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Summary of the project

In December 2019, the boxes and canisters containing 16mm film production elements of “Farmers of the Sea” were moved from the off-site storage facility where they had been stored to my cube for a reassessment starting in 2020. “Farmers of the Sea” is a documentary film directed and produced by Jim Larison in 1984, at the time the Director of Communications for the Oregon State University Sea Grant Program. Produced with the support of the Oregon State University, the film examines recent developments in aquaculture in the US, Japan, Scotland, and Panamá. In November 13th, 1984, the film was broadcast by PBS NOVA and in 1986 it won the International Agricultural Film and Television Competition Award. ¹

This film set is part of the Oregon Sea Grant Communications Moving Images Collection, alongside other “Framers” audio and videotapes. In 2019, the OSU/DPU digitized a Umatic tape of the film and made it available online.² I watched the video before initiating the inspection to get familiar with the material and captured a frame per scene of the video to keep as reference of the editing decisions.

The collection was partially processed, and the inventory list was preliminary. Thus, the goal of the reassessment was threefold: to verify and further identify and describe the film elements and assess their condition; to identify items for retention and potential deselection; and, last, to develop guidelines for identifying potential items for deselection amongst similar film collections at SCARC. Following these three goals, I approached the project in three stages:

1. Inspection and identification of materials;
2. Identification of potential items for deselection;
3. Development of retention/deselection guidelines for SCARC.

¹ See https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/about/tva2.html
² See https://media.oregonstate.edu/media/t/0_dr2szawh
Inspection and identification of materials

I completed the first stage, inspection and identification of materials, between February and July 2020. However, there was a two-month pause between mid-March to mid-May due to the COVID-19 outbreak in Oregon, after which I moved to remote work. While on-site, I collected the metadata from inspection on paper reports. Once working remotely, I transferred the metadata to a Google spreadsheet and continued collecting the metadata there. Metadata collected included: date of inspection; name of inspector; production title; accession number; box number; can number; item number (for keeping track of the amount of items in the same can or box); the item’s name as it appeared in the SCARC preliminary inventory; information on can, box, label and leaders; any other information; # (the serial numbers on a small sticker pasted on some original elements); accompanying documentation (documentation originally present with the films in the can or box; base type; film stock; edge code; gauge; color (color or B&W); sound (sound or silent); soundtrack type (optical or magnetic); optical track type (variable area or variable density); track letter (A or B); contains (picture-only, sound-only, composite); film type; film version; length (feet); core width; approx. run time; wear; tears; splices; smelly; warped; faded; content; and notes. I completed the inspection on July 31st and returned the films and the inspection equipment to the library on August 1st, 2020.

Identification of potential items for deselection

I completed the second stage, identification of potential items for deselection, in December 2020. I did extensive research about the 16mm film duplication process as well as the best practices for preservation and digitization of film elements. Despite the digitization of “Farmers” was not a planned outcome for this project, digitization is increasingly part of the preservation strategy, so it was important that I contemplated
digitization in my recommendations, making sure that the elements retained are also
the preferred for digitization.

Making the recommendations was a daunting task, because understanding the
elements was a daunting task in the first place. It is expected for many elements to be
produced over the course of making any film, but “Farmers” was a greater challenge
because two versions of the film were made, and, at some point, different fonts were
used for the titles (more on this in the detailed findings section). Due the complexity
of the case, I contacted Jim Larison over email on several occasions to consult about
the materials (see appendix A). Of course, having passed 36 years since the making
of “Farmers,” and given that the laboratory was the responsible of producing all the
intermediate elements, a process that producers don’t tend to follow closely, Larison
was unable to clarify many of my conjectures about the elements. As a result, most of
the sense-making of the elements in the set, and their role in the duplication process
of the film, I’ve done by informed deduction, by checking the information on the can
labels against other information gathered during inspection (such as the reels’ length,
the parts, the letters, etc.) and from research. For this reason, as informed as they are,
my deductions could be wrong.

In addition to this, and because the literature tends to be intentionally vague in
terms their recommendations on retention and deselection, I also researched on case
studies and consulted film archivists more experienced than myself at different kinds
of institutions to gain an insight on their practices to inform my recommendations.

**Development of retention/deselection guidelines for SCARC**

I will be working on the third stage, development of the retention/deselection
Detailed timeline

- January 14, 2020: Preparation began (inspection supplies were ordered).
- February 2020: Films inspection began.
- March 9, 2020: First progress report sent via email to Elizabeth Nielsen (EN) and Chris Petersen (CP).
- May 16, 2020: Picked up films and equipment from The Valley Library.
- May 25, 2020: Second progress report sent via email to EN and CP.
- June 2020: Research and consultation with archivists and Jim Larison began.
- August 1, 2020: Returned films and equipment to The Valley Library.
- September 2020: Vacation.
- October 2020: Resumed work (clean up spreadsheet with inspection findings).
- November 4, 2020: Third progress report sent via email to EN and CP with preliminary spreadsheet with findings;
- December 25, 2020: Finished report sent via email to EN and CP.
- January 2021: Decision was made by SCARC archivists to move forward with deselection of the proposed elements and make “Farmers” a new collection;
- March 29, 2021: Separated retained elements from those for deselection;
- April 5, 2021: Rehousing of retained films to polypropylene cans began;
- May 3, 2021: Google Doc document for drafting finding aid created;
- May 14, 2021: Rehousing of retained films to polypropylene cans finished;
- May 19, 2021: Re-watched “Farmers” to gather information on interviewees, topics, and places featured for determining subjects for the finding aid;
- May 27, 2021: Finding aid ready and sent out to SCARC staff for review.
Detailed Findings

There are 319 16mm film and audiotape elements related to “Farmers of the Sea” in the Oregon Sea Grant Communications Moving Images collection (VHS and Umatic videotapes not counted). From those, 311 are 16mm audio-visual elements, and the remaining 8 are ¼ inch audiotape recordings which were not inspected as part of this project. The elements were dispersed in 11 boxes and 7 canisters, and accessioned in two parts, 2000:100 and 2003:083.

Accession 2000:100 contained the smaller total number of film rolls, 37, but the greater variety of film production elements: A&B rolls (cut negatives or edited original negatives), workprints (low quality silent prints used to produce the editing template of the film), duplicate negatives (or “internegatives”), master positives (or “interpositives”), a fragment of reversal film, title trims, composite prints (prints with image and sound combined), and optical and magnetic soundtracks. Accession 2003:083, on the other hand, contained the bigger number of film rolls, 274, but were primarily camera original negatives trims and outtakes, and three workprints.

On table 1, the elements found were grouped according to the film production process stage to which they belong, providing information of the total number of rolls and percentage per type of element.

Different total amount of film rolls

Permitting a more granular identification and counting of the films, inspection identified a greater number of elements than the originally stated on the preliminary inventory list. However, in some cases there were fewer elements than the originally listed. The comparative table 2 below compiles this information.
### Table 1. Film production elements grouped according to film production stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Film Production Stages</th>
<th>Film Production Elements</th>
<th>Film Rolls Qty.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>• Unedited camera negatives *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unedited sound recordings **</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>• Negative trims and outtakes</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Magnetic soundtracks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Workprints</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Titles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Color reversal fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishing</td>
<td>• A&amp;B cut negatives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internegatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpositives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Magnetic masters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Magnetic full mix</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Optical soundtrack negatives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>• Projection prints</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Answer prints?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Grouped with the negatives trims and outtakes.

** The ¼ inch original sound recordings were not inspected.

### Table 2. Comparative of film rolls quantity from initial inventory and reassessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession 2000:100</th>
<th>No. rolls listed inventory</th>
<th>No. rolls found</th>
<th>Dif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 *</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can 1</td>
<td>No amount provided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can 10-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession 2003:083</th>
<th>No. rolls listed inventory</th>
<th>No. rolls found</th>
<th>Dif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The extra element here is the 16mm full mix short version magtrack. This elements was originally grouped in the preliminary inventory list with the ¼ inch audio recordings but I inspected it following the directive to inspect all 16mm elements.

Table 2. Comparative of film rolls quantity from initial inventory and reassessment
Two versions of the film

Inspection showed that two versions of the film were made, one of 60 minutes and another of 30 minutes. This information was confirmed by Larison (email, July 10, 2020). He explained that the 60-minute version has been made for broadcast on the PBS NOVA show and the 30-minute version for high quality projection prints.

