angle shown around 15° but which may be steeper (Bamford, 1977, personal communications). Apart from this, and contrary to Jacob's interpretation of EKA data, a 6.4 km/sec layer is not recognised under the Southern Uplands.
CHAPTER III

SEISMIC RECORDING

3.1 Seismic Arrays

3.1.1 Introduction

Borg & Bath (1971)\(^{(37)}\) defined a seismic array as "the one which consists of a number of seismometers arranged in a regular geometric pattern, with central recording, and where the signals from the individual sensors show such similarity in wave shape as to permit an ensemble treatment". They stressed on signal similarity where regular geometric pattern and central recording can be dispensed with.

The idea of using seismic arrays originated from the requirement to measure velocities and amplitude absorption more accurately. The time differences and amplitude ratios, upon which these parameters are respectively based, are most precisely measured between stations with identical seismometers and over distances at which signal similarity is retained.

Such comparative studies have been done both regionally and world-wide by using records of independently recording stations. This dates back to the beginning of the application of seismic prospecting techniques where the need for closely spaced seismometers with central recording was obvious.

In the 1930s several investigators suggested triangular arrays for microseismic research. For continuous teleseismic recordings, the
multi-sensor technique was applied during and after World War II by the U.S. Navy for locating and tracking tropical storms by the generated microseisms \(^{(37)}\). Triangular nets of ordinary seismograph stations began to be used during the 1950s for correlation of surface waves \(^{(37,38)}\), particularly after the development of the time-domain phase velocity methods for surface waves by Press \((1956b)^{(39)}\).

The technical possibilities and problems of nuclear tests were discussed in the conference of experts at Geneva in 1958 which resulted in the involvement of seismology for nuclear test detection. This introduced a new era in the field of seismic array techniques. It is from this conference that the term Geneva-type station stems, i.e., array station \(^{(37,40)}\).

A seismic array was installed on Salisbury Plain, in February 1961, to test the effectiveness of a practical array. To test recording, shots were fired at distances of 100 - 200 kms \(^{(41,42)}\). Another array was installed by the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority (U.K.A.E.A.) at Pole Mountain, Wyoming, U.S.A. in December 1961. Recordings were made of the 3.5 kT Gnome nuclear explosion near Carlsbad, New Mexico at a distance of 1000 kms. This array was discontinued in September 1963 \(^{(41,43)}\). Results from these two arrays were encouraging enough to put into practice the idea of establishing larger and more fully instrumented arrays at Eskdalemuir in the United Kingdom and somewhere else. The construction of Eskdalemuir station commenced in the Autumn of 1961 and the array became operational in May 1962 \(^{(43)}\).
In the 1960s many arrays were installed in different parts of the world. Different shapes were considered and tried such as triangular, rectangular, circular, cross (semi-cross), L-shaped, ... etc. An array could be constituted by grouping subarrays as in the case of LASA, near Miles city in Eastern Montana, where the array comprises (21) subarrays of (25) short period vertical seismometers and a three-component set of long period seismometers (44).

Different sizes of arrays were practiced also. "Size", here, refers to the number of the arrays seismometers. This varied from a few up to hundreds of seismometers. The area covered by an array, best referred to seismologically as the "aperture", varied also from few up to hundreds of kilometers.

Signals from different sensors of the array are usually transported into a central recording either by cables or through radio links.

3.1.2 Advantages of Seismic Arrays

The advantages of using seismic arrays can be grouped in the following:

(1) Central recording is convenient as it provides immediate access to all records. This is particularly important for quick preliminary location of all sorts of events.

(2) Small aperture, big sized, arrays provide more details on the variation of the slowness (dT/dA) with epicentral distances. On the other hand large aperture arrays provide the facilities for a clearer understanding of the Earth's structure, particularly the Earth's Crust, over large areas, at least the area covered by the array. Therefore, arrays are useful in the studies of both vertical and lateral inhomogenities.
(3) They are also used to distinguish between natural earthquakes and artificial explosions. They also provide information about azimuths, epicentral distances, origin times and magnitudes of all sorts of events.

(4) Array techniques can be used by Universities and Research Centres, on a temporary basis and with reasonable costs, especially after the development of long-period (long time) multichannel recording equipments. (See Section 3.4).

(5) Arrays proved to be a convenient answer for one of the most awkward problems in seismology, the noise, and for the detection of weak arrivals. A considerable amount of work has been published on this subject. Different techniques have been applied, all of which utilize the simple fact that "by introducing time delays to compensate for the signal propagation time across the array and (summing or multiplying or both) the outputs from each sensor, an improvement in S/N ratio is obtained."

It should be mentioned, however, that rapid advances in computer technology (both analogue and digital) in the last two decades have made possible rapid and also real-time array processing not previously feasible.

3.1.3 Array Data Processing Techniques

Different array data processing techniques have been developed and adapted for different arrays within the last decade or so. All of them aim to improve our ability to extract reliable information from these data and are based upon signal similarity between different
sensors for at least the first cycle or few cycles. This requires careful consideration, especially in dealing with large aperture arrays, since large distances between sensors might introduce certain geological conditions (such as sedimentary layering and/or anisotropic effects) which will make this expectation unlikely. Jansson & Husebye (1968)(45), in their discussion of the application of array data processing techniques to SLASA arrays, reported that if the signal similarity is not maintained over a number of cycles, SLASA arrays cannot be used because errors in station corrections, travel-time curves, etc make it impossible to determine the proper time shifts necessary for the array processing.

Different techniques can be grouped under two headings:

(a) Linear which include frequency filtering and array summation, and has the advantage that no information is destroyed. The most commonly used method of processing the output of a U.K.A.E.A. type array(46) has been described by Birtill & Whiteway (1965)(41). The method is to form linear partial sums from each of the two array lines, multiply these together and average the output with either a square or exponential window for 1 – 2 S. The linear sums preserve the signal waveshape and the correlator output provides an improved S/N ratio. Therefore linear processing is preferred in the case of incoherent noise. Wiechert et al (1967)(47) suggest that background noise is largely incoherent at short periods if the array site is relatively quiet and the spacing between the different sensors is large. Wilson (1967)(40) reported that
in the case of incoherent noise, simple summing of the output of different sensors scattered over an area with dimensions of a few kilometers should increase S/N ratio by \( n \), where \( n \) is the number of seismometers.

(b) Non-Linear methods, such as cross-correlation. These methods are usually used if the noise is coherent, and have the disadvantage of distorting the signal. Nevertheless, non-linear methods have been widely used for the enhancement of S/N ratio in the past fifteen years or so. These methods imply appropriate phasing and attenuating the noise which will be subtracted to produce an enhanced signal. It should be noted, however, that the appropriate phasing varies with the direction of arrival.

An outstanding technique which has been discussed and used by different authors, is known as "Velocity Filtering" or "Frequency-Wavenumber Filtering". (See Savit et al (1958)\(^{(48)}\) and Bath (1974)\(^{(38)}\) pp 265 - 269. This technique is based on the fact that although noise is coherent, it crosses the array with different velocity which is usually less than the velocity of the desired signal.

Muirhead & Datt (1976)\(^{(49)}\) discussed what is known as the non-linear \( N \)th root method, which was suggested earlier by Muirhead (1968a)\(^{(50)}\). The method is based on taking the \( N \)th root of the sensor outputs (with the sign preserved) before phased summing. The authors conducted their numerical experiments on synthetic signals and noise. However, they believed that for event detection, this process is much better at handling non-Gaussian noise and is only very marginally worse
than linear processing when it is Gaussian. For event processing they reported the advantage of suppression of sections of the record where the S/N ratio is low enabling more precise azimuth and slowness measurements to be made.

Iyer (1968)\(^{51}\) concluded that U.K. methods of array processing are seen to be equivalent to simplified Fourier transforms in wave-number space. The technique of multiplying array data by a Fourier operator and integrating is shown to be a simple and effective way of computing frequency wave number spectra of space time signals.

### 3.2 The Eskdalemuir Seismological Station

#### 3.2.1 Introduction

In the year 1959, the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority began a program for detection and identification of nuclear explosions. A Geneva-type station, referred to later as a U.K.A.E.A.-type, was first installed in Salisbury Plain in early 1961, followed by a larger station at Pole Mountain in the same year. Experience from these arrays was sufficiently promising to support the establishment of larger, more fully instrumented arrays at Eskdalemuir, south of Scotland; Yellowknife, Canada; Gauribidanur, India and at Tennent Creek, Australia.

Each array consists of two perpendicular lines of ten vertical component seismometers spaced at 0.896 km in the case of Eskdalemuir and 2.5 km for the others. Full description of sites, station design, instrumentation and operation for these arrays is available in Literature For Eskdalemuir, see Truscott (1964-5)\(^{43}\).
The design of any seismic array will depend mainly on the intended use of that array. Haubrich (1968) described the problem of array design in two steps: (a) the number of seismometers and where they should be placed, and (b) what processing scheme should be applied to the output data.

The choice of a suitable site should be the best compromise between many requirements. First of all the site should be away from all noise sources, good coupling at all seismometer pits should be achieved and the geology of the site should be homogeneous and uncomplicated by major elastic discontinuities. Accessibility and local topography also should be considered. The spacing between different seismometers, their configuration and the aperture of the array are mainly controlled by the sort of events we are interested in, and the background noise of the area of the array.

Truscott (1964-5) reported that the site at Eskdalemuir has been chosen to fulfil the following requirements:—

(1) It should not be closer than:
   a) 10 miles to the sea
   b) 5 miles to any railway line
   c) 1 mile to any "A" class or well-used "B" class roads.

(2) To be free from large numbers of trees or woods; scattered individual trees being acceptable. Rivers and streams must not be near possible pit locations.

(3) Contours to permit siting of pits within ±200 ft (61 m) of a mean level.

(4) Cables to be buried but not necessarily directly routed.
(5) Service facilities of electrical power, telephone and water to be available.

(6) Good access by road to recording laboratory.

3.2.2 General Description of the Array

The array is sited on Llandovery rocks of Silurian age (Lower Palaeozoic), isoclinally folded, highly cleaved and compacted but no metamorphism is evident on the surface. Typical rock types are frits, shales, mudstones, greywackes and conglomerates. When the site was first chosen, most of its land was used for sheep farming. Few years after several private companies and the Forestry Commission have acquired parts of the land which have now become subject to afforestation programs.

The average annual rainfall is 2.54 meters and the terrain has an irregular network of drainage ditches and forestry roads.

The noise at the site has been reported to be relatively low and to vary between 3 and 20 mm for the 1-3 C/S band depending on weather conditions\(^{(41)}\). Truscott (1964-5)\(^{(43)}\) represented the background noise at the site under typical conditions in Fig. (3-1).

The complete installation comprises an array of 20 seismometers, recording laboratory and seismological vault. The array consists of two, almost, straight lines of especially constructed pits excavated down to well consolidated rock, levelled off with a 6-inches thick concrete layer where a cylindrical steel shell,
covered by a fibre glass lid with inverted U-band vents, is planted upright to house the seismometer. Every precaution has been taken to prevent the pits from water drainage.

The two lines intersect at right angles, see Fig. (3-2) and Fig. (3-3), forming a semi-cross with an aperture of about 10 km. There are eleven equidistant pits on each line, spaced about 0.896 km, making a total

![Graph](image)

Fig. (3-1) Eskdalemuir noise probabilities
(band pass $\frac{1}{2}$-3 c.p.s.).
After Truscott (1964-5)(43).
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Fig. (3-2) Eskdalemuir Seismic Array Station.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIT</th>
<th>CARTESIAN COORDINATES (KM)</th>
<th>SEISMOMETER TYPE</th>
<th>ELEVATION (METERS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>305.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>-1.049</td>
<td></td>
<td>274.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>-0.717</td>
<td></td>
<td>313.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>-0.521</td>
<td></td>
<td>312.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td></td>
<td>298.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td></td>
<td>310.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td></td>
<td>337.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td></td>
<td>436.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td></td>
<td>405.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td></td>
<td>398.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td></td>
<td>327.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td></td>
<td>342.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>-1.174</td>
<td></td>
<td>355.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-0.342</td>
<td></td>
<td>349.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td></td>
<td>321.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td></td>
<td>337.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td></td>
<td>306.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>2.983</td>
<td></td>
<td>395.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>3.814</td>
<td></td>
<td>348.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>4.645</td>
<td></td>
<td>419.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>5.477</td>
<td></td>
<td>428.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>6.308</td>
<td></td>
<td>383.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>7.140</td>
<td></td>
<td>350.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-over Point (CP): 55°19'59.48"N 03°09'31.52"W

Grid reference NT 265050

Table (3-1) Cartesian coordinates of different pits with respect to CP - Eskdalemuir Array
length of about 9 km. Pits number (10) on each arm are not instrumented now. Seismometers were removed to pits (11) a few years ago. The two lines were referred to as "RED" for the NW-SE line and "BLUE" for the other. The maximum altitude difference between one pit and the next is (99) meters for the blue and (89) meters for the red. The pit coordinates and elevations are given in table (3-1).

3.2.3 Instrumentation and Recording

Each pit, apart from $R_{10}$ and $B_{10}$, is instrumented with a vertical Willmore Mk II short period seismometer, adjusted to a natural period of one second and damping factor of 0.6, a telemetry sender unit which contains a preamplifier, an amplitude modulated (am) tone modulator, calibration circuits, filters, voltage stabilisers and line driver circuits. A separate unit contains lightning protection circuits. Power for the senders is fed from the station laboratory via the telemetry transmission cables.

In the year 1970, new cables (known as spiral 4) and Mk II am tone system were installed to replace the old multi-cored cables known as the de system and the Mk I system. With the new system, frequency multiplexing is used to transmit two am tones along one cable corresponding to two seismometers' output. For a detailed description of the telemetry systems and their characteristics, see (18).

The recording station is a single storey brick building which contains the main laboratory, battery room, store room, office, ... etc. Electrical power, telephone and water are available. Should power
cuts occur, a standby diesel powered alternator, housed in the
adjacent garage, is automatically brought into operation.

The main recorder is a 24-track EMI TD 516 deck. The 24 tracks are
obtained by using two 12-track record heads with the heads mounted so
that the tracks interlace. One track is used for the station clock
code, two for error correction, one for the strong motion seismometer
(which is situated in the vault) and the remaining twenty for the
array seismometers. Incoming signals are amplified, filtered
(low pars 150/S cut-off) and frequency modulated.

One inch (2.54 cm) width polyester base magnetic tapes, 7200 feet
(2194.5 m) long, are used for recording. Tapes are usually mounted
on 14 inches (35.56 cm) reels. Recording speed is 0.3 in./sec.
(0.762 cm/sec.), giving a recording time of 80 hours. The carrier
frequency is 270 C/S with a peak deviation of 33 3/4%.

The clock-coder in use has been designed and developed at AWRE,
Blacknest. The unit has a fast warm up crystal oscillator which
operates at 5 MHz. It takes only 30 minutes to reach its specified
accuracy of less than ±1 part in 10^9 per °C. The coder generates
a fast code in Vela format. The output from the clock-coder is
recorded in a form which gives 1 sec., 10 sec. and 1 min. markers,
together with a code one per minute which describes the absolute time
in days, hours and minutes.

A correlator system is available at the laboratory and is used to
produce the replay of 8 channels from the short period tape deck
on to a paper chart recorder. The summed output of the 8 channels
with automatic gain correction and also a cross-correlation output is
therefore obtainable for any event of interest.

Tapes are collected and transported monthly to Blacknest to be filed and stored. Processing facilities are available there where detailed analysis of selected events are carried out. Also play-back facilities are available at I.G.S., Edinburgh and elsewhere.

3.3 LOWNET

This is a permanent radio-linked short-period seismometer network operating in the central of Scotland (Midland Valley) and recording on an analogue, 2.54 cm (1 inch) magnetic tape. The network has been partially operating since January 1969 and fully since September of the same year. At present, it consists of seven vertical Willmore Mark II seismometers, placed on high ground with line of sight to the Royal Observatory, Edinburgh, where the recording takes place. A three-component set of seismometers is lodged in the Observatory Vault EDI, see Fig (3-3).

The network is used mainly for (a) time-term refraction studies of the crustal structure in central Scotland, (b) for monitoring the minor seismic activities which have been reported, in the area, as early as the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see Davison (1924)(54) and continuing into the twentieth century, see Dollar (1950)(55) and Crampin and Willmore (1973)(56) and (c) the network could be used as an array of 100 km aperture to determine apparent velocities and azimuths of teleseisms.

Crampin et al (1970)(36) gave a detailed description of LOWNET, equipment, sites and the results of a study of some explosions and
Fig. (3-3) Map of Southern-Central of Scotland showing the three seismic arrays, LONNET, EKA and Broughton.
natural events recorded on the network, see Section (2.4). A computer program "FAMG" is used to determine the epicentre, depth, magnitude and travel time of any event recorded by the network, see Crampin (1970)(57) and Crampin (1973)(58).