Three different titles fonts

Inspection also revealed that, at some point, two different fonts were used for the film’s titles. For practicality, I will refer to them as “font 1” and “font 2” (see figures 1 and 2 below). Both fonts were found in title trims, workprints, and composite prints. However, only the font 2 appear in the Color Reversal Internegative for the 60-minute version (figure 5) and the internegative for the 30-minute version (figure 6). Because the font 2 was found in these internegatives, the element with the final cut of the film from which the projection or release prints are made, it makes sense to say that one was the preferred font. Further, in the set of 5 titles inventoried as “Original Master Positive B title (5),” not only the majority of the fragments have the font 2, but most importantly, two of them are labeled “New title trims” and “New Title WP.” To check the titles on the intermediate production elements against this set of titles makes sense because the label “Original Master Positive B title (5)” suggests that these titles were used for printing the Master Positive (or interpositive), which is the preservation element in any film production the contains the final edit of the film. In this sense, the font on the Master Positive is be the final one. I don’t have photos of the titles on the Master Positive, but it could be argued that if the Dupe Negative, which is produced from the Master Positive, has the font 2, the Master Positive should also have this font.

On the other hand, while in the “Original Master Positive B title (5)” set there is only one fragment of title with the font 1, as inspection progressed, more appeared
amongst the original negative trims and outtakes in accession 2003:083. This seems to support the idea that the font 1 was ultimately discarded,\(^3\) although this remains a conjecture, as Larison was unable to provide confirmation or explanation to why two fonts were used (email, December 24, 2020).

Looking for clarification, I checked the two fonts on film against the “Farmers” video (figure 9) and discovered that they don’t match, so, a third font was ultimately made for broadcast. Paul Souza, credited as graphic designer on the video, might have been the one redesigning them. Alongside new titles, new animated credits were created for the broadcast by the New York Institute of Technology (figure 10).

---

\(^3\) See accession 2003:083, box 4, the box with the label “Aquaculture OPT MATERIAL, WP TRIMS 83 A 312; A330; A643 - WORKPRINT FA 028, 029, 030, 031; FA 030 MASTER FROM INTERNEG.” See the plastic bag “FA 028 FRAMERS,” then the plastic bag “BAG 1/4 A,” and the film roll: I Q 930/2119 - 2203; A/WIND SUPERS.
3. Workprint with font 1 (2003:083)
4. Workprint 30-min with font 2 (2003:083)
5. CRI 60-min with font 2 (2000:100)
6. Dupe Neg 30-min with font 2 (2000:100)
7. Composite 60-min with font 1 (2000:100)
8. Composite 60-min with font 2 (2000:100)
9. Capture of the digitized Umatic titles

10. Capture of the digitized Umatic credits

**Condition of the production elements**

**Vinegar Syndrome**

All film picture, sound, and composite elements in the set are of acetate base, making them subject to vinegar syndrome deterioration. Acetate-based magtracks are also susceptible to this kind of deterioration. However, the magtracks in this set might be of polyester base—resistant to vinegar syndrome—based on the fact that manufacture of polyester-based magnetic tape base became the norm by 1970. Polyester magnetic tape does suffer from sticky shed syndrome, however, and while this kind of decay was not found in the magnetic materials inspected, it is something to keep an eye on in the future. The acetate-based materials were also found in good condition overall. Some elements, though, most especially those stored inside plastic bags, were smelly (see Google spreadsheet for more details on which). Since vinegar syndrome is contagious, elements showing this decay should be stored separately from those found healthy. While this initial inspection allowed for detecting smelly elements, an A/D strip test should be done on each roll for a precise determination on vinegar syndrome levels.

---

4 See [https://www.archives.gov/preservation/formats/audio-important-characteristics.html](https://www.archives.gov/preservation/formats/audio-important-characteristics.html)
**Color fading**

Additionally, with “Farmers” being a color film, the picture film elements in the set are subject to color fading. Color fading is the chemical deterioration of the color dyes in color films resulting in the picture turning magenta or purplish.⁵ Fading also derives in a loss of contrast and color balance, and the picture looking washed out. Negatives, interpositives, and prints are all subject to this kind of decay, however the speed and degree may vary depending on the color processes and film stock. Visual examination of the materials indicated that the fragment labeled “Master Original FA 191” from accession 2000:100 is faded, showing an intense purple cast, and that two workprints from accession 2003:083 (the workprint “short version” in box 3, and the workprint “FA 011” in box 16) showed magenta and purplish casts, respectively.

However, this does not mean that other elements in the set are exempt from fading. Visual examination alone may not be sufficient for determining color fading, which can be especially tricky with elements with an inversed image and colors such as the negatives and internegatives. In the case of the Color Reversal Internegatives (CRI)—a kind of internegative that allows for skipping the interpositive step in the traditional duplication process—I marked them as faded on the Google spreadsheet based on research that CRIs are chemically unstable and thus “prone to rapid fading, usually on an average of within five to seven years.”⁶ The 36-year-old CRIs in this set quintuples that timeframe, so I consider them faded. The CRI used to be considered preservation copy until their rapid fading was discovered. As a result, film producers and archives had to make new preservation copies from the edited negative. This, too, would be the preservation strategy to follow with “Farmers” whenever possible.

---

⁵ See [https://www.filmpreservation.org/preservation-basics/color-dye-fading](https://www.filmpreservation.org/preservation-basics/color-dye-fading)

⁶ See [https://enacademic.com/dic.nsf/enwiki/847123](https://enacademic.com/dic.nsf/enwiki/847123)
Similarly, I was unable to determine from visual examination alone whether the original edited negative (A&B rolls) and negative trims and outtakes are fading. Some experts argue that negative tend to fade at a much slower rate than prints, although others sustain that one of the reasons that might happen is that negatives often are stored in better conditions than prints. This means that the negative elements might be fading or already faded to some degree, especially considering they are 36 years old. Just like with vinegar syndrome, once fading has commenced, there is no way for it to be stopped, or reversed, only slowed down. To that end, valuable color elements should be stored at a temperature of 0°F or lower and a relative humidity of 30%.  

Until faded elements can be replaced, they should be retained, most especially if they are the only copy available in the set. A faded internegative, as any other faded element, can still be digitized if necessary, and the faded color, corrected digitally.  

Last, inspection revealed that the composite prints were printed onto “Eastman LPP” film stock, a “low fade” filmstock introduced by Kodak in 1982, shortly before the production of “Farmers” began. This seems to explain why their colors are stable after 36 years.

**Challenges**

One of the biggest challenges with these materials was to make sense of them, their linkage, and their specific role in the duplication process of the film. Having two versions of it, and two fonts for the titles resulted in the production of more elements than usual, adding another layer of perplexity and complexity to an already daunting task. Terminology was also challenging, since often different terms are used to refer to the same element (such as “Master Positive” and “Interpositive”; “Dupe Negative”

---

and “Internegative,” among others) and usage is different in the US and the UK, for instance, so terms changed depending on the resource consulted.

In addition to this, laboratories often use their own jargon to name production elements, and since film producers not necessarily understand the jargon nor follow the lab processes closely, they are often unaware of the intermediate elements made for the editing and finishing of their films. This was certainly the case with Jim Larison (email, December 23, 2020) so he was unable to confirm many conjectures about the elements. The absence of documentation of the steps and decisions taken made the endeavor harder and probably less precise as well.

However, making the effort to understand the production process of “Farmers” was key for making informed recommendations, and the effort has been made. What comes next in this section is an explanation of the traditional film duplication process, and an alternative to it, followed by my conjectures about the particular process of “Farmers,” including those steps that remain unclear.

The traditional film post-production and duplication process

In an effort to trying to identify to which instance of the process each element belonged to, I researched the traditional film duplication process, where picture and sound are recorded separately and synched back together in post-production. In this process, the camera negative is developed after shooting and printed for editing as a “workprint,” while the audio is transferred from the original audiotapes onto full-coat perforated magnetic track of the same size and length as the film, in this case, 16mm. The workprint and magtrack are synched based on common markers. During editing, additional audio tracks are often added, requiring a mix-down to join all the dialog, music and effects on one piece of magtrack. The edited workprint is then conformed to the camera negatives by lining up the edge codes common to both in A & B rolls, a common 16mm editing technique known as “checkerboarding” where two (or more)
matching rolls are cut alternating picture with opaque leader so that Roll "A" presents picture where Roll "B" presents opaque leader, and vice-versa, to dissimulate the splices, as can be seen in the picture below.⁸

Then, the lab takes the A&B rolls of camera negative and times the color and exposure to make the “answer print,” a print containing the final cut of the film plus titles and other effects. When approved by the producer, the timing for the answer print is used to make the interpositive.⁹ From the interpositive, duplicate negatives (internegatives) are made. A “check print” is made from the internegative to assess the quality of the bulk release work before printing the release prints.

The audio, once edited, is either combined with the picture by an edge mag track or an optical negative soundtrack is made which is printed onto the composite at the same time as the picture. There are optical negative soundtracks in this set, so we know the latter was the approach taken for this film.

**Reconstructing the “Farmers” post-production process**

**The picture workflow**

---


In our first communication (email, July 10, 2020), Larison provided details on the filmstock and equipment used for capturing image and sound. He used 16mm Kodak 7252 negative filmstock on an Arriflex SR-2 camera for recording picture, and ¼ inch audiotapes on a Nagra IV tape recorder for recording sound. He said that the negatives were printed to produce the workprint while the ¼ inch audiotapes were transferred to perforated full-coat magnetic stock, so they could be synched and edited together on a Steenbeck flatbed film editing suite.

The workprint was conformed to the original camera negative by the lab into A&B rolls. Now, traditionally, what follows is the creation of an interpositive, then an internegative, and, finally, the release prints. We know that there are two versions of the film, one of 60-minutes (2,000 feet) and another of 30-minutes (1,000 feet), and that the 60-minute version was the original, so at the very minimum we expect a 60-minute interpositive, a 60-minute internegative, and a 60-minute release print. And perhaps a similar workflow for the shorter version. The workflow, though, is flexible and it might have been adapted to meet the specific needs of the project.

We know from Larison that the long version was intended for broadcast, so perhaps he never made release prints for the long version, only composite answer prints for checking the final product before printing the interpositive for the video transfer. This would explain why there are two 60-minute composite prints in the set, one with the titles with the font 1, and the other with the titles with the font 2. Making final release prints of a film with two different fonts seems a rather improbable choice. This workflow would also have saved him money, and we know that making release prints was intended for the 30-minute version instead.

Now, besides the composite prints with the different fonts, another perplexing finding for the 60-minute version was the simultaneous presence of a Color Reversal Internegative (CRI), a kind of internegative that allowed for skipping the interpositive
step, and an interpositive that is labeled “short version” despite being of 2,200 feet. At first glance, this simultaneous presence is perplexing because you wouldn’t need an interpositive if you have a CRI, but it might be that these elements were used for different purposes, at different times. I think he might have made the CRI (skipping the interpositive and saving money) for printing the composite answer prints with different fonts (mentioned earlier) for checking the final film, approved it, and then made the interpositive as a preservation copy. The interpositive would also have been the preferred source material for making the video transfer, which according to Larison was made by PBS from an intermediate element he provided them. Although Larison said this element was the CRI (email, December 23, 2020), the interpositive is typically used for video transfers, since they are the second best-quality element after the cut negative. Whatever the source he used for the video transfer, this workflow would explain the simultaneous presence of the CRI and the interpositive.

The only aspect that remains confusing is that the 2,200 feet-long interpositive is labeled “short version.” Either it was mislabeled, or it is labeled that way because it was the source or reference element for the short version, in an attempt to avoid re-cutting the A&B rolls, originally conformed to the 60-minute version. However, this remains unclear.

The remaining elements are of the 30-minute version: the 1,010 feet-long internegative that came with a “B” Track short version soundtrack, and two composite prints (accession 2000:100, items LS01.10.08.02 and LS01.10.08.03). The prints have the same font for the titles (the font 2), as well as the same duration, but this does not necessarily mean that they are duplicates. In fact, the composite LS01.10.08.03 has a splice near the end that might indicate that a scene was edited, as well as more wear. It could be that LS01.10.08.03 is an answer print that was re-edited (hence the splice) and that LS01.10.08.02 was printed afterward (hence the same duration but not the
splice). A closer examination of the composites could help determine whether they are exact duplicates, but until then I would keep both.

These are conjectures trying to make sense of the information on labels and cans checked against the traditional and alternative film duplication processes and the duration of the elements. A closer examination of certain elements might help in making further determinations. For instance, checking the titles on the A&B rolls and on the Master Positive “short version” could shed light on the preferred font, helping, in turn, to shed light on the conjectures made for other elements.

**The sound workflow**

In regard to the sound, Larison confirmed that the original ¼ inch audiotapes were sent to the lab to be transferred to sprocketed full-coat magnetic 16mm film for the sound to be synched and edited with the workprint on a Steenbeck. Looking into the set, there are two magtracks (one of them associated to a workprint), a two-reel sound master, a full mix, and four optical negatives, two labeled “B” track, and two labeled “A” track. Then there are sound elements that came together with picture elements, such as an “A” track with the 60-minute CRI, and a “B” track with the 30-minute internegative. A closer look into these elements follows.

The magtrack associated with a workprint is the one inventoried as “Audio #2 MAG goes with FA 6 Workprint (2).” A yellow label on the magtrack reads “COM TEC Reel 2,” and it is supposed to go with the “Workprint Sync with Audio FA 6 used to make optical A track 2, 11/16/84 (1).” The other magtrack has the same yellow label but it reads “COM TEC Reel 1,” so they seem to go together or be linked somehow, and for that reason I wouldn’t separate them. There’s insufficient information to say whether any of the two separate “A” tracks is this new track, or if this new “A” track was made for the shorter version of the film.
The two-reel sound master seem to have been made for the 60-minute version as it is labeled “Sound Master NOVA English,” and the full mix might be for the 30-minute version since it is labeled “short version” (1,090 feet). Both of these elements should be retained as preservation elements.

Then, the separate optical tracks labeled “A track” and “B track.” I’m unfamiliar with the intricacies of sound editing and duplication. I tried to figure out how these tracks are related to each other and why four of them, whether any are duplicates. If such information is not readily available through the labels of the elements, though, making those finer determinations is not possible without listening to the elements. Unable to do that, I tried instead to make sense of the elements with the information available plus that gathered during inspection. Initially, I thought the “A track” and “B track” denominations were somehow connected to the A&B rolls. Then, doing some research, I found that the “A” track is commonly “the primary dialog track cut by the picture editor. The B-track and subsequent tracks would be used for overdubs.”

It is important not to confuse “A track” and “B track” with “A wind” and “B wind” (see illustration below) which is a way of identifying the winding of single-perforated film stock (the stock used for the optical sound in “Farmers” has perforations only in one side). Because the link between these tracks remains unclear, if SCARC were to decide to keep the optical tracks, I would recommend keeping them all until it is possible to make further determinations.

---

As seen, as it was typical for professional productions, image and sound were recorded separately, and while each had its own separate “path” they were edited in synch in order to be married together in the printing. Below are simplified illustrated workflows for the traditional film duplication process and the alternative process with a Color Reversal Internegative (CRI) to help illustrate what has been discussed in this section.
A last comment. I’ve discussed in this section how making sense of production elements and their relationships is like resolving a puzzle, and how it remains unclear at this point where some pieces of the puzzle go. However, looking at the laboratory processing information, most especially, at patterns, might provide additional hints. Looking at the metadata collected, I noticed lab elements are labeled with different “job” numbers, which seem to be an internal processing identification. We know the long version has two reels in total, and while there are many job numbers, the great majority of elements have either job #19481, #19482, or #20750. It would seem that elements labeled #19481 are related to the Reel 1 of the 60-minute version, #19482 to the Reel 2, and elements labeled #20750 seem to be linked to the short version.
Recommendations

Criteria

For the recommendations, I researched the best practices for film preservation from reputable sources such as the National Film Preservation Foundation (NFPF) and the International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF). Because guidance on retention and deselection is scarce in the literature, I’ve also consulted deselection practices from the National Film and Sound Archive Collection Policy and consulted experienced film archivists working at different institutions for input on their retention practices.

Based on the research and information gathered, I established retention priority levels (high, moderate, low) for the “Farmers” elements taking into consideration:

1. The SCARC collection and records management policies.
3. Possibility of reobtaining deaccessioned elements from retained materials.
4. The uniqueness of the materials.
5. The condition of the materials.
6. Elements typically retained by experienced archivists at other institutions.

The SCARC collection and records management policies

Since SCARC does not have a collecting or deselecting policy in place, I’ve reviewed the mission statement, which states that it is SCARC’s mission to stimulate and enrich the research and teaching endeavors of OSU through primary sources and make them available to the OSU and the larger community. In addition, it is stated that SCARC builds unique collections in the areas of natural resources, the history of science, university history, and Oregon's multicultural communities. Based on this, it is possible to say that “Farmers” still aligns with SCARC’s mission in several ways:

- The film itself, and the production materials, are primary sources;
The film was produced by OSU and it features James E. Lannan, a researcher from OSU, which captures OSU history; and

The film’s content (aquaculture techniques around the world) aligns with two of the areas of interest for SCARC, natural resources and the history of science.