3.4 Broughton Seismic Array

3.4.1 Introduction

Results from local events received at EKA, see Chapter II, show an azimuthal shift varying in sign and magnitude and variations in apparent velocity in both direction and distance. Results from EKA close shots, see Chapter I, indicate an azimuthal velocity variation in the vicinity of Eskdalemuir.

Results from an array south of the Southern Uplands Fault, near the town of Biggar, would help to define the following factors:

(1) Seeing wavefronts differently affected by possible anisotropy than those for the same events at EKA, details in Chapter VI.

(2) Studying the apparent velocities from the same sources at different distances and azimuths.

(3) The nearest likely geological factor to EKA is the line of S.U. fault. If the block to the north of the fault had a velocity of 6.0 km/sec. and that to the south a 5.8 km/sec., then 15° ray re-orientation could be expected at critical angle refraction. Apparent re-orientation of this amount occur, however, at nearer normal than parallel incidence. The proposed array will receive as critical angle refractions, from sources to the NE and close to the north side of the fault.
(4) We also hoped to time the blasts at the sources, see Chapter IV, and thus achieve as accurate origin times and locations as possible.

3.4.2 Description of Site and Station Layout

Three sites were considered for the location of a temporary seismic array in the area south of the town of Biggar. The main factors which controlled the search for a suitable site were:

(1) The number of the sensors will be nine vertical, short-period seismometers, arranged on two 5-6 km long perpendicular straight lines, forming either a semi-cross or a T or L-shaped array and preferably with one seismometer common to both lines.

(2) One of the lines is to run parallel to the strike of the rocks in the area (about 40° - 50°).

(3) Recording is to be central where the recording device will be lodged in a well-secured place (base station) and all the other stations will be connected to it by radio, apart from the nearest one, which might be connected by cable. Therefore, a line of sight from every outstation to the base should be achieved.

(4) Height differences between seismometers not to be large.

(5) All seismometers should be on geologically homogeneous rock and coupled to it, away from noise sources, easily accessible and secured against vandalism.

(6) Permission to be permitted by the land-owners for access to their land.

(7) The array will be used mainly to record local events (quarry blasts and natural events) at different distances and azimuths and originating mainly in the Southern Uplands and the
Midland Valley.

The area around Broughton village was found to be the best compromise between all these requirements and was finally selected, see map of Fig. (3-3).

Site Description

The array was sited on greywackes and shales of Ordovician (Upper Llandeilo – Caradoc) age. These rocks form a part of what is geologically known as the Northern Belt of the Southern Uplands, which is made up of thick greywacke successions thinning in a south-easterly direction, and associated with Upper Llandeilo or Caradocian volcanicity, see Walton (1961)\(^{59}\). At outcrop, these rocks are well compacted, steeply dipping (generally SE) and unmetamorphosed. Typical rock types are greywackes, shales, conglomerates, grits, sandstones and limestones.

The altitude of the seismometer pits varied between 259 m and 346.5 m. Most of the ground is used for sheep pasture. There are few trees and little of the land is used for agricultural purposes. The ground is crossed by an irregular network of drainage ditches and little streams which join the River Tweed. All seismometers were kept at considerable distances from drainage ditches and streams to minimise the noise effect. Seismic noise sources are little and the site can be fairly described as "quiet".
Array Layout and Pit Construction

The idea was to install all seismometers on bedrock, preferably on two perpendicular straight lines and with equal spacings between seismometers. Conditions, however, were not favourable since peat and boulder clay sediments were up to a few feet thick in some places. Therefore, some pits were moved from the original proposed sites for the seismometers to be on bedrock and on line of sight with the base station to ensure radio connection.

Nine seismometers were available with eight radio links which allowed the installation of eight seismometers on two, almost straight, lines intersecting at the point with NG coordinates of (313.42/635.32) and making a 90° angle, see Fig. (3-4). These seismometers were connected by radio to the recording base station, which was installed on Dreva Craig Hill. A Post Office Engineers tent was borrowed and used to house the recorder (Geostore). The ninth seismometer was placed, off both lines, at Dreva Craig, some 50 m from the Geostore and connected to it by cable. The lines, referred to as "S" and "N" for parallel and normal to strike respectively, were of lengths of 6.20 km for the first (measured from the cross-over point i.e. 5_s - CP) and 6.10 km for the second i.e. (N_1 - N_4). Maximum spacing and altitude differences between two successive seismometers were 1.77 km and 0.08 km for S-line and 2.87 km and 0.16 km for N-line, in respective order. The location, height and coordinates of each seismometer are given in table (3-2).

Pits were excavated through topsoil down to bedrock, levelled off with cement, 10-20 cm thick. A wall was built around each pit and
Fig. (3-4) Broughton Array - Seismometers locations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coordinates N.G. Lat./Long.</th>
<th>Height (meters)</th>
<th>Bedrock</th>
<th>Seismometer Type</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>Dreva Craig</td>
<td>312.710/635.340</td>
<td>266.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>WMK III</td>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>Base Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>Rachan Hill</td>
<td>311.940/634.100</td>
<td>288.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS-10-2</td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>Wrae Hill</td>
<td>311.140/633.350</td>
<td>261.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>WMK III</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Old Quarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₄</td>
<td>The Rings</td>
<td>309.790/632.200</td>
<td>283.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS-10-2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₅</td>
<td>Glenhighton</td>
<td>308.740/631.300</td>
<td>259.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>WMK III</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₁</td>
<td>Langlaw Hill</td>
<td>310.250/639.130</td>
<td>266.7</td>
<td>Greywacke</td>
<td>WMK III</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Old Quarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>Cloverhill</td>
<td>311.610/637.780</td>
<td>346.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS-10-2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₃</td>
<td>Ruthwell</td>
<td>312.230/636.630</td>
<td>308.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS-10-2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₄</td>
<td>Drumelzier</td>
<td>314.130/634.470</td>
<td>259.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS-10-2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>313.420/635.320</td>
<td>190.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Cross-over-point not instrumented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3-2) Broughton Seismic Array
Seismometers locations, coordinates and heights
wooden boards were used to cover them. Little ditches were dug for water drainage when necessary. Every precaution was taken to protect the seismometers from water, wind and sheep. In some cases, fences were built around the pits. Seismometer N₁ was placed in a concrete slab, built on rock, in an unused quarry. That was the only case where a pit was not excavated. Seismometer N₃ was probably placed on a large boulder. A nearby better (bedrock) site was missed due to snow on the ground when setting up. The depths of different pits varied from 20 - 50 cm. Cables connecting seismometers with transmitters and receivers with the Geostore were always buried.

3.4.3 Instrumentation and Power Supply

Each pit was instrumented by a vertical short-period seismometer, adjusted to a natural period of 1 sec. and connected to an amplifier modulator (amp. mod.) which converts the seismometer's output to a train of pulses and transfers it through a cable into a radio transmitter of a certain frequency which transmits the signal to a radio receiver with the same frequency, installed at the base station and from which the signal is fed through a cable to the recorder. Seismometer (S₁) was connected through amp./mod. to recorder by cable. The equipment involved in the array could be grouped in three categories: detection, amplification and transmission; receiving and recording and maintenance equipment.
Detection, Amplification and Transmission Equipment

(A) Seismometers

Two types of vertical, short-period seismometers were used. Four of them were of WillmoreMk III type and the other five of HS 10 type. Both instruments are adjustable frequency and based on the idea that earth movements will cause relative movements between the casing of the instrument and a suspended permanent magnet mass which will generate an E.M.F. as an output fed to the amp. mod. The output of the W Mk III is greater than 4 V/cm/sec., with sensitivity variation of less than 1% over a temperature range of -40°c to +50°c, using a coil of 16 Kohm resistance. The output of the HS-10 is of the order of 3.73 V/cm/sec. when fitted to a coil of 4000 ohm resistance. For safety reasons, it is recommended that the HS-10 should be carried upside down when transported. W Mk III is supplied with a clamping facility for these reasons and therefore when used it should be unclamped.

(B) Amplifier-Modulator (amp. mod.)

The seismometer's output is directly fed into an amp. mod. where the input is amplified and converted to a series of pulses (frequency modulated signal centred on 676 Hz). This simple audio frequency output signal is not only suitable for transmission by wire or radio, but also for direct recording on magnetic tape. Power can be fed along the same part of wires that carry the output signal. The unit is designed for low power consumption and is packed in a waterproof container.
Two different types of amp. mods. were used at Broughton, known as "prototype and production", having different gain settings to cope with the noise level in the area and the type of seismometer. In our case all amp. mods. were adjusted to a gain of "7" for production type and "3" for prototype (This was the case for both W Mk III and HS-10 seismometers). The amp. mods. outputs were fed through cables, connected direct to the input terminals of the geostore for station "S", and to the input terminals of U.H.F. transmitters for the other outstations. All amp. mods. were covered by plastic bags and housed inside the pits for protection against water.

(C) U.H.F. Transmitters

For each of the eight radio linked outstations, the output from the amp. mod. was connected to the input terminal of a miniature U.H.F. transmitter, housed in a metal can strapped to the aerial mast above ground level or to the antenna. The coaxial output from the transmitter was convected directly to a multi-element Yagi array (antenna). The antenna was fixed on top of the mast and directed towards the corresponding receiver at the base station and in line of sight with it. Different transmitters had different frequencies. In some cases, fences were built round the transmitter for protection against sheep.
Receiving and Recording

(A) U.H.F. Receivers

Radiated signals from transmitters' antennae were received by similar antennae fixed on top of masts over the ground, near the recorder, at the base station. These antennae were directed towards the corresponding transmitters and each convected to a metal can housed receiver arranged in a similar way as the transmitter. Outputs from these receivers were connected by cables to the input terminals of the geostore. Two or three receiver antennae were strapped to one mast to reduce the size of area covered by masts. Power was fed to the receivers from the recorder supply via the same cables carrying the outstations' output.

(B) M.S.F. Radio Receiver

This is a timing device which receives the 60 KHz short wave standard time signal transmitted by the M.S.F. Rugby station, and delivers it to the geostore for referencing the interval encoded time signal. The radio has an accuracy of better than 1 m sec. at 650 km from the transmitter in the presence of moderate background noise. With a pass-band frequency width of 25 c/sec., the radio can work under temperature range of $0^\circ - +45^\circ$C, supplied by a 4.5 volt dry battery and with a consumption of 0.8 mA.

(C) Geostore Field Recorder

This is an analogue recording device, designed for long term collection of frequency modulated seismic data, with very low power consumption and suitable for temporary or permanent seismic networks.
All geostore components are light weight, designed for easy installation, fully protected against the impress of dirt or water and each is easily accessible for routine checks and maintenance. Housed together with a time encoder in a completely waterproof aluminium cabinet, the field recorder unit weighs 23 kgm, measures 52 cm width, 27.5 cm height and 44 cm depth, and uses a 1.27 cm (½ inch) width, 730 m (2400 ft.) length, magnetic tape wound on 10.16 cm (4 inch) diameter spool, which accommodates a total of 14 tracks, 11 of which are used for seismic data, one for time and the other two for flutter compensation to improve the signal to noise ratio. Two seven-track interleaved heads are fitted and either uni or bi-directional recording may be employed. In the second case only five seismic data channels are available and the recording time is doubled.

The recorder accepts, on the seismic channels, only frequency modulated input signal with a centre carrier of 676 Hz and a maximum deviation of 40%. This, however, does not apply to an external standard radio time signal. Recording speeds of 0.05953, 0.11906 and 0.23813 cm/sec. (15/640, 15/320 and 15/160 in/sec.) are provided giving maximum recording time of 680, 340 and 170 hours respectively (bi-directional operation) and half these times for uni-directional. A 37 way socket is provided which, in conjunction with the geostore field test box (see Section 4.3.4) will monitor selected points within the recorder in order to verify correct functioning of the equipment.

A 12 volt power supply is required to operate the equipment,
normally a standard car battery. Another 12 volt battery is required for the outstation supply. Three power supply cables are provided, one for the outstations and two for the recorder supply, as a facility for changing batteries without disturbing recording or time code. The equipment has been designed to keep power supply down to 1.5 W. Input sockets are provided for the eleven data channels. These sockets also send power to the outstations' radio receivers or, for cable links, to the amp. mod.

The time encoder is an integral part of the recorder and provides time code data, an accurate flutter compensation signal, and a capstan servo reference frequency. The timing signals from the encoder are accurate to one part in $10^6$ over the full operating temperature range, and recording is in accordance with "Vela Uniform Code" for one minute time frames. Timing is in days, hours, minutes and seconds which can be read numerically, see Fig. (3-5). The time code generator has a visual display which is enabled by a key switch where push buttons enable the date/time to be updated. Facilities are provided to allow the recording of a broadcast standard radio time signal (via an external receiver e.g. the M.S.F.). This may be done either continuously or once every hour on the hour and for a limited time.

A desiccator is screwed inside the recorder to dry out the air inside the recorder case if the humidity is high when the lid is closed. A routine check on the running of the recorder can be carried out by observing a red light plug connected to the side of the case and without opening the lid.
Time decoded reads:

Year = Zero

Day of year = 16

Hours = 8

Minutes = 1

$P_0 - P_5 = 0.8$ sec. duration = '10 sec. marks'

Position Identifiers.

$R = 0.8$ sec. duration = 'End of frame marks'

Reference

$R$ & $P_0$ denote '1 minute mark'

Binary coded decimal bits = 'One' = $0.5$ sec.

'Zero' = $0.2$ sec.

Unused bits = $0.2$ sec.

Clock rate (Bit rate) = 1PPS

Clock interval = 1 sec.

Time frame interval = 1 min.

Flag bit 'F' denotes abnormal recording format

when value is 'One' (See index count 49)

Fig. (3-5) Vela standard time code for use with Magnetic Tape Recording
At Broughton Array, nine channels were used for seismic data and one channel for standard radio time signal. The recording speed was chosen to be 0.11906 cm/sec. (15/320 in./sec.) giving a maximum recording time of 170 hours and a 16 Hz frequency bandwidth, see Fig (3-6). Standard radio time signal was recorded continuously. The geostore, the M.S.F. radio and the batteries were housed in a Post Office Engineers tent, specially borrowed for this purpose and this proved to be efficient against wind and rain, and the geostore was kept dry and safe during the period of the experiment. All cables connecting the geostore with seismometer "S" and the receivers of the others were buried a few centimeters in the ground.

Power Supply and Cable Connections

Each transmitter was supplied by a 12 volt car battery with maximum capacity of 40 A/H. The amp. mod. was fed by the same battery via the signal cable. Total power consumption, from that battery, was of the order of 0.1 A/H. Two batteries of the same type were used to supply the geostore, the receivers and the amp. mod of seismometer S₁, making a total power consumption of about 0.45 A/H. Although batteries were supposed to supply power for over a week, it was more convenient to charge them weekly. Twenty batteries were used, 10/week.

Army type "D10" cable connections were used to connect amp. mods. with transmitters, receivers with geostore and amp. mod. of seismometer S₁ with geostore.

Fig. (3-7) shows the overall picture of the geostore seismic data.
Fig. (3-6) Geostore Frequency Response – overall system excluding seismometer
Fig. (3.7) Geostore Seismic Data Field Recording System.
field recording system.

**Maintenance Equipment**

Test equipment and tools were essential for routine maintenance and checking the performance of the array. A kit of tools, wires, fuses, tape, a voltmeter and three field test boxes were used throughout the experiment. The field test box is a self-contained and very compact one which can be used as a "short-run" seismograph station, and it may be used to monitor any channel whilst geostore system is in use. Outputs from this box include power for driving the amplifier modulator or radio, test signal for the amp. mod. to confirm its gain accuracy and test signals for setting up radios and the field recorder. Inputs include the seismometers output signals which can be checked on the field test box pen recorder, and the field recorder head currents which can be monitored in both frequency and amplitude on each of the 14 channels.

Checking on functioning of network was carried out weekly as also changing tapes and batteries.

**3.4.4 Array Performance**

The array operated partially with seismometers \( N_1, N_2, N_4, S_4, S_3 \) and \( S_5 \) on 31/1/1977 (16 hr. 46 m. U.T.), and fully on 2/2/1977 (15 hr. 40 m.) and was discontinued on 6/4/1977 (12 hr. 51 m.).

Ten tapes were used successfully for continuous recording during that period. Many seismic events were recorded, ranging from local to teleseisms (only local events were processed). Fig. (4-4) shows a local event recorded at the array. A statistical survey, carried out
on 119 selected events recorded on all the tapes, showed that the average recording of all the channels was 71.7%.

Some faults and breakdowns were experienced in the system throughout the experiment and are summarised as follows:

(A) Geostore

(1) Channel (1) showed to be noisy at the start of the experiment and therefore was not used.
(2) Channel (10) was found faulty on 3/4 and not used thereafter.
(3) Two days' recording was lost due to battery failure (22 - 23 March).

(B) Seismometers

On only one occasion seismometer N1 was found on its side. This was a possible wilful interference.

(C) Amp./Mods.

Occasional high frequency noise was noticed on play-back of seismometer N1. This is believed to have been caused by an amp./mod. fault.

(D) Radio Telemeter Links

Occasional transmission/reception failures occurred and found to have been caused by:

(1) fuse failure (one case) at transmitter N1.
(2) untuned transmitter (one case) at S5.
(3) wet receiver (one case) at N3.
(4) possible high moisture causing intermittent transmission (one
(E) Cables

Damage occurred in only two cases. One was caused possibly by sheep at \( N_1 \) and the other (S4) by strain when at first stretching the cables between the trees at the base station was attempted.
CHAPTER IV

SOURCES, ORIGIN TIME RECORDING AND DATA PROCESSING

4.1 Sources

4.1.1 Introduction

As outlined in the introduction to this thesis (chapter I), our first interest was in local events received at EKA from different azimuths and distances and showing short-period (about 1 sec.) surface waves. Such for such events began through transcribed EKA and LOWNET records filed in the I.G.S. (Edinburgh) and containing different events. These events varied from local to teleseisms. The latter category was ignored. Local events were mainly quarry blasts, special marine shots and LOWNET fixed earth tremors. Play-backs were carried out for more than (70) of these and showed that events of the last category (ie earth tremors) are the only likely ones to show surface waves. Unfortunately, these were only a few.

First P-arrivals of these events were considered next. Results revealed the need for (1) more events at various azimuths and ranges, see chapter (VI). (2) shots to be fired at short ranges in the vicinity of Eskdalemuir array, see chapter (V), and (3) the study of other events, preferably from the same sources, recorded at different location in the Southern Uplands, see Section (3.4) and chapter (VI).

The data used for this thesis are summarised in the following sections. Fig. (4-1) shows the location of all sources, apart from the close
shots which are shown on Fig (5-1). A list of all sources, their locations, origin time and where received, is given in Appendix (1).

4.1.2 EKA Close Shots

These shots were fired in summer 1976, at ranges less than (10) km from the cross-over point of EKA. Chapter (V) has been devoted for this data, its presentation, analyses and interpretation.

4.1.3 Quarry Blasts \((19 \text{ km} \leq \Delta \leq 130 \text{ km})\)

Numerous quarries in the Midland Valley and a few in the Southern Uplands firing heavy \((1,000 \text{ lb} \text{ to over } 10,000 \text{ lb})\) shots provide the main source of data, see references (60) and (61). The regularity of blasting at different quarries varies from several a year to as many each week. Most quarries are required to use time delays in blasting to avoid damage to surrounding buildings. Time delays vary from 0.7 m. sec. to 20 m. sec. Maximum charge per delay varies also from less than \((100 \text{ lb})\) to hundreds of pounds. These blasts are recorded on LOWNET and EKA at ranges of over 100 km if the charge/delay is more than \((300 \text{ lb})\). Epicentres within LOWNET can be fired from its recordings to ± 0.5 km (Neilson (1977) personal communications).

Events from these quarries can be grouped into two batches: the first batch includes all the (pre-February 1977) events received at EKA and fixed by LOWNET. These were about (25) events received from (10) different quarries at distances ranging between 20 km and 126 km from EKA cross-over point and propagation sectors ranging between 90° and 210°, see Fig. (4-2).
The second batch spanned essentially the period during which Broughton array was operating (1st February - 6th April 1977). Through direct communication with the quarry operators, close checking on the location of these blasts was possible. This resulted in (1) the identification of over (60) events from (22) different quarries, giving propagation vector ranges of $90^\circ - 248^\circ$ and $89^\circ - 224^\circ$ and distance ranges of 20 km - 126 km and 19 km - 81.5 km from the cross-over points of EKA and Broughton Array respectively. (18) of these events were timed at (14) different quarries. Figures (4-3/5) show the recordings of a quarry blast (Craig Park Q.) at EKA, Broughton and LOWNET respectively. (2) Some of the LOWNET identifications were found to be wrong. Therefore about (15) events of the first batch were rejected from the analysis.
Fig. (4-4) Broughton record of the above mentioned blast at Craig Park Quarry.
Fig. (4-5) LOWNET record of the same blast of Craig Park Quarry.
4.1.4 Marine Shots \((100 \text{ km} \leq \Delta \leq 340 \text{ km})\)

With the kind permission of I.G.S. (Edinburgh), shots \((22 - 36)\) of SOSP (II) project in the North Channel were made available for my use. Also a few Navy shots, near the Isle of May, and some shots of SOSP (I) project were also permitted. EKA records of these shots were of importance. They enlarged the range of propagation sectors to \(54^\circ - 248^\circ\).

4.1.5 Natural Events \((56 \text{ km} \leq \Delta \leq 165 \text{ km})\)

There is a considerable seismic activity in the Midland Valley, some of which has been associated with the mining activity, see Mashkour (1976)\(^{(4)}\) and references therewith. Tremors are recorded on both EKA and LOWNET where the second is used to determine the epicentres of such events. Accuracy of determination is of the order of \(\pm 0.5 \text{ km}\), providing that the event has been recorded at five sensors, or more, of the network (Neilson (1977) personal communication). About \(15\) (pre-February 1977) EKA records of such events were analysed but the location of more than half of these were doubtful and therefore were rejected.

4.2 Origin Time Recording

As mentioned in the previous section, \(14\) different quarries were visited, during the period when Broughton Array was in operation, attempting to determine the origin times of their blasts.
Timing Device

With the kind cooperation of the Geology Department, Birmingham University, their timing device was available for our use during the period of our experiment at Broughton. The device consists of:

1. An M.S.F. radio, see Section (3-4-3).
2. Seismometer of any type.
3. A mixer box, with variable gain control, which amplifies the seismic signal output and mixes it with the output of the M.S.F. radio. The mixed output is fed and recorded on:
4. An ordinary, one channel, cassette recorder.

To time any blast, the seismometer was planted as near as possible to the centre of the shot pattern, mostly of the order of (10 m) and surrounded by a wall of stones to avoid any possible damage. A (100 m – 150 m) cable connected the seismometer with the recorder box which was generally placed near the shot firer. The instrument was switched on a few minutes before the shot and off a few minutes after.

A difficulty was experienced in timing some blasts, where the M.S.F. time signal disappeared through a background noise of television and/or radio programs. That resulted in the loss of a few timed blasts. This is believed to have been caused by either (1) battery voltage being too low to drive the oscillator gated by the M.S.F. pulses and/or (2) the long cable connecting the seismometer with the box, where the cable might have acted as a receiver. Thereafter, the battery was replaced and a short cable was used. The seismometer
was located about (100 m) from the shot and small corrections were made to the origin times.

All timed blasts, at the quarries, were played back using either the facilities of I.G.S. (Edinburgh), see Section (4.3), or a single channel hot-stylus device at Glasgow University. Timing accuracy was of the order of ± 0.01 sec.

It should be mentioned that the M.S.F. minute markers were not decoded at the time of the experiment. To avoid confusing the timed blast with any near simultaneous event on the seismic tapes, an accurate hand watch was used to time the blast to the nearest minute.

4.3 Data Processing

With the kind permission and cooperation of the U.K.A.E.A., all wanted EKA tapes were transported to Edinburgh for my use and with the kind permission of I.G.S. (Edinburgh), all LOWNET tapes and playback facilities for all types of tapes were accessible. Two playback systems were used, one which handles geostore 1.27 cm (½ inch) Broughton tapes, referred to as Geostore Replay System, and the other handles 2.54 cm (1 inch) EKA and LOWNET tapes and referred to as Analogue Processing System. Both systems, described in detail by Houliston, et al (1976)(62), will be briefly described in this section.

4.3.1 Geostore Replay System

The geostore reproducer comprises a mains operated tape deck and an electronics unit. Two different head assemblies are offered with the tape deck, the choice of which depends on whether uni or bi-directional
recording was employed in the field i.e. providing simultaneous playback of 7 or 14 channels respectively. A subtractive flutter compensation system is used to reduce the base line noise and thereby improve the S/N ratio on all data channels. A monitor switch enables any one channel to be switched independently to a pre-amplifier unit (housed in the rear of the equipment) which automatically adjusts the gain and bandwidth to suit the level and frequency of the signal. This switched gain/bandwidth facility allows reproduction of signals at speeds in the range of $2.38/25$, $4.7625$, $9.525$, $19.05$ and $38.1$ cm/sec. ($15/16$, $3\frac{3}{8}$, $3\frac{3}{4}$, $7\frac{1}{2}$ and $30$ in./sec. respectively). Inserts for the demodulators cards are also available for these speeds. The output may be fed to an ink-jet recorder, computer or any other analysing equipment.

The 16-channel ink-jet recorder provides a visible display of the analogue magnetic tape. A fine jet of ink is directed at a moving paper chart. A galvanometer switch, consisting of a small permanent magnet mounted upon a glass capillary tube, is provided to control the oscillation of the ink-jet. The ink flow is adjustable and controlled by a pump which feeds it to the capillary tube jet via a filter.

This system was used for playing back Broughton Array tapes from which about (120) selected events were reproduced in an analogue form on paper. These events were timed quarry blasts, known untimed quarry blasts, LOWNET fixed natural events and quarry blasts and few special marine shots. The replay speed was selected at $2.38/25$ cm/sec. ($15/16$ in./sec.) corresponding to a speeding factor of (20). The ink-
jet gain was mostly chosen to be at 2.5 volt/cm and found to be more appropriate for small and distant quarry blasts recordings. Paper speed was always selected at 1000 mm/sec. Time channel was reproduced as first and last traces to increase the accuracy of time measurements (± .01 sec.). M.S.F. radio signal was also made on every record.

A few selected events, with possible surface waves, were transcribed on another tape in a digital form using the PDP11/50 computer available in I.G.S. Limitations concerning speeding up factor, frequency limit and a computer maximum capacity of 12,000 samples/sec., limited the number of digitised channels for any events to (6) including the time channel at a digitising rate of 120 samples/sec.

4.3.2 Analogue Processing System

This system was developed to provide processing facilities for seismic network data recorded on 2.54 cm (1 inch) tapes. The system consists of a 24-channel replay unit connected to a programming board to facilitate the interconnections between various instruments, stereo listening for event detection, 24 analogue band pass filters, a 16-channel ink-jet recorder to provide visual playbacks, time decoder to decode and display time channel, two particle motion analysers, an automatic analogue playback control unit and bass-lift circuits for wave velocity response modification.

The unit is capable of replaying 24-track tapes at various speeds 19.05, 38.1 and 76.2 cm/sec. (7.5, 15 and 30 in/sec.) which are 25, 50 and 100 times the recording speed of EKA tapes and 64, 128 and
256 times the recording speed of LOWNET tapes. Two replay heads provide the data for amplification and demodulation, one track per head being used for flutter compensation. The band-pass filters provide optional analogue filtering within the range 0.01 Hz - 100 kHz, with an attenuation slope of 24 db octave. The ink-jet recorder is the same one described in Section (4.3.1).

The replay speed for both EKA and LOWNET tapes was selected at 19.05 cm/sec. (7.5 in/sec.). Filtering was applied within the range 0.1 Hz - 16 Hz for both tape types. Ink-jet gains, mostly used, were 1 volt/cm or 2.5 volt/cm., depending on the size of the event. Paper speed was always selected at 1000 mm/sec. Time channel was always played back at the top and bottom of each record, for more time-measurement accuracy.

When playing-back an EKA tape, the operation was carried out twice to cover all the channels (20 seismic + time channel) since the ink-jet recorder can display only 16 channels at a time.

For the convenience of anyone wishing to reproduce EKA data, the (24) tape tracks correspond to the channels as shown in table (4-1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track Plug Socket on I.G.S. Playback</th>
<th>EKA Tapes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>R4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>R5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>R7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>B7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>R8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>B8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>R9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>B9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>R11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>B11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>TIME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4-1) EKA records - tracks and corresponding channels
CHAPTER V

ESKDALEMUIR ARRAY SHALLOW STRUCTURE

5.1 Introduction

Preliminary analysis of P-waves of about (50) local events and Rayleigh waves of five of these received at Eskdalemuir Array from different azimuths and ranges (some of which were repeated) revealed the existence of an azimuthal anomaly or shift (bearing of direct source to receiver ray — observed) varying in sign and magnitude from one source to another and ranging from (-5° to +15°). In other words, waves travelling from different sources, originating in the Midland Valley, Southern Uplands and off-shore, seemed to have been refracted from their straight line routes to Eskdalemuir.

At that stage, an explanation of the azimuthal anomalies of Rayleigh waves were considered of foremost importance. Their periods varied within the range (0.5 sec. - 1.5 sec.) and therefore required any causative structure to lie within the upper 0-3 km of the earth's surface, anywhere between the sources and Eskdalemuir. On the other hand, P-waves may be affected by deeper structures as their emergent ray angles from the vertical are in the range 40° to 70°.

Azimuth anomalies of seismic waves from array data have been reported by different authors (more details in Chapter VI). Such anomalies have been attributed to different causes such as: non-homogeneous and anisotropic conditions within the wave path; lateral heterogeneity in the media such as dipping planes and/or a complex velocity
structure of some sort immediately beneath the recording station.

An explosion experiment in the vicinity of Eskdalemuir seemed to be a convenient way to study the shallow velocity structure within the Lower Palaeozoic bedrock beneath the array, utilizing P-waves and aiming to:

1. identify any lateral inhomogeneity such as dipping refractors.
2. study the effect of depth on velocity, i.e. significance of layering.
3. and to study the velocities in different directions, i.e. possible anisotropy.

Resources available permitted a pattern of six untimed shots providing enough energy to be detectable across the whole array, i.e. ranges up to about 10 km giving information to depths of about 1 km. Since all seismometers are founded on the steeply dipping Lower Palaeozoic bedrock (shales & greywackes) no effect from superficial deposits (at most a few metres of peat, boulder clay, alluvium, sand or gravel) is anticipated on the apparent velocities measured at over 100 m range. There is no expectation of any other change of rock type within the top kilometre of depth. Velocity changes with depth, therefore, are only to be expected from joint and crack effects. Lateral changes in velocity may be due, in addition, to any contrast between shale and greywacke beds.

5.2 Description of Shot Pattern and Operational Details

Four reversed inline shots were fired on the two arms of the array and two shots in between (see Fig. (5-1)). Distances between shots
Different seismometers varied between 0.1 km and 10.09 km.

Charge sizes averaged around 4 kg/shot, divided into separate units through 0.2, 0.4 or 0.6 kg depending on shot-hole depths and were fired instantaneously. Holes were drilled by hand percussion bore through peat or earth down to 1–2 m or rockhead if shallower than 3 m. Shot patterns were limited to a line or two, with maximum length of about 15 m, parallel to the cable lines (which run roughly in the two arms of the array) and about 10 m off them to avoid any possible damage. For the two off-arm shots, holes were drilled in small circles of about 7 m diameter. Shots were located to ± 0.01 km in relation to the seismometer array, certainly for those on its axes and probably, through compass bearings to features on the 6" map, for the other two.

In the cooperation of the supervisors in the recording laboratory, simultaneous play-back of three shots was carried out using the available play-back facility referred to in Section (3.2.3), to verify the recording and check on the efficiency of these shots.

Analysis & Interpretation

Play-backs were carried out in I.G.S. (Edinburgh), see Section (4.3).

Fig. (5–2) shows the record of shot (6). All shots were received on every sensor of the array. First arrivals (P-waves) were picked from records of the six shots with an accuracy of ± 0.01 sec. Relative arrival times (see Appendix 2) were first plotted against distances in each shot. Origin times were calculated on the assumption that the baseline between the nearest pair of seismometers to the shot projected through the point (0.0). Three of the inline shots were about 0.10 km
from the nearest seismometer, the fourth was about 0.48 km. The nearest seismometers to the off-line shots, 2 & 4, were at 1.66 km and 1.58 km respectively. For the inline shots accuracy of origin time determination is believed to be ± 0.01 sec, which is the difference between the travel times to the nearest seismometer at 4.3 and 3 km/sec. For the other shots accuracy is of the order of ± 0.02 sec.

5.3.1 Vertical Velocity Variation

T-X Graphs/Inline Shots

First inspection of the travel-time-distance graphs of the inline shots suggested that three linear segments could be fitted to each. It should be mentioned, however, that the third segment (with lowest slope) of each curve was fitted to only two or three points at most. Velocities associated with different segments are given on the graphs, see Fig. (5-3 A).