**Availability of the best surviving source materials**

According to the Film Preservation Guide by the National Film Preservation Foundation, the best source film production elements are A&B rolls, interpositives, and negative or magnetic tracks (see table below). Fortunately, SCARC has the best source production materials: for the image, the A&B rolls and the interpositive, and for the sound, both optical negatives and magnetic tracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Film Material or Type</th>
<th>Does Your Institution Have the “Best” Surviving Source Material?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production element (A and B rolls, interpositive,* negative, or magnetic track)</td>
<td>Probably yes, if materials are complete and in good physical condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversal original</td>
<td>Probably yes, if materials are complete and in good physical condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-colored artist print</td>
<td>Probably yes, although similar copies may exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amateur film or home movie</td>
<td>Probably yes, if material is reversal original. If a print, check institutional records and contact filmmaker or heirs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction print** of Hollywood feature or short</td>
<td>If 8mm, no. If 16mm sound print, probably not. If 28mm or 16mm print of a silent film, perhaps. More research required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print of federal government film</td>
<td>Probably not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print of film produced by state or local government</td>
<td>Perhaps. Likelihood increases if 35mm print. More research required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print of specialized-subject film with limited circulation</td>
<td>Perhaps. Likelihood increases if 35mm print. More research required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print of regionally produced film with limited distribution</td>
<td>Perhaps. Likelihood increases if 35mm print. More research required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print of nationally distributed educational or industrial film</td>
<td>Unlikely. Difficult to document. More research required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An interpositive is a color production or preservation element made from a negative original and then used to create a duplicate negative from which many prints can be generated. An interpositive is not intended for projection.

**A reduction print is a positive made in a smaller format than the original.
FILM MATERIALS PRODUCED IN THE FILM-TO-FILM COPYING PROCESS

Original | Preservation Masters | Access Copies*
--- | --- | ---
Silent Print | Negative** | Viewing Print
 | | Answer Print
Sound Print | Picture Negative | Composite Answer Print
| Optical Track Negative | Composite Viewing Print
| Magnetic Track (optional) | | |
Silent Negative | Duplicating Positive*** | Dupe Negative** |
| Answer Print**** | | Viewing Print
A and B Rolls (positive) with separate Magnetic Sound Track | Picture Negative | Composite Answer Print
| Optical Track Negative | Composite Viewing Print
| Magnetic Track (optional) | |

*An acceptable answer print may be used as viewing print. Chart does not include video copies.
**Usually called internegative for color.
***Usually called fine grain master for black and white and interpositive for color.
****This answer print is used to determine the timing for the duplicating positive.
The FIAF Technical Commission Preservation Best Practice recommends that archives set up policies and procedures for the most suitable elements for retention and deaccessioning of materials in their collections. As the Commission stated, what constitutes the most suitable elements will depend on the production process used for each work, but they will ideally include “image and sound negatives, analogue or digital sound elements, first generation duplicates, digital master files, and, if possible, a presentation copy (i.e. a print or digital cinema package).”

The golden rule, however, is to keep original elements whenever possible and “unless their instability becomes a danger to the rest of the collection; this is because improvements in preservation and restoration techniques may lead to better results in the future” (2009, p.2). The Commission also added that while “master elements are irreplaceable (or replaceable only at high cost, or at the expense of a loss of quality),” access elements “can be handled without endangering the existence and the quality of the work.” (2009, p.2).

In determining the most suitable elements for retention and deaccessioning it is important to consider that while some elements, such as the original cut negative and the masters, have an “absolute” value, others have a more “relative” value, that is, that it would be considered of lesser value or lower retention priority when the other elements in the chain are available and complete, but that might become important if they are the only element available. For example, if the original cut negative of a film was lost, and only a release print is available as reference to how that film looked and sounded, then that release print would be considered a master.

**Possibility of reobtaining deaccessioned elements from retained materials**

Having the original edited materials, all subsequent intermediate, finishing and distribution elements should be re-obtained. From the A&B rolls, an interpositive can be produced, and from an interpositive, an internegative, and finally the prints. From
the magnetic sound masters, new optical tracks can be made and combined with the image internegative to create the final composite prints for projection. However, it is important to keep in mind that re-making deaccessioned elements will cost money. Additionally, and most importantly, with filmmaking being such a changing industry, it is important to consider that filmstock necessary to produce any of these elements may become unavailable in the future. For example, Kodak just announced that it is discontinuing certain types of 16mm color internegative filmstock.\(^\text{11}\) In the same line, the FIAF Commission mentioned the obsolescence of film processes, such as colour and sound systems (2009, p.2).

**The uniqueness of the materials**

Unique materials have a higher value and retention priority than materials that are held by several repositories, therefore it was key for my recommendations to know whether any archive other than SCARC hold materials related to “Farmers.” Since the film was broadcast by PBS NOVA, I contacted the PBS Director of the Media Library, Maureen Harlow, with this inquiry. She responded (email, November 29, 2020) that PBS holds a broadcast master, no film masters. This suggests that SCARC is the only archive safeguarding the film production elements related to “Farmers.”

**Elements typically retained by experienced archivists at other institutions**

I’ve consulted film archivists Andrea Leigh from the Library of Congress, Brian Meacham from Yale University Film Archive, and Bill Brand, artist, film preservationist and educator at the New York University’s Moving Image Archiving and Preservation program for input on their retention practices. I’ve compiled their responses on the comparative table below.

\(^\text{11}\) See [https://www.kodak.com/content/products-brochures/Film/PCN-120120a-Disc-2273-3273-16MM-FC.pdf](https://www.kodak.com/content/products-brochures/Film/PCN-120120a-Disc-2273-3273-16MM-FC.pdf)
The physical condition of the materials

The physical condition of the materials is an important factor in the decision-making process when it comes to retaining and deselecting materials, but they are more determining when materials are severely degraded or are damaged beyond repair. As seen in the findings section, materials in this set present some decay but not as severe as to merit immediate deaccession. In cases like this, condition often serves as a tiebreaker.

Retention priority

As mentioned earlier, I’ve assigned to each element in the set one of the three levels of retention priority, high, moderate, or low. “High” means the element must be retained because it’s the original cut negative, a master, or an element that would be needed for the digitization of the film or for making new preservation copies in the future. This category also includes those elements that are unclear in some way and that, therefore, would be cautious to keep until clarification is achieved. “Moderate” means the elements whose retention would be optional, as long as all the elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Andrea Leigh</th>
<th>Brian Meacham</th>
<th>Bill Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential to keep</td>
<td>- A&amp;B cut negatives&lt;br&gt;- Interpositives&lt;br&gt;- Composite prints</td>
<td>- A&amp;B cut negatives&lt;br&gt;- Internegatives&lt;br&gt;- Interpositives&lt;br&gt;- Magnetic soundtracks&lt;br&gt;- Optical soundtracks</td>
<td>- A&amp;B cut negatives&lt;br&gt;- Magnetic mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to keep in case other elements get damaged or lost</td>
<td>- Workprint&lt;br&gt;- Titles&lt;br&gt;- Other production elements</td>
<td>- Trims and outtakes (depending on the value of the content)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would most probably not keep</td>
<td>- Negative trims and outtakes (unless deemed of particular value)</td>
<td>- Workprint (when unable to keep everything)</td>
<td>- Workprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
deemed of high priority are kept. Their absence shouldn’t compromise the making of new preservation copies in the future. However, they could be kept for cautiousness. And “low” priority means elements that are often discarded by the producers or the labs after they serve their purpose, therefore, their absence shouldn’t compromise the making of new preservation copies in the future as long as all elements deemed of high priority are kept.

For each category, I listed the element type, an explanation why that element was placed in that category and listed the name of the element as it has been listed on the preliminary inventory list, or the information on that element gathered from inspection if the element was not listed individually.