(A) Plus—Minus Method

Utilizing the results obtained from the T-X graphs of Fig. (5-3A) and considering a two-layer model, the plus-minus method has been applied to the reversed inline shots, see Hagedoorn (1959)(63). Results are given in table (5-1) and Fig. (5-4). Commenting on these, the following points should be made:

(1) The refractor velocity under the Blue arm differs significantly from that under the Red (+ 0.36 ± 0.03 km/sec.). The higher velocity is in the direction closer to the local geological strike (20° compared with 70°) (more details later). This difference means that the basic assumptions of this method of
Fig. (5-3): (A) T-X graphs for inline shots, numbers on segments refer to their velocities in (km/sec);
(B) Velocity-Depth functions, dotted lines-4 results, solid lines = WHB integral, dashed lines are Jacobs(31).
### Table 5-1: Results from + method. Last column gives the depth to the refractor under different pits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pit secs.</th>
<th>tA secs.</th>
<th>tB secs.</th>
<th>tAB secs.</th>
<th>( \frac{V_1}{4} )</th>
<th>(-) value ( \frac{tA - tB - tAB}{V_1} )</th>
<th>(+) value ( \frac{tA + tB - tAB}{V_1} )</th>
<th>Depth to refractor (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>-2.245</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>-1.890</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>-1.525</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>-1.173</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>1.610</td>
<td>-0.776</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Red arm, A = shot (5), B = shot (6)

\( V_1 = 4.35 \text{ km/sec.}, V_2 = 4.86 \pm 0.02 \text{ km/sec.} \)

| B4        | 0.277   | 0.919   | 1.196    | -1.751          | 0.087           | 0.350           |                  |
| 5         | 0.466   | 0.740   | 1.206    | -1.383          | 0.097           | 0.390           |                  |
| 6         | 0.637   | 0.560   | 1.197    | -1.032          | 0.088           | 0.360           |                  |
| B7        | 0.824   | 0.402   | 1.226    | -0.687          | 0.117           | 0.470           |                  |

(b) Blue arm: A = shot (1), B = shot (3)

\( V_1 = 4.45 \text{ km/sec.}, V_2 = 5.22 \pm 0.02 \text{ km/sec.} \)
Fig. (5-4) Vertical section along the two arms showing depths to refractor under different pits as calculated through method.
analyses are not met. Refractor depths under one arm cannot, strictly, be compared with those under the other when the velocities differ.

(2) From a reference datum the apparent amplitude of relief on the refractor is 66 m on Red and 58 m on Blue (table 5-2, col. 7) with a maximum apparent slope between adjacent seismometers of 4°. On the Red arm the refractor appears to be slightly deeper near the centre of the reversed spread (R5 & R6). The unreversed off-line ray paths cannot be used to add unambiguously to this pattern.

(3) The most sustained apparent slope on the refractor is shown towards ESE along Red (Re to R6). This is little more than one degree. A dip in this sense would tend to produce both azimuth shifts and apparent velocity differences in the senses observed for arrivals from the northerly quadrants. The maximum azimuth shift i.e. arrival along strike with a 2° dip and a velocity contrast of 0.8 would, however, only be 1-2° compared with 10-15° observed. Similarly the maximum velocity difference would be about 2% compared with 10% observed (allowing for range).

(4) Corbishley (1970)(34) found from teleseisms i.e. arrivals at nearly vertical incidence that time delays between EKA Seismometers correlate with their elevations which is indicative of a surface layer velocity of $2.94 \pm 1.3 \text{ km/sec}$. This is a low figure for the well-compacted rocks on which the seismometers are founded. Lack of original times combined with the wide seismometer spacing exclude the possibility of direct determination of near (tens of metres) surface velocities from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sea Level Datum</th>
<th>Elev. Difference from B4 (ED) (km)</th>
<th>Elevn. Delay (ED/(\nu_1)) secs at 3.0 km/sec</th>
<th>Structure Delay (SD) (km)</th>
<th>Structure Delay Delays (secs) at (V_1 = 4) km/sec (V_2 = 5) km/sec</th>
<th>Structure &amp; Elevn. Delays (secs)</th>
<th>Difference from B4 (secs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R_3)</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>+.023</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.0048</td>
<td>.0108</td>
<td>.0093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>+.039</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.0060</td>
<td>.0160</td>
<td>.0145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>+.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.0066</td>
<td>.0086</td>
<td>.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>+.097</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.0081</td>
<td>.0321</td>
<td>.0306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>+.049</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.0060</td>
<td>.0180</td>
<td>.0165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B_4)</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>+.011</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.0029</td>
<td>.0059</td>
<td>.0044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>+.039</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0100</td>
<td>.0085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>+.034</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>.0346</td>
<td>.0331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Col. (5) - Col. (6) = .024 secs.; Col. (5) - Col. (10) = 0

Table (5-2) Delay times at different pits assuming different velocities for the top layer.
the present measurements. It is found, however, that the algebraic sum of the differences in delays due to using a surface velocity of 4.0 rather than 3.0 km/sec. is cancelled by the additional delays introduced by the structure on the 5.0 km/sec. refractor taking an average figure and for this purpose assuming that depths under Red and Blue can be compared.

At less than vertical incidence and neglecting the effect of refractor dip (delay = \( \Delta h \left( \frac{V_2 - \sqrt{V_2^2 - V_1^2}}{V_1} \right) \)), delays due to variations in top layer thickness will be decreased by up to \( \frac{1}{3} \) (at the critical angle), i.e. in the worst cases (B7 & R6 relative to B4) will lie between +0.036 and 0.024 sec. Assuming critical angle refraction and elevation differences only, calculated apparent velocities, see Jacob (1969)(31) and Appendix (4) differed by up to 0.03 km/sec. from those found by neglecting the elevation effect entirely.

(B) Continuously Increasing Velocity with Depth

The data (Appendix 2 and Fig. (5-3A)) could be considered to represent sample points on smooth T-X curves instead of linearly segmented ones. The slightly greater apparent refractor depths under the middle of the Red arm could reflect the progressively decreasing T-X gradient. In-line shots at different ranges into the array arms would, in principle, resolve this ambiguity. Whilst these are not available, the increase in apparent velocity with range for more distant (20-150 km) sources, see Jacob (1969)(31) and Chapter VI, supports the continuous velocity variation model at
greater depth (3 to 10 km).

The inversion of a suitable T-X graph to yield the implied velocity depth function may be achieved by applying the Wiechert–Herglotz–Bateman (WHB) integral. This may be formulated as:

\[ Z(v) = \frac{1}{V} \int_{0}^{\Delta} \cosh^{-1}(v \cdot \frac{dt}{dx}) \, dx \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots (5-1) \]

Where \( V = \left( \frac{dt}{dx} \right) \) and \( \Delta \), see Grant & West (1965) (6d), p. 139.

The program used here for evaluating this integral is listed in Appendix (3). Input to it requires a series of T-X sample points such that each successive time increment is less than the previous. Such series have been estimated from the in-line data for each array arm, see Appendix (3).

The results (Fig. (5-3B)) appear to indicate:

1. a rapid (1.3 to 1.4 km/sec./km), though slightly decreasing rate of velocity increase over the first 0.7 to 0.9 km.
2. a reduced rate (0.3 km/sec./km) near the limit of depth penetration (0.8 to 1.0 km).
3. a greater velocity under the Blue array arm than under the Red at every depth within the range (+ 0.3 to 0.4 km/sec.).

These velocities, however, appear to be too high when compared with the refractor model. A simpler approach which allows the theoretical travel times to be calculated for comparison with the observations is to find the best value of linear rate of increase in velocity with depth \( \lambda(K) \) for each line taking the appropriate values of \( V_i \) i.e. 4.35 km/sec. for Red and 4.50 km/sec. for Blue. On this basis,
using equation (5-2) K was found to be about 0.8 km/sec./km for both arms.

The velocity-depth curve under EKA derived from the linear relation between apparent velocity and range \((20 \leq \Delta \leq 120 \text{ km})\) extrapolated to zero range shows velocity increasing from 5.54 to 6.0 (or 6.2) km/sec. at a decreasing rate over the depth range 0 to 10 or 12 km, see Jacob (1969)^{(31)} and Fig. (2-6A). This is in general agreement with laboratory measurements on greywackes over a range of pressure (5.4 km/sec. at 0.01 k bar to 6.13 km/sec. at 10 k bar, see Anderson & Liberman (1968)^{(65)}. High initial rates of velocity increase have been found in granitic gneiss (1.0 km/sec./km) in the first 0.3 km, see Smithson & Shive (1975)^{(66)}. These effects are considered to be due to the closure of cracks (joints, bedding, cleavage-fracture) under pressure, see Hall & Al-Haddad (1976)^{(67)}.

The velocity-depth curves derived here appear to join the curve found for greater depths at about 1 km below the surface (slightly greater under Red) (Fig. (5-3B)). The higher velocities under the Blue arm could be due to the orientation pattern of cracks, see Schenk & Schenkova (1974)^{(68)}; thus more frequent cracks may be expected to be parallel with the steeply inclined bedding (strike 20° off Blue) and reduce, relatively, the velocity of paths across them (the Red arm lies at 70° to the strike). At depths over 3 km, however, where velocity increments with pressure become small (Fig. (2-6A)) such an azimuth effect should also be much reduced but see Chapter VI on apparent velocity variation with azimuth).
5.3.2 Azimuthal Velocity Variations

Whilst a T-X plot of all the data points (Fig. (5-5), 6 shots into 20 seismometers) shows a mean velocity of 5 ± 1 km/sec. with a possible 3 to 4 km/sec. top layer between 0 and 0.07 km thick, in-line measurements indicate higher velocities under the Blue than the Red arm. In off-line azimuths the travel times are, in general, known for only a single range along a particular line.

In order to compare them the average linear rate of increase of velocity with depth (K = 0.8) has been used. On this basis the implied zero-depth velocity, Vo, has been calculated for each travel time, T, and range, X, from the equation:

\[ Vo = \left(\frac{K \times X}{2}\right)/ \sinh \left(\frac{TK}{2}\right) \]  

(5-2)

These velocities are plotted against ray azimuth from the geological strike direction (N 50 E - S 50 W) in Fig. (5-6) where some systematic variation becomes apparent when the Red and Blue seismometer points are treated separately and all points from ranges < 1.8 km are omitted. Each set of lines then shows a Vo range approaching 1 km/sec. between a minimum 70/20° and a maximum, best seen on Blue, 10/20 from the strike direction. The Blue set, however, lie about 1 km/sec. above Red representing differences, in the same sense for each shot, in the interpolated cross-over times.

The mean cross-over time difference (Red-Blue) is 0.07 ± 0.005 sec. and the mean Vo difference is (-0.85 ± 0.05 km/sec.). Each difference depends only on relative arrival times at Red and Blue seismometers read from an analogue play-back of both onto the same chart. Errors here should not exceed ± 0.02 sec. and despite rechecking no explanation of the large and systematic difference.
Fitted Line is

\[ Y = 0.02 + 0.20 \times \]

R SQUARED = 0.98

Standard Deviation = 0.06

Corr. Coeff. = 0.99

Fig. (5-5) T-X graph, all close shots.
Fig. (5-6) Velocity Vs. angle between geological strike (N50°E/S50°W) and ray path.

Solid lines = Blue seismometers,
Dashed " = Red "
S1,...,6 = Shot 1,...,6.

Angle between strike and Ray path.
strike (H50°E/350°W) and ray path.
Solid lines = Blue seismic... ";
Dashed " = Red " ;
S1, ..., 6 = Shot 1, ..., 6.

Angle between strike and ray path
Theoretical curve showing the variations in qP velocity for propagation through transversely isotropic olivine scaled to an amplitude of 0.85 km/sec. After Crampin (1976)(82)

Angle between strike and ray path
has been found. The most direct estimate of its value is given by
the time differences on three reversed ray paths involving a Blue
and Red seismometer + 0.123 ± 0.03 (Red-Blue). Estimates of Vo
for one arm and one shot at constant azimuth are:

Shot 1 (Blue 5.03 ± 0.06 km/sec; shot 5 (Red) 4.60 ± 0.06 km/sec
Shot 3 " 4.89 ± 0.06 km/sec; shot 6 " 4.59 ± 0.06 km/sec
Mean = 4.96 ± 0.06 km/sec; Mean = 4.595 ± .6 km/sec

On reading the above, Dr. B. Jacob suggested that a misalignment of
the tape heads on the I.G.S. (Edinburgh) playback system could have
produced such a time difference. New analogue playbacks, provided
by Dr. Thirlaway, from the original tapes at M.O.D., Blacknest have,
in fact, confirmed this. For the fire shots (2, 3, 4, 5 & 6) of
7 September, the first arrivals for red on these new playbacks were
found to average 0.05 sec. earlier, relative to Blue, than on the
original playbacks. Relative to each other, arrival times on Red
had not changed. The same applies to Blue. Since for shots 1, 3,
5 & 6 the origin times were estimated relative to either Blue (1 & 3)
or Red (5 & 6) times, there has been no need to change the travel
times used in Section 5.3.1. Similarly on Fig. (5-6) the in-line
Vo values for these shots are unaffected. The ranges for each of
these 4 sets of points are an indication of the uncertainties
applicable to individual off-line points. For the off-line
seismometer travel times, however, those from shots 1 & 3 into Red
have been shortened by 0.05 sec. and those from shots 5 & 6 into Blue
lengthened by 0.05 sec. in producing Fig. (5-6A). For shots 2 & 4,
off-line with respect to both Red and Blue, the travel times have
been shortened and lengthened by 0.025 sec. into Red and Blue
respectively in the calculations of Vo for Fig. (5-6A).
To read travel times from Appendix (2), the origin times have now been taken as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>13hr 06' 28.05&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>11hr 20' 02.45&quot; + 0.025&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>13hr 48' 40.82&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>15hr 34' 45.10&quot; - 0.025&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>17hr 24' 45.70&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>19hr 21' 46.75&quot; - 0.05&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions to be drawn from this analysis, Fig. (5-6A) are:

1. Calculated as Vo, from eqn (5-2), where $K = 0.8$ km/sec/km, the velocity varies systematically with azimuth from a maximum around 5.1 km/sec parallel with the geological strike to a minimum around 4.4 km/sec normal to the strike. Towards the maximum range, where its effect is most, changing $K$ by $\pm 0.1$, affects $Vo$ by not more than $\pm 0.03$ km/sec so that this conclusion is not particularly sensitive to the rate of increase of velocity with depth, in fact, it is apparent in the uncorrected travel times ($K = 0$).

2. An average variation derived as points at $10^\circ$ azimuth intervals from averages of all the calculated points in those intervals is shown on Fig. (5-6B) in comparison with the theoretical variation in velocity for a transversity isotropic material (see Crampin (1976)\(^{82}\), Fig. (2) for olivine parallel to (001) with the b & c axes randomly orientated) scaled to the same amplitude (85).

3. Anisotropy of this amount would produce wave front shifts up to $10^\circ$ from the normals to ray paths in the sense shown on Fig. (6-3). The theoretical estimation of these shifts is based on the relationship given on page 106 which compares closely with that given by Crampin (1977)\(^{83}\), Fig. (3) for the variation in angle ($\phi_1$) between group velocity and propagation vector with propagation vector for qP in anisotropic material.

4. The problem which arose because of the time difference between Red and Blue cross-over times have been explained by a misalignment of the heads of the replay system. Correction for this has not changed the data or conclusions about velocity variation with depth of Section (5.3.1) as these were based on time differences along either the Red or Blue arms.
CHAPTER VI

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

ALL LOCAL EVENTS

EKA, BROUGHTON & LOWNET

6.1 Introduction

First P-arrivals of most local events, see map of Fig. (4-1), Appendix (1) and Chapter IV, were picked with an accuracy of ± 0.01 sec. and less than that for weak arrivals. Travel times and average velocities were calculated for all timed shots. A computer program "CLOSE", see Appendix (4), designed to handle array data and makes allowance for the curvature of the wavefront and the altitude variation between the seismometers, has been used to calculate the apparent velocities and angles of approach (with accuracies of ± 0.002 km/sec. and ± 0.3° respectively) for all local events received at Broughton and EKA.

Since most of the sources lie within the distance ranges 20 km ≤ Δ ≤ 126.85 km and 20 km ≤ Δ ≤ 90 km from EKA and Broughton respectively, it is anticipated from previous work (table 6-1) that first arrivals at both arrays will be either Pg or P* except for a few possible Pn from over 130 km.

It should be mentioned that for these events linearly interpolated cross-over times from the Red and Blue arms agree to within the expected reading error, but that from Red is systematically later by up to 0.02 sec.

The results for each array (apparent velocities (Va), azimuth shifts (Δθ)) are first considered separately. Travel times to both arrays and some LOWNET stations are considered together in a following section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Southern Uplands</th>
<th>Midland Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Velocity(km/sec)</td>
<td>Range(km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg</td>
<td>5.8-6.0</td>
<td>20-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P*</td>
<td>6.7-6.9</td>
<td>80-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pn</td>
<td>7.9-8.1</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6-1) Seismic crustal phases - their expected velocities and ranges at Broughton and EKA as seen from previous work, see references 21, 26 and 31.

6.2 EKA

6.2.1 Va Against Distance (Δ) and Azimuth (θ)

Apparent velocities, calculated by the program "CLOSE", for 62 events from 41 different source locations are plotted against distance in Fig. (6-1). More than one event has been recorded from 11 of these sources (linked points in Fig. (6-1)). These repetitions indicate an average standard deviation of about 0.06 km/sec. but may be twice that figure at low signal/noise ratios. With the exception of the natural events and a few marine shots (for which only a general location is known) distance errors are negligible. A linear regression through all the points suggests Va increases at 0.01 km/sec/km. The correlation coefficient (0.43) and standard deviation 0.4 km/sec in conjunction with the expected errors (< 0.12 km/sec.) indicate that Va varies at least as much due to other factors as it
Fig. (6-1) Apparent velocity against distance for 62 events received at EKA. Repeats are linked and/or circled.

Southern Uplands source received at Broughton, see Section (6.3.1)

Regression line is
\[ V_a = 5.53 + 0.01 \Delta \]
Corr. Coeff. = 0.43
S.D. = 0.40

95% confidence lines
does proportionally to distance. On a similar plot using different events but probably a few of the same sources, Jacob\(^{(31)}\) recognised slow (5.5 - 6.0 km/sec.) and fast (6.44 km/sec. average) groups of 30 and 41 events respectively, with none in the 6.0 - 6.2 km/sec. interval, and fitted regression lines to each separately. Ten of the points on Fig (6-1), however, lie in this interval. Since the distance ranges of Jacob's fast and slow groups overlap it is no longer clear how to justify this separation. If the upper limit of the slow group is raised from 6.0 to 6.2 km/sec., a regression line through those points on Fig. (6-1) below that limit is, in fact, very close to that for Jacob's slow group but the correlation coefficient is not improved by comparison with taking all the events together and is considerably lower than that obtained by Jacob for the narrower velocity interval (0.43 compared with 0.78). It is concluded that more than half the variation in Va is still due to other factors than distance.

Despite the overlap in distance ranges between the fast and slow groups, where all are considered as first arrivals, Jacob proposed a model consisting of an increase in velocity with depth (5.5 to 6.0 km/sec.) to 12 km followed by a refractor having a velocity near the fast group average (6.4 km/sec.). To explain that the fast group sources approach closer to EKA along a NE-SW axis than a NW-SE one, he suggested that the refractor depth decreased with distance from EKA along the 'fast' axis and increased along the 'slow' one. Although the LISPB interpretation of a 6.4 km/sec. refractor limited to the Midland Valley at 7 km depth does not support this aspect of Jacob's model, the relationship on which it
was based is confirmed by the additional data reported here. In Fig. (6-2) a linear regression is drawn between apparent velocity and a function of azimuth i.e. the sine of the angle between arrival azimuth and a reference axis (140°/320°) which is approximately the normal to the trend of the Southern Uplands Fault and the Lower Palaeozoic structure. The correlation coefficient is 0.43 and the standard deviation 0.35 km/sec. The tendency for \( V_a \) to increase with range at constant azimuth can also be seen on this diagram.

In this analysis events have only been limited to exclude those with \( V_a > 6.9 \) km/sec., i.e. \( P_n \gg 6.9 \) km/sec., see table (6-1). A few events from Jacob's paper for which the source azimuths could be identified have been included because they lie in otherwise unrepresented southerly quadrants i.e. they support the radial symmetry of the relationships. The azimuth of the LISPB line is shown on Fig. (6-2) and it appears in this orientation that \( 5.8 \) km/sec. \( \leq V_a \leq 6.1 \) km/sec. i.e. the range of velocities which the LISPB interpretation assigns to the first 12 km under the Southern Uplands is restricted because of the orientation of the measurements.

6.2.2 Azimuthal Anomalies (\( \Delta \theta \))

As mentioned earlier, in Section (5.1), it was found that waves travelling to EKA from different sources show azimuthal anomalies varying in sign and magnitude, where

Azimuth anomaly (shift) = (Direct - Calculated Propagation Vector)

Fig. (6-3) shows the relation between these anomalies and the direct
Fig. (6-2) Apparent Velocity against \( \sin \alpha \), where \( \alpha \) is angle between the propagation vector and the normal to the strike (140°/320°).

Regression line is \( V_a = 5.77 + 0.51 \sin \alpha \), Corr. Coeff. = 0.43, S.D. = 0.35, \( \circ \) Points from Jacob's' data, \( \triangle \) Southern Uplands source received at Broughton Array.
Fig. (6-3) Azimuth anomaly against propagation vector for all EKA local events.
propagation vector (P.V.) as measured at the cross-over point of EKA, for all local events i.e. including all possible first-arrival phases, \( P'_e \), \( P^* \) & \( P_n \). It seems appropriate to include here rays from any depth, i.e. including \( P_n \), since any azimuth anomalies they show may be produced by the velocity structure in a depth range common to them all.

The principal features of these observed anomalies are as follows:

1. Seismic rays travelling at propagation vectors lying in the ranges \( 120^\circ - 140^\circ \) and \( 220^\circ - 240^\circ \) are not deflected, i.e. approximately normal and parallel to the geological strike.

2. All rays with a propagation vector between about \( 130^\circ - 230^\circ \) seem to be deflected anti-clockwise. Deflection (shift) seems to increase systematically from \( 0^\circ \) at about \( 130^\circ \) (P.V.) into a maximum of about \( 11^\circ \) somewhere around \( 180^\circ \) (P.V.) and decreases afterwards.

3. Rays travelling at propagation vectors less than \( 120^\circ \) seem to be deflected clockwise. Deflection (shift) increases as propagation vector decreases, giving a maximum of \( -10^\circ \) at about \( 55^\circ \) (P.V.). Lack of data beyond that point makes the prediction of the state of the anomaly unresolved. On the other hand, the few points beyond \( 230^\circ \) indicate a clockwise shift.

Azimuthal anomalies of different seismic waves have been observed, discussed and interpreted by different authors.

Otsuka (1966a) observed azimuthal anomalies of some teleseisms recorded at the University of California network. These were found
to be cyclic functions of the direction of the source and with amplitude of 10°. The author(70) discussed error sources and concluded that these anomalies cannot be attributed to measurement errors. In a following publication, Otsuka (1966b)(71) reported that the structural feature which is primarily responsible for these anomalies is located in the upper mantle within a depth of about 100 km. To account for these anomalies, the author(71) suggested a moderately dipping Moho underlain by a second deeper interface with a velocity decrease downward and with a steep dip towards the Ocean.

Niazi (1966)(72) reported that when a layer is overlying a half-space with a tilted interface, the refraction of seismic waves, from the half-space, generally results in their re-orientation away from the vertical plane of incidence with the following consequences:-

(1) The angle of emergence at the free surface will become azimuth dependent.

(2) The apparent direction of approach will be different from the true azimuth. The azimuthal variation also varies with azimuth.

The author(72) gave a mathematical formulation for the computation of apparent azimuth and the angle of incidence at the free surface and tabulated some numerical corrections to the observed apparent azimuth for a number of combinations of various dip angles and velocity contrasts.
Bolt & Nuttli (1966) studied P-wave delay times at 12 California stations relative to Berkeley as functions of azimuth and computed best-fit sinusoids. In a later publication Nuttli & Bolt (1969) concluded that variations in the depths to the top and bottom of the mantle low-velocity layer can account for the observed azimuthal anomalies.

Brown, Borg & Bath (1969) studied apparent velocities in different azimuths and proposed a possible method of calculating true strike and dip of crustal boundaries. They developed a theory, partly for a sloping Moho only and partly for sloping Conrad and Moho with parallel strikes. They applied the theory to some observed P$_n$-arrivals and calculated the strike and dip of the Moho. They also concluded that if a sufficient number of P$_n$ arrivals can be observed, it would be possible to determine the strike and dip of the Conrad.

Ellis & Basham (1968) reported azimuthal shifts as high as 18° from teleseisms recorded at four seismic stations in Central Alberta. They utilized Niazi's approach to conclude that a (15° - 20°) dipping plane could explain such shifts.

From his studies of slowness and azimuth at the Uppsala Array, Brown (1973 a & b) reported that near-surface lateral inhomogeneity was found from azimuth deviations to be small and equivalent to less than 3° dip on the Moho. He pointed out that to study the near-surface structure, azimuth is a better sounding parameter than slowness. In another publication, Brown (1973 c) fitted sine curves to the travel time residuals of P-waves, from
teleseisms recorded at 13 Fennoscandian stations, with back azimuths as the independent variable. The result showed a clear regional trend towards apparently early arrivals from the north relative to those from the south. Ultimately the author\(^{(79)}\) proposed two possible solutions

1. systematic epicentral mislocation
2. lateral inhomogeneity in P-velocity structure of the Fennoscandian crust and/or uppermost mantle.

In respect of EKA, however, since:

1. for arrivals from \(20 \leq \Delta \leq 150\) km i.e. approximately equivalent to depth penetrations ranging from 2 to 25 km, a consistent azimuth anomaly pattern is discernable (Fig. (6-3)),
2. for arrivals in the velocity range \(5.4 \leq v_a \leq 6.9\) km/sec, \(v_a\) tends to a maximum (6.28 km/sec.) along strikes and a minimum (5.71 km/sec.) normal to it i.e. a ratio of 0.92 which, in so far as data are available, appears to apply to all quadrants,
3. for the close shot travel times a similar directional velocity variation (5.4 to 4.8 km/sec. as \(v_0\) on Blue (Fig. (5-6)) with a ratio of 0.88 km/sec.,

it seems likely and most economical of hypotheses to suggest that the azimuthal variation in propagation velocity (anisotropy) within the rocks under and around the array inferred from the close shot data is also responsible for the effects described on arrivals from more distant sources.

If it is considered that at any depth, \(Z\), within these rocks that
the velocity, \( v_p \), in the vertical plane (YZ) of the bedding is constant and greater than the velocity, \( v_N \), normal to the bedding, then the seismic wavefronts should be considered as oblate spheroids rather than spheres. Then the azimuth, \( \Phi \), of the normal to the tangent plane at a point \((x, y, z)\) on a wavefront surface is \( \arctan \left( \frac{v_N^2}{v_P} \right) \) whereas that of the ray to the origin (source), \( \Phi' \), is \( \arctan \left( \frac{y}{x} \right) \). Their difference \( (\Phi' - \Phi) \) is then the apparent deflection or shift in the propagation vector. Under these assumptions these angles are independent of the vertical angle of approach. The shift, always towards the slow direction, would be up to \( 10^\circ \) for \( \frac{v_N}{v_P} = 0.85 \). The assumed linear relationships between \( v_a \) and \( \Delta \), see Fig. (6-1), and \( v_a \) and \( \sin (\alpha) \), see Fig. (6-2) are likely to be biased because not all azimuths are represented at all ranges. Such effects may be reduced if the \( v_a \) values are corrected for known variations in \( v_0 \), see Fig. (5-6), according to the relation:

\[
\sin(e) = \frac{v_0}{v_a} = \frac{V_0}{V_a}
\]

Where \( e \) is the angle of emergence of a ray path. Taking \( v_0 \) values from the Blue data shifted to a mean position between the Red and Blue points of Fig. (5-6), \( 4.4 \leq v_0 \leq 5.0 \text{ km/sec.} \) a set of \( v_a \) values have been calculated for a mean \( (\bar{v}_0) \) value of \( 4.7 \text{ km/sec.} \). For this purpose some of the events on Fig. (6-1) have been omitted. These are from sources over 50 km beyond the Southern Uplands Fault into the Midland Valley measured along their azimuths from EKA where the minimum time paths are likely to involve the 6.4 km/sec. basement (LISP). One value from a nearer source (Duntilland, distance = 72 km) has been discarded as it is too low compared with two others from nearby and even compared with two from 20 km. Five of Jacob's
events from the south and one at short range from the west have been included on the Figure (6-3A). In fitting a regression line the two short range sources (< 20 km) have been excluded from the calculation. Its slope is now much less than in Fig. (6-1) and suggest a very slow rate of increase of velocity with depth (< 0.0030 km/sec./km) affecting ranges from 35 km out to 150 km.

The initial rate of velocity increase with depth (0.8 km/sec./km), see Chapter V, could be maintained to a depth of about 1.6 km before reaching the 6.0 km/sec. value indicated at a range of 40 km, see Fig. (6-3A). The two arrivals from sources at about 20 km should then, but do not, reach this velocity.

It is, however, proposed that the apparent velocity with range variation into EKA taking azimuth into account is represented by Fig. (6-3A). If this is true, the seismic problem of recognising the presence or absence of a 6.4 km/sec. Midland Valley type basement under the Southern Uplands is not only difficult across strike (LISPB) but impossible along strike where such velocities are achieved within the Lower Palaeozoic.
Fig. (6-3A) Apparent velocities corrected for azimuth effect against distance - EKA
6.3 **Broughton Array**

6.3.1 **Apparent Velocity** \(V_a\) **against Distance** \(\Delta\)

Thirty events from 20 different sources are plotted in Fig. (6-4). The nine events which repeat a source (linked points) indicate a standard deviation of 0.08 km/sec. A least squares fit through all the points (Line 2) has a correlation coefficient of 0.79. The three abnormally low \(V_a\) values are for the only events originating within the Southern Uplands. Omitting these improves the correlation coefficient to (0.90) and shows \(V_a\) increasing at 0.024 km/sec./km from a projected 5.59 km/sec. at zero distance (Line 3). The standard deviation (0.1 km/sec.) is similar to that expected from repetitions of a source. The three events from the Southern Uplands (Line 1) suggest a parallel trend about 1 km/sec. slower. Plotted on Fig. (6-1) these three points are not as anomalous as they are on Fig. (6-4).

6.3.2 **Apparent Velocity** \(V_a\) **against Propagation Vector** \(\theta\)

Taking all the points together, see Fig. (6-5), there is little apparent systematic variation. For the Southern Uplands' trio, that parallel with the strike has the highest \(V_a\) with the other two symmetrically disposed about it. Plotted on Fig. (6-2) these three points again are not anomalous.

Dividing those from the Midland Valley side of the array about the critical distance (50 km, see table (6-1)) suggests a possible minimum \(V_a\) normal to the strike for the longer range but not for the shorter range group.
Line (1) S. Uplands sources
(2) All sources
(3) M. Valley

$V_a = 5.59 + 0.024$
Corrected Coeff. = 0.97
S.D. = 0.1

$V_a = 5.53 + 0.02$
Correct Coeff. = 0.79
S.D. = 0.1

$V_a = 5.08 + 0.02$
Correct Coeff. = 0.97
S.D. = 0.1

Fig. 6-4 Apparent velocity against distance for 30 local events received at Broughton Array.
Fig. (6-5) Apparent velocity against propagation vector for events received at Broughton Array.
6.3.3 Azimuth Anomalies

Fig. (6-6) shows the relation between azimuth anomalies (as defined in Section (6.2.4)) and the propagation vector. One of the two most anomalous events is a Southern Uplands source and the other is a non-repeated 78.4 km distance quarry (Hillhouse). Taking all the points, there is no systematic anomaly change. Plotting the three Southern Uplands sources on Fig. (6-3), they seem to fit the Eskdalemuir pattern.

6.3.4 Conclusions and Comparison with EKA

When the apparent velocities measured at Broughton from Midland Valley sources are plotted over the lines representing the upper (parallel to strike, P) and lower (perpendicular to strike, N) velocity limits measured at EKA, see Fig. (6-7), it is clear that out to a range of 37 km, Broughton values lie within these limits. It is considered particularly significant that they lie very close to the parallel to strike value line at EKA. At EKA this direction lies in the plane of the essentially vertical bedding. Since the Lower Palaeozoic strata of the Midland Valley inliers are much less deformed than in the Southern Uplands, it is possible that the seismic waves from the north travel to Broughton also essentially in the plane of this bedding. At the same time this proposal explains the absence of azimuth anomaly at Broughton if this is to be associated with anisotropy along and across the bedding.