**HIGH PRIORITY**

- **A&B Rolls**: Are the original edited negative.
  - Original A/B Negative Reel 1 (2)
  - Original A/B Negative Reel 2 (2)
- **Interpositive**: It’s the edited and color-corrected master. Because it’s color-corrected, it’s a more ‘finished’ element than the edited negative. In addition, the interpositive is needed for making new internegatives and video transfers.
  - AB Master Positive - Short Version (2)
- **Internegative / CRI**: It’s the edited and color corrected element needed for making composite prints. If these were deaccessioned, another internegative can be obtained from the interpositive, but it would cost money. Further, and most importantly, we know that the titles on the internegative and the CRI is the same (font 2) but are unsure about that on the interpositive. Because we have two different titles, we should clarify this to ensure these internegatives were made from the interpositive we have. Another key reason is that the
interpositive was labeled “short version” but its length indicates otherwise. As we cannot be sure this is the interpositive for the short version, for the short version we should consider the internegative as the “master” element. Thus, I would retain them all, as well as the optical soundtracks they came with.

- A Track #2 – Accession 2000:100, can 1
- CRI #1 1-16 A Track #2 - with optical track (2) - Accession 2000:100, box 11, item “m #19482; Oregon State Univ. "Farmers of the Sea Reel 2" CRI #1 16 A Track # 2”
- FA8 Original Dupe Negative; B Track short version (2)

- Magnetic sound master, long version: It’s the final edited sound product. It is also preferred for preservation and digitization because it has a greater fidelity and dynamic range compared to optical soundtrack.
  - FA 12 Sound Master (2)

- Magnetic full mix, short version: It’s the mix of all the soundtracks at their correct volumes, together with any equalization, filtering, and effecting for the desired end result. The final mix soundtrack is used by the labs to transfer to an optical sound negative.
  - Magnetic Full Mix - FA026, short version (30’) (1)

- Optical track negatives:
  - 16 A Track #2 (1)
  - A Track-Reels 1 & 2 (Note: "Do not use per customer request") (2)
  - Optical Sound Reel - Original B Track
  - Original B-Track Reel #2 Dupe Negative

- Title trims original master positive: Based on the label, these fragments are trims of the titles used for the original master positive. I would keep them until it can be confirmed whether the font 2 was the final for the 60-minute version
(which will be possible after taking a second look at the titles on the A&B rolls and the interpositive). If the font on the A&B rolls and interpositive is font 2, it would be safe to deaccession these trims.

- Original Master Positive B title (5)

- **Composite prints:** Created for checking quality during the editing process of the film (called answer prints, trial prints, or check prints) and, once approved, for distribution (release prints). In “Farmers,” two versions were produced for different outlets. The 60-minute version for broadcast on the PBS NOVA show, and the 30-minute for prints. The two 60-minute composite prints in the set are not identical, since one was made with the font 1 and the other with the font 2. This might indicate they are answer prints, although only the producer would be able to confirm this conjecture. Since the producer was unable to explain the two fonts, I would keep both until it can be confirmed whether the font 2 was the final for this version (which will be possible after taking a second look at the titles on the A&B rolls and the interpositive). For the 30-minute version there are also two prints. They have the same titles (font 2) and duration, but one of them has greater wear and a splice near the end, which indicates either that it was edited or repaired. The only way of confirming whether they are duplicates would be to visualize and compare them shot by shot. However, I would keep both even if they were duplicates. Because prints are the access copies, and thus wear out, and get damaged from the projection, archives often keep more than one copy as a backup.

- Can 13, LS01.10.08.05, 60-minute, Reel 1
- Can 15, LS01.10.08.07, 60-minute Reel 2
- Can 14, LS01.10.08.06, 60-minute, Reel 1
- Can 12, LS01.10.08.04, 60-minute Reel 2
MODERATE PRIORITY

- **Magnetic soundtracks:** The editing magtracks are the sound counterpart to the workprint, the sound elements that are edited with the workprint. When a master is available, retention of these editing magtracks would be optional. In this case, there are two magnetic tracks that seem to have been used with a workprint to make a new optical “A” track. Having a sound master for the 60-minute version, a mix for the short, and the optical tracks, SCARC should be “covered” if digitization of the sound elements is needed in the future. But if SCARC decided to keep these magtracks, I would keep the workprint as well.
  - Audio #2 MAG goes with FA 6 Workprint (2)
  - Original COM TEC-used to make new Optical A, Track 2 (1)

- **Negative trims and outtakes:** They are footage shot but not used, and trims from edited shots. Archives tend to keep them if the final film is an important production, or if the content is unique in some way. With the improvement of the restoration techniques, it is increasingly common for producers to seek for never-seen-before material for re-releasing classic films digitally restored with bonus material, for releasing new editions, etc. However, this is more frequent with classic or popular cult films such as “Star Wars”.12 Predicting whether the outtakes in “Farmers” will ever be requested for research or inclusion in a new film production is impossible. Usage statistics would help guide this decision, but usage of these materials might have been scarce or non-existent since no description of their content was previously available. Were outtakes in similar productions been requested for any of these purposes before? In “Farmers,”

---

the volume of trims and outtakes is substantial (several boxes). Deaccessioning them would be a valid course of action should space became a pressing issue. Having the A&B rolls, the interpositive, and the internegatives for the long and short versions, the absence of these trims and outtakes shouldn’t compromise the making of new prints of the film in the future.

- Accession 2003:083, box 4
- Accession 2003:083, box 5
- Accession 2003:083, box 6
- Accession 2003:083, box 8
- Accession 2003:083, box 9
- Accession 2003:083, box 16

LOW PRIORITY

- **Workprints:** Workprints are usually discarded once the negative is cut/edited. Since we have the A&B rolls, and prints for access copy, we shouldn’t need to retain them. Retaining them would be optional.
  - Original A/B Track FA182 (1)
  - Original 188 (Addison Lawrense-Texas shrimp)
  - Original A/B 184, 09/25/85
  - Workprint Sync with Audio FA 6 used to make optical A track 2, 11/16/84 (1)
  - Farmers of the Sea - 1 reel in 1 canister (workprint short version)
  - Farmers of the Sea - 2 reels in 2 film boxes (workprints) 1994, FA011
  - Farmers of the Sea - 2 reels in 2 film boxes (workprints) 1994, FA190
Recommendations for better preserving the retained film elements

Because film elements expel gasses, they need to be stored in containers that allow them to breathe. A great amount of the elements in this set were stored inside plastic bags that impeded them to breathe, and, as a result, some elements were smelly. If left unchanged, this would accelerate the vinegar syndrome. Therefore, I would recommend removing the plastic bags from the elements that are retained, most especially to higher priority elements such as the A&B rolls and the masters. Additionally, and most especially for the elements that are already smelly, I would recommend wrapping them instead in buffered tissue paper in the can to absorb some of the acids to slow down the decay as well as prevent contaminating other materials in the container. Note that the tissue paper must be approved for film-based photographic materials.\(^\text{13}\)

In addition to removing the plastic bags and wrapping the smelly elements in the paper tissue, preservation could be bettered if elements are rehoused. Elements stored in rusty or damaged tin cans, as well as in shipping plastic or cardboard cans, would be the priority for rehousing, alongside the A&B rolls and picture and sound masters. Elements stored in tin cans in good condition could continue to be so until rehousing is possible.

Furthermore, the negative trims and outtakes were not only stored in plastic bags, but many rolls came with a piece of paper attached with the shot’s key number, secured with a rubber band. Both the rubber and the paper may deteriorate onto the film,\(^\text{14}\) so, should these materials be retained, I would recommend removing them as well. This would be done safely, without losing the shot’s information, since I

\(^\text{13}\) McShea, Megan, “Guidelines for Processing Collections with Audiovisual Material,” 2015
\(^\text{14}\) See [https://everpresent.com/8mm-16mm-film-reel-preservation/](https://everpresent.com/8mm-16mm-film-reel-preservation/)
transferred this information to the paper tape I used to secure the rolls during inspection.

Last, for long-term preservation, SCARC should consider duplicating the A&B Rolls, which are suffering from vinegar syndrome. Since it is not possible to stop or revert vinegar syndrome from degrading the film, making new duplicates of these materials in film might be the better way of ensuring long-term preservation and access to this content. If needed, any duplication of intermediate materials would be done from these new and healthy A&B Rolls.

**Deselected materials and new collection creation**

Following the submission of my report in December 2020, in early 2021 the SCARC archivists decided to move forward with deselection of film elements that fell in the categories of moderate and low priority (remix mag tracks, negative trims and outtakes, and workprints) and to create a new collection with the retained production elements of “Farmers of the Sea,” entitled the Farmers of the Sea Motion Picture Film Production, 1983-1984.

I separated the elements meant for retention from those meant for deselection and, following my recommendations for improved long-term preservation, rehoused all the retained elements to polypropylene film cans. In addition, once the elements were rehoused, I separated those suffering from vinegar syndrome from the healthier to avoid contamination. As a result of the deselection and rehousing processes, the initial collection that extended over 11 boxes and 7 canisters, now fits into 5 boxes, and it is better described for increased discoverability.