From 40 - 80 km range, arrivals from the Midland Valley into Broughton have, without exception, higher apparent velocities than the fast limit into EKA from similar ranges. The alignment of the Broughton
Azimuth anomaly (°)

Fig. (6-6) Azimuth anomaly against propagation vector for 30 events received at Broughton
Fig. (6-7) Apparent velocities at Broughton compared with EKA velocities along strike and normal to it
events, Fig. (6-4) is probably fortuitous. The arrivals from
$\Delta \leq 40 \text{ km}$ are better considered as refractions from a higher velocity
basement ($6.4 \text{ km/sec. at } 7 - 8 \text{ km under the LISPB line}$) for which the
critical distance is about right, see table (6-1). The apparent
velocity values are, however, higher than expected from LISPB. As
pointed out previously, the across strike orientation of the LISPB
line in the Southern Uplands leads to velocities compatible with those
deduced from the EKA measurements in that direction. As seen by
LISPB the same velocity range ($5.8 - 6.0 \text{ km/sec.}$), is found under the
Midland Valley where it is again associated with Lower Palaeozoic rocks.
At Broughton, however, velocities in this layer may range up to
$6.3 \text{ km/sec.}$ and the underlying basement velocities exceed $6.4 \text{ km/sec.}$
These problems seem less severe than those which would be faced in
accepting the high continuous rate of velocity increase with depth
implied by the line on Fig. (6-4).

Dipping Interface(s) under Broughton Array

As an alternative, the rather high apparent velocities of waves
received at Broughton Array from the Midland Valley side could have
been magnified by approaching the array up-dip from the north.
Considering an average solution where the 27 events of line 3,
Fig. (6-4) are sub-divided into two groups, the first group
includes 14 events at $\Delta \leq 40 \text{ km}$, rays for which are unlikely to
have reached the $6.4 \text{ km/sec}$ basement. These have an average $V_a$
of $6.32 \pm 0.13 \text{ km/sec}$ with a mean propagation vector of $162^\circ \pm 36^\circ$.
The second group consists of 13 events at $\Delta > 40 \text{ km}$ with an average
$V_a$ of $6.92 \pm 0.4 \text{ km/sec}$ and a mean propagation vector of $143^\circ \pm 34^\circ$. 
The indications of dipping plane effect are: (1) magnitude of \( V_a \)

(2) Azimuth shifts, shown on Fig. (6-6), is in reverse sense from EKA.

From the geological and seismic points of view, a dipping velocity structure in the vicinity of Broughton could be one of the following possibilities:-

(1) Relatively shallow boundary within the Lower Palaeozoic on which the array is situated with a velocity contrast base of "weathered" or fractured layer, cf. results of EKA close shots but with a dip towards the north.

(2) Upper Palaeozoic/Lower Palaeozoic discontinuity to the north of Southern Upland Fault around Biggar where the L.O.R.S. is seen at the outcrop. Such a discontinuity is unlikely to be deeper than 1 km.

(3) Lower Palaeozoic/6.4 km/sec basement which is known to be at a depth of about 7-8 km.

If we consider a ray coming up from a refractor with velocity \( V_n \) (either 5.8 km/sec or 6.4 km/sec) through a refractor dipping with an angle \( \theta \) and separating between two media with velocities \( V_o \) at the top and \( V_1 \) at the bottom then it can be easily shown that:

\[
\tan(\theta) = \frac{V_o V_1/V_n - V_o V_1/V_a}{V_o \sqrt{V_n^2 - V_1^2} - V_1 \sqrt{V_a^2 - V_o^2}}
\]

Now if the first group arrive from the Lower Palaeozoic (5.8 km/sec) and the second group from the 6.4 km/sec basement, then a dipping interface towards \( \frac{162^\circ + 143^\circ + 180^\circ}{2} = 332^\circ \) which will provide the \( V_a \) values, will have \( V_o \) & \( V_1 \) which satisfy

\[
\tan(\theta) = \frac{V_o V_1/6.32 - V_o V_1/5.8}{V_o V_1/6.32 - V_1 \sqrt{6.32^2 - V_o^2} - V_1 \sqrt{6.32^2 - V_1^2}} = \frac{V_o V_1/6.92 - V_o V_1/6.4}{V_1 \sqrt{6.92^2 - V_o^2} - V_1 \sqrt{6.92^2 - V_1^2}}
\]

which leads to a set of values of \( V_o \) & \( V_1 \). The maximum value of \( V_o \)
is 2.9 km/sec which leads to $V_1 = 4.3$ km/sec, $i_c = 42.5^\circ$ and $\theta = 5^\circ$. Such a refractor will have a depth less than 1 km in 10 km along dip.

Considering individual events from the first group, for example, Tams Loup is about 10$^\circ$ off true dip direction with $V_a = 6.4$ km/sec. This requires $V_n$ to be about 6.0 km/sec to maintain a dip of about 5$^\circ$. For Middleton which is about 75$^\circ$ off true dip direction, its 6.38 km/sec observed velocity requires also a 5$^\circ$ dip along its direction. It was found that, for this group, to satisfy equation A this requires (1) $V_n$ is about 6.0 km/sec. (2) the dip of 5$^\circ$ of this shallow refractor to be maintained through the range of azimuths they span.

For the second group, i.e. arrivals from a refractor with $V_n = 6.4$ km/sec, those $V_a's > 6.52$ km/sec require a dip of not less than 5$^\circ$ with the specified $V_0$ & $V_1$. Since some of the strong events associate $V_a > 7.0$ km/sec with azimuths up to 60$^\circ$ from true up dip direction (e.g. Hillhouse), this group also require a deeper interface (6.4 km/sec) with radiating dip in addition to the shallow one.

Therefore a model could be a choice of one or a combination of two of the following:

1. Higher Lower Palaeozoic velocity than 5.2-6.0 km/sec.
2. Higher basement velocity than 6.4 km/sec.
3. Shallow dipping plane.
4. Deeper dipping plane.

Until future work shows that shallow dipping plane exists or not or higher $V_n$ values exist or not, the structure, as seen from this data, remains a choice between the above possibilities.
General Conclusion

Whilst the general proposition that the high average apparent velocities at Broughton may be due to a structural model involving true velocities consistent with LISPB/LOWNET is reasonable, there are complexities beyond a single dipping plane structure when the apparent velocities and azimuths of individual events are considered, i.e. almost certainly radiating dips and less certainly both a shallow and a deep interface.

With the present data such a model is, perhaps, to be preferred to one involving such high true velocities as Lower Palaeozoic $V_a$ of 6.3 km/sec and basement $V_a$ of 6.9 km/sec. The simplest way to choose between these alternatives would be a shallow refraction survey at the site of the Broughton Array.

6.4. Travel Times (EKA, Broughton & LOWNET)

Some preliminary calculations for simple models, in particular those describing velocity structure as continuous linear rates of velocity increase with depth have been made using the following equations

$$K = \frac{2}{X} \sqrt{V_a^2 - V_o^2}$$
$$& T = \frac{2}{K} \sin^{-1} \left( \frac{XX}{2V_o} \right)$$

Where $K$ is the velocity rate of increase in km/sec/km, $V_o$ is the velocity, at the surface (zero depth), $V_a$ is the apparent velocity, $X$ is the horizontal distance and $T$ is the travel time.

Assuming a mean surface velocity of 5.0 km/sec., $K$ was calculated for each of 12 timed events recorded at EKA and from this their
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event's Name</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>Apparent Velocity (km/sec)</th>
<th>Observed Tr. Time (sec)</th>
<th>Calctd. Tr. Time (sec)</th>
<th>Obs.-Calc (sec)</th>
<th>K (km/sec/km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td>66.83</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillhouse</td>
<td>96.11</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>+0.26</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boards Farm</td>
<td>93.31</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clogburn</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tams Loup</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>+0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaimes</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>+0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglassmuur</td>
<td>101.72</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrayshall</td>
<td>99.63</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>+0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collace</td>
<td>126.85</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loanhead</td>
<td>103.23</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>94.21</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6-2) Observed and theoretical travel times as calculated through a model with continuous linear increase of velocity with depth for timed events received at EKA.

Travel times which show an average difference from the observed times of -0.09 sec., see table (6-2). The time differences between an assumed linear increase and Jacob's non-linear function over his given velocity range 5.54 - 6.0 km/sec for the top 12 km are only a few hundredth's of a second.
The timed events for which Figs. (6-3A) and (6-7) are supposed to apply cover a limited range of azimuths around the slow direction (108° - 188° (P.V.)). The low velocity gradient below a depth of 1.6 km suggests that travel times should match the apparent velocity of the refractor allowing for azimuth and delays in the top 1.6 km (0.33 sec). On this basis a mean $V$ of 5.7 km/sec at a mean range of 57 km compares with an apparent velocity of 5.78 km/sec from Fig.(6-7).

Observed travel times into the Broughton Array and four LOWNET stations (GL, BL, AB & AU) from Midland Valley sources were compared with those calculated for the regional LOWNET model, see Section (2.4), for 12 events.

The mean difference (observed T.T. - calculated T.T.) at Broughton is 0.24 sec., at (GL, BL, AU), also on the Southern Uplands Fault side of the Midland Valley, 0.23 sec. and for (AB) on the north side by the Highland Boundary Fault, 0.20 sec. It is concluded that the average velocity structure approaching Broughton is not significantly different from that approaching the quoted LOWNET stations.

Calculated travel times into Broughton based on $K$ values (from measured $V_a$'s and an assumed $V_0 = 5$ km/sec.) have an average closer to the observed than those from the LOWNET model (0.09 sec. compared with -0.24 sec.) The rates of continuous vertical increase of velocity with depth ($K \approx 0.2 - 0.25$ km/sec./km) are quite high.
The continuity of velocity increase with depth to below 7 – 8 km implied by the line of Fig. (6-4), however, has been rejected and the alignment of the Broughton points in the range 20 – 38 km suggests a low rate, see Fig. (6-7) (on EKA limit lines) in presumably the Lower Palaeozoic rocks above the basement. In the absence of shorter range data (20 km) there is little point in elaborating the model. Some continuous though non-linear function of velocity increase with depth from Old Red Sandstone into the underlying Lower Palaeozoic would, however, be consistent with the geologically observed gradation between them.

6.5 Conclusions

(1) Velocities in the Lower Palaeozoic rocks of the Southern Uplands are seen both from the close shots and the local events to vary from a maximum along a direction parallel to bedding (strike) and to a minimum at right angles. The ratio between these velocities is similar in both cases. This magnitude of anisotropy will provide azimuth anomalies of the observed magnitude and pattern.

(2) The velocity appears to increase rapidly (about 0.8 km/sec./km) down to a depth of 1 – 1.5 km and thereafter at a very slow rate of about 0.003 km/sec./km.

(3) This indicates along strike velocities in the Southern Uplands, approaching that of the 6.4 km/sec. refractor under the Midland Valley, at a range of about 75 km.

(4) The rather high apparent velocities measured at Broughton from the Midland Valley side may generally propose a structural model involving velocities consistent with LISPB & LOWNET with the existence of a shallow 4.3 km/sec refractor under
Broughton with a radiating dip of about 5° maintained through a wide azimuth range.

(5) If such a structure does not exist under Broughton area, then those high velocities from the Midland Valley side, which seem to agree with the along strike i.e. in the plane of the bedding velocities in the Southern Uplands, together with absence of systematic azimuth anomalies seem to be consistent with the Lower Palaeozoic structure under the Midland Valley being on average sub-horizontal. There the velocity of this refractor and the underlying basement appear to be greater than those found by LISPB.

(6) On the evidence presented here it is considered that the velocity of P waves within the Lower Palaeozoic rocks around EKA not only increases with depth but also varies with azimuth. Similar anisotropy dependent upon the attitude of the bedding in these rocks is to be expected elsewhere in the Southern Uplands and needs to be investigated before a complete interpretation of a seismic profile in any single azimuth can be achieved. Since it is not known whether the shallow structure under Broughton is a sufficient cause for the high apparent velocities observed there, it is recommended that this structure should be determined here and, routinely during future array work in the region. Until this point is resolved at Broughton the results there cannot be used to say how important it is to use arrays rather than linear profiles in seismically investigating the Lower Palaeozoic basement interface under the Midland Valley.
APPENDIX (1)

List of all source events received at EKA, Broughton and some/all LOWNET sensors. X indicates that the event has been received at that station. Known origin times are either recorded (R) or calculated (C) through LOWNET. Origin times of the first 6 events were calculated without LOWNET. X* indicates that the event has been received weekly at that station. Q = Quarry, N.E. = Natural Event. Some of these events were repeated, see Appendices (5) and (6)

<p>| No. | Date   | Event's Name | Coordinates       | Origin Time | | | Received At |
|-----|--------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|----|----------------|
|     |        |              |                   |             |    | EKA | Broughton | EDI | AU | EH | GL | BL |
| (1) | 8.6.76 | EKA Shot(1)  | 325.920/603.530   | 13 06 28.05 | X  | X   | -       | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| (2) | 6.9.76 | &quot; &quot; (2)     | 325.250/605.510   | 11 20 02.50 | X  | X   | -       | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| (3) | 6.9.76 | &quot; &quot; (3)     | 328.150/609.100   | 13 48 40.82 | X  | X   | -       | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| (4) | 6.9.76 | &quot; &quot; (4)     | 328.750/605.830   | 15 34 45.10 | X  | X   | -       | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| (5) | 6.9.76 | &quot; &quot; (5)     | 325.250/605.510   | 17 24 45.70 | X  | X   | -       | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| (6) | 6.9.76 | &quot; &quot; (6)     | 332.140/602.710   | 19 21 46.75 | X  | X   | -       | -   | -  | -  | -  | -  |
| (7) | 3.2.77 | Murrayshall Q| 277.250/691.450   | 16 09 08.50 | X  | X*  | X*     | X   | X  | -  | X* | X* |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event's Name</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Origin Time hr. m. sec.</th>
<th>Received At</th>
<th>LOWNET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>C R</td>
<td>EXA</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>9.2.77</td>
<td>Dumbuckhill</td>
<td>242.030/674.660</td>
<td>12 12 05.95</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>10.2.77</td>
<td>Douglasmuir</td>
<td>252.400/674.780</td>
<td>12 49 38.66</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>14.2.77</td>
<td>Kaimes</td>
<td>313.12 /666.4</td>
<td>16 22 26.51</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>15.2.77</td>
<td>Tams Loup</td>
<td>288.230/663.780</td>
<td>12 57 51.41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>23.2.77</td>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td>312.720/670.280</td>
<td>16 45 32.57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>10.3.77</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>334.500/657.400</td>
<td>15 00 06.19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>10.3.77</td>
<td>Boards Farm</td>
<td>279.450/685.430</td>
<td>17 07 11.11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>11.3.77</td>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td>312.750/670.280</td>
<td>16 45 54.54</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>14.3.77</td>
<td>Cruicks</td>
<td>313.040/681.550</td>
<td>13 04 51.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event's Name</td>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>Origin Time</td>
<td>Received At</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hr. m. sec.</td>
<td>EKA</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>16.3.77</td>
<td>Cloburn</td>
<td>294.710/641.390</td>
<td>12 28 49.01</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>16.3.77</td>
<td>Duntilland</td>
<td>284.240/663.560</td>
<td>14 52 59.86</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>25.3.77</td>
<td>Hillhouse</td>
<td>235.000/634.000</td>
<td>11 08 12.19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>30.3.77</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>321.250/699.280</td>
<td>14 26 54.80</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>30.3.77</td>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td>312.670/670.280</td>
<td>15 39 56.70</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>1.4.77</td>
<td>Loanhead</td>
<td>236.580/655.420</td>
<td>11 03 21.45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>6.4.77</td>
<td>Cloburn</td>
<td>294.600/641.330</td>
<td>11 32 40.09</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>28.4.77</td>
<td>Collace</td>
<td>320.960/731.610</td>
<td>19 03 33.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>11.2.77</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>279.8 /685.420</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX (1) (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event's Name</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Origin Time</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Received At</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EXA Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>23.3.77</td>
<td>Oxwellmains</td>
<td>366.2 /677.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>25.12.77</td>
<td>Goat</td>
<td>317.450 /686.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>7.4.77</td>
<td>Craighouse</td>
<td>361.5 /635.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>30.3.77</td>
<td>L*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>18.2.77</td>
<td>U/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>14.4.77</td>
<td>Dunion</td>
<td>55°46'30&quot;N/2°59'2&quot;W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>16.2.77</td>
<td>Coatsgate</td>
<td>55°33'33&quot;N 3°47'42&quot;W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>3.5.74</td>
<td>Cairney Hill</td>
<td>285.30 /666.50</td>
<td>15 45 00.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>23.5.74</td>
<td>Dollar NE</td>
<td>56°14'22&quot;N 3°61'55&quot;W</td>
<td>18 35 00.9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX (1) (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event's Name</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Origin Time</th>
<th>Received At</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hr. m. sec.</td>
<td>EKA Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>10.5.74</td>
<td>Frairton Quarry</td>
<td>309.0 /723.0</td>
<td>15 43 25.9</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>15.4.74</td>
<td>Newbattle</td>
<td>55.8725°N 3.0727°W</td>
<td>23 04 54.6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>4.3.69</td>
<td>Rosewell NE</td>
<td>329.06 /661.9</td>
<td>19 14 08.2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>18.9.69</td>
<td>Midlothian NE</td>
<td>332.8 /661.0</td>
<td>03 43 11.60</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>6.7.76</td>
<td>Navy Shot(1)</td>
<td>356.2 /701.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>23.6.76</td>
<td>Navy Shot(2)</td>
<td>365.0 /706.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>7.5.74</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>295.0 /713.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>29.4.74</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>297.5 /683.0</td>
<td>21 19 46.4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event's Name</td>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>Origin Time</td>
<td>Received At</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>27.6.69</td>
<td>Dollar N.E.</td>
<td>305.0</td>
<td>/681.0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>27.6.69</td>
<td>Dollar N.E.</td>
<td>294.5</td>
<td>/693.0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>25.12.69</td>
<td>Midlothian N.E.</td>
<td>330.5</td>
<td>/672.0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>15.4.71</td>
<td>Glenalmond</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>/727.0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>17.4.71</td>
<td>Glenalmond</td>
<td>297.0</td>
<td>/727.2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>22.4.71</td>
<td>Glenalmond</td>
<td>295.7</td>
<td>/725.0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>7.9.76</td>
<td>Navy shot (I.M.)</td>
<td>369.0</td>
<td>/695.0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>8.4.71</td>
<td>Loch Awe</td>
<td>194.0</td>
<td>/713.5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dates and Arrival Times of EKA close shots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shot No. &amp; Date</th>
<th>R₁</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>R₁₁</th>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>B₁₁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 8.6.76</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 6.9.76</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 6.9.76</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 6.9.76</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 6.9.76</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) 6.9.76</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **R₁₁** and **B₁₁** represent arrival times at various locations.
- **13 hr 06' 28.0" +** indicates arrival times for shot (1).
- **11 hr 20' 02.0" +** indicates arrival times for shot (2).
- **13 hr 48' 41.0" +** indicates arrival times for shot (3).
- **15 hr 34' 45.0" +** indicates arrival times for shot (4).
- **17 hr 24' 45.0" +** indicates arrival times for shot (5).
- **19 hr 21' 47.0" +** indicates arrival times for shot (6).
APPENDIX (3)

This program was used for the inversion of the T-X data for the
inline shots of Chapter V and is based on Wiechert-Herglotz-Bateman
integral, see Grant & West (1965) (64) p. 139. Input to it are
travel times and distances. Output are velocities and depths, see
Fig. (5-3B).

```fortran
C COMPIL E GALV07
C PROGRAM W3, HALL, GLASGOW. JUNE 1977
C WIECHERT-HERGLOTZ-BAT EMAN INTEGRAL FOR INVERSION OF T-X DATA
1 DIMENSION VINT(100), VPT(100), Z(100), T(100)
2 REAL TEXT(5)
3 READ (5,104) UPR
4 DO 56 K=1, UPR
5 READ (5,106) TEXT
6 WRITE (6,105) K, TEXT
7 READ (5,100) XMAX
8 READ (5,101) T(J), J=1, N
9 WRITE (6,103)
10 VINT(1)=XMAX/T(1)/N
11 DO 26 J=2, N
12 VINT(J)=XMAX/(T(J)-T(J-1))/N
13 CONTINUE
14 M=1
15 DO 30 J=1, M
16 DIST=J*XMAX/N
17 VPT(J)=0.5*(VINT(J)+VINT(J+1))
18 Z(J)=0.0
19 DO 40 I=1, J
20 X=VPT(J)/VINT(I)
21 ACOSH=ALOG(X+SQRT(X*X-1.0))
22 Z(J)=Z(J)+XMAX*ACOSH/N/3.1416
23 CONTINUE
24 WRITE (6,102) Z(J), VPT(J), T(J), DIST
25 CONTINUE
26 DO 50 M=1, N
27 100 FORMAT(2X,13, F10.3)
28 101 FORMAT(2X,10F7.4)
29 102 FORMAT(10X, F7.3, 10X, F7.3)
30 103 FORMAT(///, X, DEPTH IN KM, V/VEL O C I T Y IN KM/X, TIME IN S/X, DISTANCE IN KM)
31 104 FORMAT(2X,13)
32 105 FORMAT(///, PROBLEM NUMBER 1, 13, 500)
33 106 FORMAT(5A8)
34 STOP
35 END
```

END
### Depth Number 1
**Shot (6)** RED ONLY 6/9/1976

**DETERMINATION OF VELOCITY-DEPTH FUNCTION**
**BY RIECHERT-HERGLOTZ-BATEMAN INTEGRAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (km)</th>
<th>Velocity (km/s)</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>4.346</td>
<td>0.1160</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>4.466</td>
<td>0.2300</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>4.565</td>
<td>0.3400</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>4.591</td>
<td>0.4490</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>4.593</td>
<td>0.5578</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>4.602</td>
<td>0.6655</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>4.619</td>
<td>0.7751</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>4.792</td>
<td>0.8830</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>4.975</td>
<td>0.9640</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>5.132</td>
<td>1.0340</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>5.379</td>
<td>1.1790</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>5.525</td>
<td>1.2700</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>5.687</td>
<td>1.3620</td>
<td>6.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>5.687</td>
<td>1.4490</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>5.714</td>
<td>1.5370</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Depth Number 2
**Shot (1)** BLUE ONLY 6/9/1976

**DETERMINATION OF VELOCITY-DEPTH FUNCTION**
**BY RIECHERT-HERGLOTZ-BATEMAN INTEGRAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (km)</th>
<th>Velocity (km/s)</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>4.869</td>
<td>0.1050</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.2055</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>5.038</td>
<td>0.3050</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>5.676</td>
<td>0.4040</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>5.239</td>
<td>0.5020</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>5.391</td>
<td>0.5950</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>5.420</td>
<td>0.6875</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>5.450</td>
<td>0.7795</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>5.479</td>
<td>0.8710</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>5.510</td>
<td>0.9620</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>5.540</td>
<td>1.0528</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>5.672</td>
<td>1.1425</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>6.192</td>
<td>1.2233</td>
<td>6.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td>1.3040</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>6.207</td>
<td>1.3816</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: RED ONLY (Graph) 6/9/70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point (km)</th>
<th>Velocity (km/s)</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>4.556</td>
<td>0.4100</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>4.577</td>
<td>0.2100</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>4.605</td>
<td>0.3200</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>4.673</td>
<td>0.5400</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>4.739</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>4.783</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>4.853</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>4.951</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>5.051</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>5.155</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>5.262</td>
<td>2.5500</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>5.383</td>
<td>2.8500</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>5.507</td>
<td>3.1500</td>
<td>6.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>5.656</td>
<td>3.4500</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>5.714</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>5.764</td>
<td>4.0500</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>5.824</td>
<td>4.3500</td>
<td>8.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: BLUE ONLY (Graph) 6/9/70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point (km)</th>
<th>Velocity (km/s)</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>4.556</td>
<td>0.4100</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>4.577</td>
<td>0.2100</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>4.605</td>
<td>0.3200</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>4.673</td>
<td>0.5400</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>4.739</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>4.783</td>
<td>1.0500</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>4.853</td>
<td>1.3500</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>4.951</td>
<td>1.6500</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>5.051</td>
<td>1.9500</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>5.155</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>5.262</td>
<td>2.5500</td>
<td>5.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>5.383</td>
<td>2.8500</td>
<td>6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>5.507</td>
<td>3.1500</td>
<td>6.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>5.656</td>
<td>3.4500</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>5.714</td>
<td>3.7500</td>
<td>7.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>5.764</td>
<td>4.0500</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>5.824</td>
<td>4.3500</td>
<td>8.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX (4)

CALCULATION OF TIME OF ARRIVAL AT AN ARRAY ELEMENT FOR A NON-PLANE WAVE-FRONT

This appendix contains a listing of the program "CLOSE" which was used for the apparent velocity and propagation vector calculations, see Chapter VI. The program was written by Jacob (1969)\(^1\) who gave the following theoretical treatment as the basis for the calculation of the delay in the time of arrival of a curved wavefront.

**Correction for a Curved Wave-Front**

Refering back to Fig. (4-2) the y-axis is NS and the x-axis is EW. Where the cross-over point of the array is \((0, 0)\) in Cartesian co-ordinates and the position of the \(i^{th}\) seismometer is at \((x_i, y_i)\) we have that the distance \(D\) from the source to the seismometer is

\[
D = \left[ (x_i + \Delta \sin \theta_w)^2 + (y_i + \Delta \cos \theta_w)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
\]

and the difference between this and the distance of the source to the cross-over joint is \((\Delta - D)\). Therefore, for each seismometer, the time correction to be added to its arrival time is

\[
\tau^t_i(x,y) = \frac{\Delta - \left[ (x_i + \Delta \sin \theta_w)^2 + (y_i + \Delta \cos \theta_w)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V_a}
\]

If the azimuth, \(\theta_2\), of the shock is used instead of the propagation vector \(\theta_w\), change signs inside the inner brackets. In processing the signal on the array \(\theta_f\) is used as this is what is "seen" by the array.
Correction for Altitude Differences

The delay due to relative altitude of the $i^{th}$ seismometer is

$$\delta t_i(z) = \frac{z_i \cos h(z)}{v_1}$$

But, as $\sin \gamma = \frac{v_1}{v_a}$ the correction term to be added is

$$\delta t_i(z) = -z_i \left( \frac{1}{v_1^2} - \frac{1}{v_a^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Summing equations (1) and (2) and allowing for experimental error, $E_i$, we get for the $i^{th}$ seismometer

$$t_o - t_i = \delta t_i$$

$$= \Delta - \frac{\left[ (v_i + \Delta \sin \theta_f)^2 + (v_i + \Delta \cos \theta_f)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{v_a}$$

$$- z_i \left( \frac{1}{v_1^2} - \frac{1}{v_a^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + E_i$$

(3)

Write $\theta_f = \Theta$ with subscript $f$ understood. The equation (3) represents a conical wave front where $v_a > v_1$. This equation as it stands cannot be used to make a least squares fit to the data as it is non-linear in terms of two of the unknowns. An iteration method has thus been used, successively correcting suggested values. Approximations are used which are acceptable as this is an iteration method. The first one is acceptable as it is an approximation to a small term in equation (3).

$$z_i \left( \frac{1}{v_1^2} - \frac{1}{v_a^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{z_i}{v_1} \left( 1 - \frac{v_1^2}{v_a^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$= \frac{z_i}{v_1} \left[ 1 - \frac{v_1^2}{2v_a^2} - \frac{v_1^4}{8v_a^4} - \frac{v_1^6}{16v_a^6} \right] \cdots$$
so we can rewrite
\[ t_o - t_i \approx E_i + \Delta (V_a + \Delta V_a)^{-1} \]
\[ = z_i \left( \frac{1}{V_1 - V_a} - \frac{V_1^3}{2(V_a + \Delta V_a)^2} - \frac{V_1^4}{8(V_a + \Delta V_a)^3} - \frac{V_1^6}{16(V_a + \Delta V_a)^4} \right) \]
\[ - (V_a + \Delta V_a)^{-1} \left[ \left(x_i + \Delta \sin (\theta + \Delta \theta)\right)^2 + \left(y_i + \Delta \cos (\theta + \Delta \theta)\right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \]

Where \( V_a \) and \( \theta \) are suggested values and \( \Delta V_a \) and \( \Delta \theta \) are corrections.

Taking the contents of the square bracket,
\[ \left[ x_i^2 + 2x_i \Delta \sin (\theta + \Delta \theta) + \Delta^2 \sin^2 (\theta + \Delta \theta) + y_i^2 + 2 \Delta y_i \cos (\theta + \Delta \theta) + \Delta^2 \cos^2 (\theta + \Delta \theta) \right] \]
\[ = x_i^2 + y_i^2 + \Delta^2 + 2 \Delta (x_i \sin \theta + y_i \cos \theta) + \Delta^2 (x_i \cos \theta - y_i \sin \theta) \]

putting \( \sin \Delta \theta = \Delta \theta \) and \( \cos \Delta \theta = 1 \)
\[ \sin (\theta + \Delta \theta) \approx \sin \theta + \Delta \theta \cos \theta \]
\[ \cos (\theta + \Delta \theta) \approx \cos \theta + \Delta \theta \sin \theta \]

so
\[ \left[ x_i^2 + y_i^2 + \Delta^2 + 2 \Delta (x_i \sin \theta + y_i \cos \theta) + 2 \Delta \Delta (x_i \cos \theta - y_i \sin \theta) \right] \]

putting
\[ r_i = x_i^2 + y_i^2 + \Delta^2 + 2 \Delta (x_i \sin \theta + y_i \cos \theta) \]

and
\[ s_i = 2 \Delta (x_i \cos \theta - y_i \sin \theta) \]

we have
\[ \left[ x_i^2 + y_i^2 + \Delta^2 + 2 \Delta (x_i \sin \theta + y_i \cos \theta) + 2 \Delta \Delta (x_i \cos \theta - y_i \sin \theta) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \approx r_i^{\frac{3}{2}} \left[ 1 + \frac{s_i \Delta \theta}{r_i} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \]

Now maximum \( s_i \) is less than minimum \( r_i \) and \( \Delta \theta \) is normally small, so
\[ \left| \frac{s_i \Delta \theta}{r_i} \right| < 1 \]
and equation (5) may be expanded. In the program $\delta \theta$ has in fact been limited to $\pm 0.2$ radians. We may also expand in equation (4)

\[ V_a + \delta V_a -1 \approx \frac{1}{V_a} - \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a^2} \]

\[ \therefore t_0 - t_1 \approx E_i + \frac{1}{V_a} \left( \Delta - r_i^\frac{3}{2} - \frac{S_i \delta \theta}{2V_a r_i^\frac{5}{2}} - \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} + \frac{r_i^\frac{5}{2} \delta V_a}{V_a} \right) \]

+ discarded $\delta V_a \cdot \delta \theta$ term

\[ - \frac{z_i}{V_1} \left( 1 - \frac{V_1^2}{2V_a^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} \right) \right)^{-2} \left( 1 - \frac{V_1^4}{8V_a^4} \left( 1 + \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} \right) \right) \]

\[ - \frac{V_1^6}{16V_a^6} \left( 1 + \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} \right)^{-6} \]

And putting \( 1 + \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} \approx 1 - n \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} \)

Where \( n = 2, 4, 6 \) in equation (6) we get

\[ t_0 - t_1 \approx E_i + \frac{1}{V_a} \left( \Delta - r_i^\frac{3}{2} \right) - \frac{S_i \delta \theta}{2V_a r_i^\frac{5}{2}} - \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} \left( \Delta - r_i^\frac{3}{2} \right) \]

\[ - \frac{z_i}{V_1} \left( 1 - \frac{V_1^2}{2V_a^2} \left( 1 + \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} \right) \right) - \frac{V_1^4}{8V_a^4} \left( 1 - 4 \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} \right) \]

\[ - \frac{V_1^6}{16V_a^6} \left( 1 + 6 \frac{\delta V_a}{V_a} \right) \]

(7)

rearranging equation (7) we get

\[ E_i = P_i + u_i \delta \theta + w_i \delta V_a + t_o \text{ where } i = 1, 2, ..., n \]

(8)

and the coefficients are as follows

\[ P_i = - \left[ t_i + \frac{1}{V_a} \left( \Delta - r_i^\frac{3}{2} \right) - \frac{z_i}{V_1} \left( 1 - \frac{V_1^2}{2V_a^3} - \frac{V_1^4}{8V_a^5} - \frac{V_1^6}{16V_a^7} \right) \right] \]

\[ u_i = \frac{S_i}{2V_a r_i^\frac{5}{2}} \]
\[ v_i = \frac{1}{V_a^2} \left( \Delta - \\frac{3}{\Delta^2} \right) + z_i \left( \frac{V_1}{V_a^3} + \frac{V_1^3}{2V_a^5} + \frac{3V_1^5}{8V_a^7} \right) \]

and the normal equations are given by
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial (\delta \theta)} \left( \sum_{i} E_i^2 \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial (\delta V_a)} \left( \sum_{i} E_i^2 \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial (t_o)} \left( \sum_{i} E_i^2 \right) = 0
\]

i.e.
\[
\begin{align*}
\left( \sum_{i} u_i \right) t_o + \sum_{i} u_i p_i + \left( \sum_{i} u_i^2 \right) \delta \theta + \left( \sum_{i} u_i w_i \right) \delta V_a &= 0 \\
\left( \sum_{i} w_i \right) t_o + \sum_{i} w_i p_i + \left( \sum_{i} u_i w_i \right) \delta \theta + \left( \sum_{i} w_i^2 \right) \delta V_a &= 0 \\
nt_o + \sum_{i} p_i + \left( \sum_{i} u_i \right) \delta \theta + \left( \sum_{i} w_i \right) \delta V_a &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

\[ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \]

Note that \( t_o \) is the actual time at the reference point \( (0, 0, 0) \) while \( \delta \theta \) and \( \delta V_a \) are corrections to a suggested value.