Elizabeth Nielsen and I work together to co-create the finding aid for this new collection. A draft was sent out for review to the SCARC department on May 27, 2021, and the project completed on June 2, with the finding aid being opened for research.
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Appendix

The following attached documents are email correspondence with Jim Larison. Emails are ordered by date, from first to last.
Dear Valeria;

I had no idea I would be dealing with such a knowledgeable person. Frankly, I'm impressed. I spent nearly 30 years making films for Oregon State University and The National Geographic Society. At no time in my long history, did I ever talk with a person at OSU who understood anything about negatives and internegatives and the process behind making films. I don't know where you learned all this but kudos to you.

That said, let's see if I can answer your questions. Yes, we shot Kodak 7252 negative, 16mm film in an Arriflex SR-2 camera in the field. That film was processed and the negative was copied to 16mm positive, what we called “work print.” The workprint had the print through edge numbers from the original so the two could always be married together in post production. We edited the positive images on a Steenbeck editing machine. In the laboratory, the edited work print was used as a template to match against the original negative stock. The corresponding negative images were pulled together into two reels of film with alternating shots, one on each reel. So there would be one positive workprint and two negative rolls for each film. Then, an internegative of the two negative rolls was made and this would become the “final” version of the film. Copies of this “final” would be made on tape (for broadcast) and on positive film as release prints (for projection). You should have all the intermediate products in your hands. This would probably include separate sound tracks. We recorded sound separately on a Nagra IV tape recorder on 1/4 inch stock. These sounds were transferred to sprocketed magnetic 16mm film so that it could be edited on the Steenbeck also. The “mix” was the composite of at least 8 individual 16mm sound tracks. You should have that mix also.

We made two versions of the NOVA show. A 59 minute version for broadcast on the NOVA show and a 30-minute version to be made into projection-quality prints. These were two versions of the same film, assembled for different purposes.

All these materials are, in my opinion, valuable as a record of what was done, what we said, and what we photographed. I would hate to see any of it disappear. If for whatever reason, you decide you do not wish to store any of these materials any longer, I'd like them returned to me with a letter saying something to the effect the university is relinquishing ownership of these materials to me.

I produced a number of films for OSU including, Mammals of the Sea, Estuary, Columbia’s Link with the Sea, Oregon’s Oceans, Saving the Great Whales, and others. You should find all these materials in your archives.

If I can be of further assistance, just let me know.

Jim

On Jul 10, 2020, at 9:55 AM, Davila Gronros, Valeria E <valeria.davilagronros@oregonstate.edu> wrote:

Dear Jim,

Thanks for reaching out! I was just writing to you in another email.

As I mentioned your son, John, I’m working on a collection of film production elements of the film “Framers of the Sea” (1984) from the Oregon Sea Grant film collection. The collection I’m inspecting contains several film production elements, and I have been tasked with determining which of the elements we should retain and which, if any, we could potentially dispose of.

Afraid of disposing of any essential (irreplaceable) element, I was hoping to ask you questions about the film and the production elements. Some questions I have are:
VERSIONS OF THE FILM

SCARC has recently digitized a U-matic copy of "Farmers" (can be seen in the following link https://media.oregonstate.edu/media/t/0_dr2szawh) that we are using as reference, meaning, we are considering this copy to be the "final version" of the film. Because of its duration, I think this U-matic copy is the "International Media Assoc./NOVA (5-dupes) (58:00) (Inventory numbers on spines)" on the attached inventory.

So far, so good. But, I came across some materials labeled as a "short version" (~30 minutes). I've highlighted them on cian on the inventory in case you want to check them out. On the same inventory there's a "Farmers of the Sea, circa 1985; 31 min" VHS copy listed, which I've highlighted in yellow.

This sparks the questions:

- Are there two versions of the film? If so, is there a reason for that?
- Is the digitized version the "final version" of Farmers?
- If the digitized version is indeed the final version, it would be key to retain the film element that was used to produce this copy. Do you remember which film element was it? (was it an internegative? was it a duplicate negative? other?)

THE CAMERA ORIGINAL MATERIALS

In the collection, I have reversal materials (positive image, black edges) and color negatives... Reversals are usually the camera originals, however, there is also a kind of reversal film stock that is used for printing. While I’m inclined to think that you used color negative film stock as your capturing material, I’m wondering:

- Are the reversals in this collection the original camera materials? Otherwise, did you use color negative film stock as your camera original material?
- If the color negatives are the camera originals, what were the reversals materials produced for?

IMAGE AND SOUND CAPTURED SEPARATELY

All indicates that you captured image and sound separately, the audio materials being full-coated magnetic tracks from which sound negatives were created. This is how I imagine the workflow for Farmers was, with the resulting product being a composite print with image and sound (but please correct me if I’m mistaken):

<Outlook-lruxflnc.png> <Outlook-ejh0rjy2.png>

These are all my questions for now, but —if that’s fine with you— I might contact you again with more questions as I continue my inspection.

Thank you so much!

Best,

Valeria.

Valeria Dávila Gronros | Library Diversity Scholar
Oregon State University Libraries and Press

Oregon State University in Corvallis, OR is located within the traditional homelands of the Mary's River or Ampinefu Band of Kalapuya. Following the Willamette Valley Treaty of 1855 (Kalapuya etc. Treaty), Kalapuya people were forcibly removed to reservations in Western Oregon. Today, living descendants of these people are a part of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon (https://www.grandronde.org) and the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians (https://ctsi.nsn.us).

De: James Larison <jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com>
Enviado: viernes, 10 de julio de 2020 8:56
Para: Davila Gronros, Valeria E <valeria.davilagronros@oregonstate.edu>
Asunto: Re: [College of Liberal Arts] Jim Larison
Dear Valeria;

John tells me you need so help. What's up?

James R. Larison PhD
Retired Professor
24665 SW Airport Ave.
Philomath, OR
97370
541-231-6816

<FV P 185 container list.doc><general_motion_picture_duplicating_process.jpg>
More questions on the Farmers of the Sea films

Davila Gronros, Valeria E <valeria.davilagronros@oregonstate.edu>
Fri 25-Sep-20 15:37
To: James Larison <jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com>

Hello, Jim! — It’s been so long, I hope you’re doing well. At least we’ve had some rain to clean the smoke from the wildfires.

I’m contacting you again because I finished with the inspection of the Farmers of the Sea materials and I’m puzzled with some of the materials and was hoping you could help me. Below, is the Excel spreadsheet where I entered all the info of the films as I was inspecting them:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1AdSjDDI4VR9lItxFMrwYoIdnzLGJYGZKgojiBu2bws/edit#gid=54942514

The table can be a bit overwhelming so allow me to explain the logic of it: there is a black row separating elements from different boxes, and all consecutive elements colored the same way mean they came together in the same can. Also, in the column called “Element Type” in the “Copy of sheet 1” tab, I entered information on the type of element but many are questions in red because I was not sure what they were and was hoping for your insight.
Truly everything helps!

As you know, I’ve been tasked with determining if any of these elements can be deaccessioned from the collection and want to make sure I’m not suggesting to deaccession anything essential. There’s still a discussion regarding what is essential to keep, and I understand that this depends on the materials available in the collection, but I’m thinking that by

- "essentials" I mean the original image negatives and audio recordings, the original cut negative — A&B rolls in this case —, the interpositives and internegatives, masters, and at least one release print;
- "non-essentials" I mean trims, outtakes, workprints, answer prints, check prints, and materials made as an intermediate material, meaning for obtaining another final material (and here I’m in trouble with the magnetic tracks which, as you explained in the email, were made from the original 1/4 tracks so the audio could be edited with the 16mm film, but are not the final sound element).

Besides identifying many of them, I’m also having a hard time “matching” or pairing up the corresponding image and sound elements together, and I was wondering if you could assist me with that as well, especially because I’d like to determine if any materials are missing from the collection (for instance, if the sound for both the A & B rolls are there, if the optical soundtrack of the final version of the film — both the long and short version — is there, and so on).

**Some concrete questions:**

1) You commented that you made A&B rolls from the negatives with the help of a working print, "So there would be one positive workprint and two negative rolls for each film."

I’d like to identify this set you mention here, the A&B rolls, the corresponding working print, and their corresponding magnetic and/or optical sound element. And I’m guessing I should have the same or a similar set of elements but for the short version? This is what I have so far:

**Regarding the A&B rolls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Job #</th>
<th>Other Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Original A/B Negative Reel 1 (2) Job #19481; Part A: Farmers R-1</td>
<td>- Eastman ECN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Original A/B Negative Reel 1 (2) Job #19481; B Roll</td>
<td>- Eastman ECN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Original A/B Negative Reel 2 (2) Job #19482; Reel 2; A/B NEG.; A Roll</td>
<td>- Kodak ECN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Original A/B Negative Reel 2 (2) Job #19482; Reel 2; A/B NEG.; B Roll</td>
<td>- Kodak ECN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have 4 reels listed in the SCARC inventory as being the A&B rolls, and each of them is ~1000 feet long. If the four of them pertain to the same final version, that makes 4,000 feet of film. Are these the original cut negatives and is it okay that I have 4 of them instead of 2? Or are they duplicated?
And I’m guessing that a duplicate of the A&B rolls was used to make the short version? Or was the short version made from a print? Do you see anything in the spreadsheet that could be “original” or “most early generation” element for the short version?

**Sound recordings**

Also, these are image-only, so there should be matching sound recordings, right? Should the corresponding audio for these be a magnetic track or an optical sound? And how many? One? two? Was wondering if:

- Are the two reels "FA 12 Sound Master (2) - NOVA Master English" of 1,050 feet each (~30’) the full mix for the long version?
- Is the "Magnetic Full Mix - FA026, short version (30’) (1)" reel of ~1,090 feet the one for the short version, as the description claims?

**Workprint**

Which workprint from the spreadsheet you think was the one used to cut the A&B negatives? On the inventory there is a ~1,080 feet “Farmers of the Sea - 1 reel in 1 canister (workprint short version)” for the short version, but shouldn’t I have 2,000 feet workprint for the long version?

But the only (identified) workprints are number 7 below which has ~960 feet and comes with corresponding audio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workprint</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Workprint Sync with Audio FA 6 used to make optical A track 2, 11/16/84 (1)</td>
<td>Job #19482, FA006, Workprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Audio #2 MAG goes with FA 6 Workprint (2)</td>
<td>Job #19482, FA006, #2 MAG (341/12 53994 13 2 6203)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...and these two, where the number 1 is ~450 feet and the number 2 is ~1,000 feet (but in the observations for number 2 I put that the titles have that font that was not used in the final version of the film, so I’m guessing this one is not a workprint of the final long version?)

2) Then, you commented that an internegative of the two negative rolls was made and this would become the “final” version of the film. Copies of this “final” would be made on tape (for broadcast) and on positive film as release prints (for projection). Which ones do you think are the release prints for each version of the film?

The reel "FA8 Original Dupe Negative; B Track short version (2)," is ~1,010 feet long and came with an optical sound, could be the short version internegative but it says "B track" which makes me think that either another roll is missing or the person who processed this collection misidentified it?

**Release print 59-minute version** (should be ~2,124 feet long according to this feet per minute table)

- The two composites “Farmers of the Sea Part 1 (1 of 2) Reel 1” + “Farmers of the Sea Part 2 (2 of 2) Reel 2,” which sum 2,060 feet could be for the long version—but the font on the title DOES NOT COINCIDE with that of the NOVA broadcasting version.

- These other two composites could also be the release print for the long version: “LS01.10.08.06 - Reel 1” + "LS01.10.08.04 - Reel 2," which together they sum 1,980 feet.

**Release print 30-minute version** (should be ~1,080 feet long according to this feet per minute table)

- Is this the release print for the short version?: "LS01.10.08.03" (~1,070 feet)

**SOUND**

Regarding sound, you commented that you "recorded sound separately on a Nagra IV tape recorder on 1/4 inch stock. These sounds were transferred to sprocketed magnetic 16mm film so that it could be edited on the Steenbeck also. The “mix” was the composite of at least 8 individual 16mm soundtracks."

I was unable to inspect the 1/4 tracks because of lacking playback equipment, so I’ve only inspected the magnetic and optical 16mm film sound elements. I have like 11 sound elements in 16mm but many are—supposedly—internegatives and masters, so I’m not sure I have those 8 elements you mentioned.
Among the 1/4 elements I couldn’t inspect, I have these:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOVA-Farmers of the Sea-tapes 1 &amp; 2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOVA-Farmers of the Sea-tapes 1 &amp; 2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>National Geographic-Farmers of the Sea &quot;P.T. Sync added during transfer,&quot; 6/6/84 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>National Geographic-Farmers of the Sea &quot;P.T. Sync added during transfer,&quot; 6/6/84 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Final Mix-Tails Out Pilot Safety-FA 017, 3/5/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Music Cuts-Tradewinds 3 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apologies for the kilometric email, your help is extremely appreciated!

Valeria.

Valeria Dávila Gronros | Library Diversity Scholar
Oregon State University Libraries and Press

🌟 On vacation through August and September 🌟

Oregon State University in Corvallis, OR is located within the traditional homelands of the Mary’s River or Ampinefu Band of Kalapuya. Following the Willamette Valley Treaty of 1855 (Kalapuya etc. Treaty), Kalapuya people were forcibly removed to reservations in Western Oregon. Today, living descendants of these people are a part of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon (https://www.grandronde.org) and the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians (https://ctslnsn.us).

De: James Larison <jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com>
Enviado: viernes, 10 de julio de 2020 11:54
Para: Davila Gronros, Valeria E <valeria.davilagronros@oregonstate.edu>
Asunto: Re: [College of Liberal Arts] Jim Larison

Dear Valeria;

I had no idea I would be dealing with such a knowledgeable person. Frankly, I’m impressed. I spent nearly 30 years making films for Oregon State University and The National Geographic Society. At no time in my long history, did I ever talk with a person at OSU who understood anything about negatives and internegatives and the process behind making films. I don’t know where you learned all this but kudos to you.

That said, let’s see if I can answer your questions. Yes, we shot Kodak 7252 negative, 16mm film in an Arriflex SR-2 camera in the field. That film was processed and the negative was copied to 16mm positive, what we called “work print.” The workprint had the print through edge numbers from the original so the two could always be married together in post production. We edited the positive images on a Steenbeck editing machine. In the laboratory, the edited work print was used as a template to match against the original negative stock. The corresponding negative images were pulled together into two reels of film with alternating shots, one on each reel. So there would be one positive workprint and two negative rolls for each film. Then, an internegative of the two negative rolls was made and this would become the “final” version of the film. Copies of this “final” would be made on tape (for broadcast) and on positive film as release prints (for projection). You should have all the intermediate products in your hands. This would probably include separate sound tracks. We recorded sound separately on a Nagra IV tape recorder on 1/4 inch stock. These sounds were transferred to sprocketed magnetic 16mm film so that it could be edited on the Steenbeck also. The “mix” was the composite of at least 8 individual 16mm sound tracks. You should have that mix also.

We made two versions of the NOVA show. A 59 minute version for broadcast on the NOVA show and a 30-minute version to be made into projection-quality prints. These were two versions of the same film, assembled for different purposes.

All these materials are, in my opinion, valuable as a record of what was done, what we said, and what we photographed. I would hate to see any of it disappear. If for whatever reason, you decide you do not wish to store any of these materials any longer, I’d like them returned to me with a letter saying something to the effect the university is relinquishing ownership of these materials to me.
Dear Jim,

Thanks for reaching out! I was just writing to you in another email.

As I mentioned your son, John, I’m working on a collection of film production elements of the film “Farmers of the Sea” (1984) from the Oregon Sea Grant film collection. The collection I’m inspecting contains several film production elements, and I have been tasked with determining which of the elements we should retain and which, if any, we could potentially dispose of.

Afraid of disposing of any essential (irreplaceable) element, I was hoping to ask you questions about the film and the production elements. Some questions I have are:

**VERSIONS OF THE FILM**

SCARC has recently digitized a U-matic copy of "Farmers" (can be seen in the following link https://media.oregonstate.edu/media/t/0_dr2szawh) that we are using as reference, meaning, we are considering this copy to be the "final version" of the film. Because of its duration, I think this U-matic copy is the "International Media Assoc./NOVA (5-dupes) (58:00) (Inventory numbers on spines)" on the attached inventory.

So far, so good. But, I came across some materials labeled as a "short version" (~30 minutes). I’ve highlighted them on cian on the inventory in case you want to check them out. On the same inventory there’s a "Farmers of the Sea, circa 1985; 31 min" VHS copy listed, which I’ve highlighted in yellow.