Program "CLOSE" uses these equations and repeats the calculations until \( \delta \theta < 0.005 \) radians and \( \delta V_a < 0.002 \) km/s. \( \delta \theta \) has been limited to \( \pm 0.2 \) radians and \( \delta V_a \) limited to 0.5 km/s. in any one pass to make the process stable when the first suggestions are a long way from the truth. With this restriction the process has proved stable and converges rapidly. It works even if the suggested angle is 180° wrong (an error that occurs when the azimuth is suggested instead of the propagation vector).

"CLOSE" can be made to work without altitude corrections by putting all \( z_i = 0 \) and it will treat the arrival as a plane wave if \( \Delta \) is made large compared with the dimensions of the array. In the case
of EKA it is quite sufficient to put $\Delta = 500$ km. If $\Delta$ is made unnecessarily large the program will be evaluating small differences between large quantities and accuracy will suffer. In the case of an unknown source an approximate value for $\Delta$ should be obtained from the P-S time interval.
REAL TE(23), X(23), Y(23), Z(23), S1(23), S2(23), T(23)
REAL PT0)
INTEGER TITLE(20)
INTEGER N, ST(23), SURF, PIT(23, 4)
INTEGER GUE
REAL T(23)
DIMENSION PI(23), DELTA(23)
WRITE (3, 1)
1 FORMAT (1H 'CLOSE SHOCK ARRAY PROCESSING'//)
READ (2, 2) ((PIT(I, J), J=1, 4), X(I), Y(I), Z(I), I=1, 23)
2 FORMAT (4A1, J, 8.4)
READ (2, 211) NUMBR
211 FORMAT (13)
RT0D=57.2, S7=77913
WRITE (3, 4)
4 FORMAT (1M, '22X ' 'PI T', '5X ' 'A', 'Y', 'Z' 'I' 'I ')
DO 5 I=1, 23
WRITE (3, 5) (PIT(I, J), J=1, 4), X(I), Y(I), Z(I)
5 FORMAT (1M, '20X ' 'A', 'Y', 'Z', I ' ')
6 CONTINUE
DO 13 MNUM=1, NUMBR
READ (2, 12) TITLE
12 FORMAT (30A1)
WRITE (3, 121) TITLE
121 FORMAT (1M, '10X ' 'A', 'Y', 'Z', I ' ')
DO 3 I=1, 23
ST(I)=0
3 CONTINUE
READ (2, 7) N, SURF, SCAF
7 FORMAT (12, 14, F7.1)
WRITE (3, 14)
14 FORMAT (22X 'PI T', '5X ' 'A', 'Y', 'Z' 'I' 'I ')
DO 3 M=1, 23
IF (MNUM=2) 2, 9, 9
2 READ (2, 21) 1, T(I)
91 FORMAT (12, 5S, 4)
ST(I)=1
8 CONTINUE
DO 10 1=1, 23
IF (ST(I)) 10, 12, 11
11 T(I)=T(1)-SCAF
WRITE (3, 15) (PIT(I, J), J=1, 4), T(I)
15 FORMAT (1M, '20X ' 'A', 'Y', 'Z', I ' ')
10 CONTINUE
C C A TABLE OF PIT TITLE AND A, Y, Z COORDINATES, AND
C A TABLE OF ARRIVAL TIMES AT THE PITS TO BE USED
C HAVE NOW BEEN PRINTED.
C READ (2, 16) VELA, THEITA, DELTA, WELI
16 FORMAT (12, 16, 5S, 4)
C C
1700 WRITE (3, 17) VELA, THEITA, DELTA
FORMAT(14,10) * FIRST ESTIMATES ARE VELOCITY = 153.1, KMS/SEC.
* PROPORTION VECTOR = 104.0, DEGREES, WHILE DELTA = 156.2.
* KMS/SEC //
WRITE (3,172) VEL
FORMAT(14,5X) * SURFACER Pattern VELOCITY = 123.1, KMS/SEC //
WRITE (3,172) VEL
FORMAT(14,5X) * THEETA +5X, DTET +5X, VELA +6X, UVEL +6X, TCP +7X /
THEETA = THEETA /1000
DO 15 I=1,23
IF(ST(I)) 25,26
21(I) = X(I) * X(I) + Y(I) * Y(I) + DELTA * Y + 2*DELTA * X(I) * SIN(THEETA) + Y(I) * C
105(THEETA)
S1(I) = 2*VELA * X(I) * COS(THEETA) - Y(I) * SIN(THEETA)
A2(I) = 2(I) * 0.5 - VELA * VELA / (2 * VELA * VELA) - VELA * (4 * VELA * VELA) - VEL1 * C0 /
106(VELA * VELA)
S2(I) = VEL1 * X(I) * (1/VELA * 3) + VEL1 * VEL1 / (2 * VELA * 5) + 6 * VEL1 * 4 / (4 *
VELA * 7)
P(I) = -T(I) - (3 * VELA - SQR(T(I)))/VELA * 2(I)
U(I) = S1(I) * (VELA * SQR(T(I)))/VELA * 2(I)
X(I) = (S1(I) - SQR(T(I)))/VELA * 2(I)
CONTINUE
A=0
B=0
C=0
D=0
E=0
F=0
G=0
H=0
DO 31 I=1,23
IF(ST(I)) 31,32
A=A+U(I) * P(I)
B=B+U(I) * Q(I)
C=C+U(I) * R(I)
D=D+U(I) * S(I)
E=E+P(I)
F=F+Q(I) * P(I)
G=G+U(I)
H=H+U(I)
CONTINUE
A4=(U*C-A*C)*((D*C-A*C))-(E*C-A*C)*((U*C-C-A*C))
A5=(C*C+C*P)*((O*C-A*C))-(O*C-M*C)+C
UVELA=A5/A5
TCP=((E*O-A*O)-(C*O-A*O)) * DVEL / (O*O-M*O)
DTETA = -(A*C*VELA+C*TCP)/B
IF (DVEL*VEL - 0.25) 34,35,36
IF (VVEL1) 332,333,334
DVEL1 = -0.5
GO TO 34
34 DVEL1 = 0.5
IF (DVEL1) 34,344,345,341
1 IF (DTRT) 342,342,343
2 DTRT = 0.2
GO TO 34
3 DTRT = 0.2
THEETA = THEETA + DTETA
V L A = V L A + D V L A

DO 110 IF (THETA, THETA, VELA, VELA, TCP)
110 FORMAT (1H, 10X, 10.3)

IF (DEHYD.WVELL = 0.0000005) 41, 41, 27
IF (THETA, THETA, 0.000005) 42, 42, 27
THETA = THETA + 100
IF (THETA = 360) 41, 42, 42
THETA = THETA - 360

GO TO 42

WRITE (3, 46) TCP

FORMAT (21, 1H, 1H, 4X, 'MEASURED VALUES', 4X, 'PROPOSITION VECTOR =
14, 46, 2D, DEGREES', 'APPARENT VELOCITY =', 4F3, 'KMS/SEC/1')

WRITE (3, 46) TCP

FORMAT (1H, 1H, 1H, 1H, 'TIME AT CROSS-OVER POI. 1 = ', F7.3, 1H, ' SECONDS')

THE APPARENT VELOCITY AND PROPAGATION VECTOR OF THE WAVE ACROSS THE ARRAY HAVE NOT BEEN CALCULATED. THE NEXT STEP IS TO CALCULATE THAT THE ARRIVAL TIMES AT EACH PIT FOR THIS VELOCITY AND ANGLE SHOULD HAVE BEEN IF THERE WAS NO ERROR (USE ORIGINAL EXACT NOT APPROXIMATE EQUATIONS FOR THIS), HENCE RESIDUALS AND AN ESTIMATE OF THE VARIANCE VALUE FOR RESIDUALS

GOT FROM EQUATION 57 A IN 'SKEW MULTILAYERING',

SCAR = 0

DO 55 I = 1, 23

TCALC (I) = 0.
IF (ST (I)) 55, 55, 54
54 (I) = SQRT ((X (I) + DELTA SIN (THETA) )**2 + (Y (I) + DELTA COS (THETA) )**2)
55 (I) = Z (I) / (VELA* VELA) - 1 / (VELA* VELA))

TCALC (I) = TCP + 05 (I) - (VELTA-34 (I)) / VELA

RESIDUAL = CALCULATED - OBSERVED

EE (I) = TCALC (I) - T (I)

SCAR = SCAR + EE (I) * EE (I)

CONTINUE

VAR = SCAR / (NN-1)

T (23) = TCP

WRITE (3, 61)

FORMAT (1H, 10X, 'PIT', 8X, 'T CAL', 8X, 'EE (I)')

DO 63 I = 1, 23

WRITE (3, 62) (PIT (I, J), J = 1, 4), TCALC (I), EE (I)

FORMAT (28X, 4A1, 2F10.3)

CONTINUE

WRITE (3, 66) SCAP

FORMAT (1H, 'SCAP = ', E14.5)

WRITE (3, 65) VAR

FORMAT (1H, 'VARIANCE = ', E14.5)

CONTINUE

STOP

END
APPENDIX (5)

List of all local events received at EKA Array, their distances, direct propagation vectors and travel times for some of these, as measured from the cross-over point and their apparent velocities and propagation vectors as calculated through Jacob's(31) program (see Appendix (4)). Some of those events with Low S/N ratio were rejected from the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Event's Name</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>Travel Time (sec)</th>
<th>Direct Propagation Vector (θ°)</th>
<th>Observed Prop. Vector</th>
<th>Apparent Velocity km/sec</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kaimes</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>161.6</td>
<td>5.718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kaimes</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>161.6</td>
<td>5.782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kaimes</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td>11.399</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td>5.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td>66.83</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>162.9</td>
<td>5.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td>66.83</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td>5.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>165.4</td>
<td>5.995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tams Loup</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>145.4</td>
<td>5.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tams Loup</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cairney Hill</td>
<td>74.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>141.2</td>
<td>5.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cairney Hill</td>
<td>74.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>144.8</td>
<td>5.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event's Name</td>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>Travel Time (sec)</td>
<td>Apparent Propagation Vector Prop. Vector</td>
<td>Apparent Velocity km/sec</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Observed S/N Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>93.23</td>
<td>17.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>93.23</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Boards Farm</td>
<td>93.31</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Murrayshall</td>
<td>99.63</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Douglasamir</td>
<td>101.72</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dumbuckhill</td>
<td>109.63</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>High Craig</td>
<td>101.10</td>
<td>129.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Coatesgate</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Craighouse</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>227.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hillhouse</td>
<td>96.11</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Goburn</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event's Name</td>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>Travel Time (sec)</td>
<td>Direct Propagation Vector ($\theta^\circ$)</td>
<td>Observed Prop. Vector</td>
<td>Apparent Velocity km/sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cloburn</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>8.699</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>5.624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cloburn</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>8.699</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>5.571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>94.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>177.0</td>
<td>170.6</td>
<td>6.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Frairton</td>
<td>117.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>171.6</td>
<td>160.5</td>
<td>6.356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Goat</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>-104.5</td>
<td>6.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>94.21</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>177.0</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td>6.358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Oxwellmains</td>
<td>82.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>208.0</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>6.475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Oxwellmains</td>
<td>82.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>208.0</td>
<td>205.2</td>
<td>6.326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Navy Shot</td>
<td>100.95</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>186.3</td>
<td>6.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Navy Shot</td>
<td>109.15</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>6.069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Collace</td>
<td>126.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>177.5</td>
<td>168.8</td>
<td>5.839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Collace</td>
<td>126.85</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>177.5</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>5.882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Low S/N Ratio
## APPENDIX (5) (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Event's Name</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>Travel Time (sec)</th>
<th>Direct Propagation Vector ($\theta^\circ$)</th>
<th>Observed Prop. Vector</th>
<th>Apparent Velocity km/sec</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Dollar N. E.</td>
<td>78.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>156.7</td>
<td>5.647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>92.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>5.782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>94.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td>154.6</td>
<td>5.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Rosewell</td>
<td>56.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>5.693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>169.1</td>
<td>6.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>66.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>174.8</td>
<td>6.131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Newbattle</td>
<td>60.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>174.6</td>
<td>5.863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Glenalmond</td>
<td>126.42</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>159.2</td>
<td>6.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Glenalmond</td>
<td>124.37</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>159.4</td>
<td>6.309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Glenalmond</td>
<td>123.54</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>167.8</td>
<td>162.1</td>
<td>6.649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Natural Event</td>
<td>125.30</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>164.5</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>6.655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event's Name</td>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>Travel Time (sec)</td>
<td>Apparent Velocity (km/sec)</td>
<td>Observed Prop. Vector</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Low/S Ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Loch Ave</td>
<td>163.13</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>6.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>SOSF(II)</td>
<td>152.13</td>
<td>25.437</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>6.565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>&quot; (25)</td>
<td>153.03</td>
<td>25.640</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>6.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>&quot; (27)</td>
<td>154.28</td>
<td>25.390</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>6.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Isle of May</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103.23</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>147.6</td>
<td>5.601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>U/V</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>147.6</td>
<td>6.094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>L*</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>118.35</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>147.6</td>
<td>5.601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Cruick</td>
<td>77.64</td>
<td>227.4</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>5.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Loanhead</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>227.4</td>
<td>248.0</td>
<td>5.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Craighouse</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>252.0</td>
<td>5.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Dunoon</td>
<td>38.70</td>
<td>252.0</td>
<td>5.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX (5) (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Event's Name</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>Travel Time (sec)</th>
<th>Direct Propagation Vector (°)</th>
<th>Observed Prop. Vector</th>
<th>Apparent Velocity km/sec</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Duntilland</td>
<td>72.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>146.8</td>
<td>4.955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Coatsgate</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>5.365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td>180.5</td>
<td>5.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>94.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>177.0</td>
<td>168.5</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>94.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>177.0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Oxwellmains</td>
<td>82.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>208.0</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>6.616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX (6)

List of all local events received at Broughton Array, their distances, direct propagation vectors and travel times for some of these, as measured from the cross-over point and their apparent velocities and propagation vectors as calculated through Jacob's (31) program (see Appendix (4))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Event's Name</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>Travel Time (sec)</th>
<th>Direct Propagation Vector (θ°)</th>
<th>Observed Prop. Vector</th>
<th>Apparent Velocity km/sec</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>5.818</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>232.8</td>
<td>6.352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>231.4</td>
<td>6.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Douglasmuir</td>
<td>72.64</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7.289</td>
<td>Low S/N Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loanhead</td>
<td>79.32</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>7.200</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>60.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>146.0</td>
<td>146.3</td>
<td>7.119</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Boards Farm</td>
<td>60.52</td>
<td>10.769</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Murrayshall</td>
<td>66.75</td>
<td>11.910</td>
<td>147.0</td>
<td>146.8</td>
<td>6.140</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dumbuckhill</td>
<td>81.48</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>6.455</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cruicks</td>
<td>76.22</td>
<td>8.316</td>
<td>179.6</td>
<td>185.4</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cruicks</td>
<td>76.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>179.6</td>
<td>184.8</td>
<td>6.694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Event's Name</td>
<td>Distance (km)</td>
<td>Travel Time (sec)</td>
<td>Direct Propagation Vector (θ)</td>
<td>Apparent Velocity (km/sec)</td>
<td>Observed Prop. Vector</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kaines</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>179.5</td>
<td>6.380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kaines</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>179.5</td>
<td>6.288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kaines</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>178.6</td>
<td>6.142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Coastgate</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tams Loup</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>6.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tams Loup</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>6.277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tams Loup</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hillhouse</td>
<td>78.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.395</td>
<td>7.612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Oxwellmains</td>
<td>67.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>232</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Craighouse</td>
<td>46.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>276.8</td>
<td>5.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>64.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>7.262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>64.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX (6) (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Event's Name</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>Travel Time (sec)</th>
<th>Direct Propagation Vector ($\theta^\circ$)</th>
<th>Observed Prop. Vector</th>
<th>Apparent Velocity km/sec</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>6.480</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181.6</td>
<td>6.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>6.510</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>178.4</td>
<td>6.296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Craig Park</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>6.460</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>179.0</td>
<td>6.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cloburn</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>6.313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cloburn</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>6.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cloburn</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>6.196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Duntilland</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>7.543</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>6.731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>High Craig</td>
<td>75.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>6.842</td>
<td>Low S/N Ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-
Appendix (7) Dispersed Rayleigh waves recorded at EKA from a Midland Valley source (natural event) and its dispersion curve as calculated through the program referred to in Chapter I, see Burton & Blamey (1972) (80).
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