This sparks the questions:

- Are there two versions of the film? If so, is there a reason for that?
- Is the digitized version the “final version” of Farmers?
- If the digitized version is indeed the final version, it would be key to retain the film element that was used to produce this copy. Do you remember which film element was it? (was it an internegative? was it a duplicate negative? other?)

**THE CAMERA ORIGINAL MATERIALS**

In the collection, I have reversal materials (positive image, black edges) and color negatives... Reversals are usually the camera originals, however, there is also a kind of reversal film stock that is used for printing. While I’m inclined to think that you used color negative film stock as your capturing material, I’m wondering:

- Are the reversals in this collection the original camera materials? Otherwise, did you use color negative film stock as your camera original material?
- If the color negatives are the camera originals, what were the reversals materials produced for?

**IMAGE AND SOUND CAPTURED SEPARATELY**

All indicates that you captured image and sound separately, the audio materials being full-coated magnetic tracks from which sound negatives were created. This is how I imagine the workflow for
Farmers was, with the resulting product being a composite print with image and sound (but please correct me if I’m mistaken):

<Outlook-lruxflnc.png> <Outlook-ejh0rjy2.png>

These are all my questions for now, but—if that’s fine with you—I might contact you again with more questions as I continue my inspection.

Thank you so much!

Best,

Valeria.

—

Valeria Dávila Gronros | Library Diversity Scholar
Oregon State University Libraries and Press

Oregon State University in Corvallis, OR is located within the traditional homelands of the Mary's River or Ampinefu Band of Kalapuya. Following the Willamette Valley Treaty of 1855 (Kalapuya etc. Treaty), Kalapuya people were forcibly removed to reservations in Western Oregon. Today, living descendants of these people are a part of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon (https://www.grandronde.org) and the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians (https://ctsi.nsn.us).

---

De: James Larison <jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com>
Enviado: viernes, 10 de julio de 2020 8:56
Para: Davila Gronros, Valeria E <valeria.davilagronros@oregonstate.edu>
Asunto: Re: [College of Liberal Arts] Jim Larison

Dear Valeria;

John tells me you need some help. What’s up?

James R. Larison PhD
Retired Professor
24665 SW Airport Ave.
Philomath, OR
97370
541-231-6816

<FV P 185 container list.doc> <general_motion_picture_duplicating_process.jpg>
Re: More questions on the Farmers of the Sea films

James Larison <jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com>
Sun 27-Sep-20 9:08
To: Davila Gronros, Valeria E <valeria.davilagronros@oregonstate.edu>
[This email originated from outside of OSU. Use caution with links and attachments.]

Hi VALERIA:

I was able to open the file. It looks to me like this material is what the lab must have sent back to OSU for storage. When films like these were made, I would send to the lab the original, exposed-but-not-developed film. They would develop it, make a workprint copy, send the workprint to me and hold the original in their vault. At the end of the project (after the film was completed) they would send the pre-print materials back to me. They would never hold on to workprint, so I am a bit confused why some of the elements on your log are listed as workprint. You should have (assuming this material all came from the lab) just ECN original negative, together with the intermediate products and masters of the finished films. You should not have any sound elements other than the mix master and intermediate products. In other words, all of the materials (with a very few exceptions) would be considered original and irreplaceable. The work prints and sound tapes would never have been held by the lab. and therefore would not appear in these boxes. If you have work print or original 1/4 inch sound tracks, then you must have material in your possession from the lab and also from Sea Grant. I’d have to see these materials to know for sure what we are looking at. But in either case, the only way to ever access the original film would be to have the workprint to view. (You can’t look at original negative ECN without damaging it and you can’t tell what you are looking at anyway because it is a negative material. You must have the workprint to view.) So, I am afraid if you decide to keep the original irreplaceable material (the original ECN) you also have to keep the workprint or you would never be able to tell what you have in the can.

I would argue that all of this footage is irreplaceable and valuable and should be kept.

So if you have specific questions about line items, I might be able to help.

Jim

James Larison, PhD
Retired Professor
24665 SW Airport Ave.
Philomath, OR 97370
jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com
On Dec 23, 2020, at 5:51 PM, Davila Gronros, Valeria E <valeria.davilagronros@oregonstate.edu> wrote:

Hello, Jim — I hope this email finds you very well.

The last time I contacted you I was creating a visual catalog of the "Farmers of the Sea" film production elements, which I promised I’d send to you as soon as it was ready. I’m sharing this link where you can access it:

[ Farmers of the Sea – Inspection data - With Images (2).pdf ]

I still have doubts about some elements and was hoping you'd be able to help me a bit more now that we have this visual reference for the elements.

**Film duplication and finishing process for the long and short versions**

I’m trying to make sense of the elements to ‘reconstruct' the post-production process for the 59-minute and the 30-minute versions.

There is only one edited negative in the set (A&B rolls), so I deduce the 59-minute version was created from this assemble, and the shorter 30-minute version was created later and probably from an intermediate element.

I simply do not remember how this was done. I produced more than 30 films over the years and I cannot remember how we did this one (the 30-minute version). It sounds reasonable that we might have recut an intermediate rather than recut the original A@B rolls, but I just can’t remember.

In fact, there is a master positive (interpositive) in the set labeled "short version" which seems to be the intermediate element from which the short version was created. An internegative was created afterward from this interpositive to print 30-minute composite projection prints. Does this sound right to you?

I’d have to say, this makes sense.

There are no master positives nor dupe negatives for the 59-minute version in the set but there is a Color Reversal Internegative (CRI), which is a kind of internegative that is obtained directly from the cut negative (skipping the interpositive step). Do you remember doing a CRI for the long version of the film?

No I don't remember. The creation of a CRI and other intermediate products would have been handled at the laboratory. I would never have seen these and was probably unaware of their creation. A lab would have taken
my cut A@B rolls, cut the negative to match, created any intermediate products, then provided me with a check print. I would have never seen the intermediates and probably didn’t follow this process too closely. The only indication, I would have had about any and all intermediate products would have been a line item on a lab bill.

Also, do you remember whether you created the broadcast videotape for NOVA from the CRI or from the master positive that is labeled as “short version”?

The transfer from internegative (or CRI) was done at WGBH in Boston. We provided the intermediate to them and they did the transfer to their own specs. We had nothing really to do with the video transfer, other than being provided with a Master Version of the show as broadcast.

Two different fonts for the title

There are two titles for the film with different fonts. The images below are included in the catalog, but I thought it would be easier to have them at hand.

I simply can’t explain the two fonts. I remember that the third title, (over the fishing nets) was the final for broadcast. But the other two are lost to the fog of history.

There are workprints and 60-min composite prints with both fonts. Then the workprint, the master positive, and the dupe negative for the short version all have the same font, the one that appears first below.

Do you remember why two fonts? Did you made composite tests with both fonts and then decided on one of them (the one that appears first below), and made the short version with this font as well?

For the broadcast version (at least the version I’ve seen), however, it seems that you used a third font (see third image below, which is a capture of the video).

I suspect the title image with the third font may have been added in the Video transfer process at WGBH.

Any information on why there are two different titles, and whether one of those is the “final” one would be much appreciated.

<IMG_E9673 copy.jpg>
<IMG_9681 copy.jpg>
<Screen Shot 2020-10-30 at 12.17.13 PM.png>

Thank you again for your help and patience.

Season’s Greetings to you and your family, and very best wishes for the New Year,

Valeria.

So, Valeria, I’m sorry I can’t be of more help. It was just so long ago that I did this film. The only way I might be able to sort through it all would be to see the elements, but I’m not even sure that would be sufficient to jog my memory. If I were you, I’d keep all the internegatives and CRI’s and any video masters plus original negative film.

Jim
From: James Larison <jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 27, 2020 9:09
To: Davila Gronros, Valeria E <valeria.davilagronros@oregonstate.edu>
Subject: Re: More questions on the Farmers of the Sea films

[This email originated from outside of OSU. Use caution with links and attachments.]

Hi VALERIA:

I was able to open the file. It looks to me like this material is what the lab must have sent back to OSU for storage. When films like these were made, I would send to the lab the original, exposed-but-not-developed film. They would develop it, make a workprint copy, send the workprint to me and hold the original in their vault. At the end of the project (after the film was completed) they would send the pre-print materials back to me. They would never hold on to workprint, so I am a bit confused why some of the elements on your log are listed as workprint. You should have (assuming this material all came from the lab) just ECN original negative, together with the intermediate products and masters of the finished films. You should not have any sound elements other than the mix master and intermediate products. In other words, all of the materials (with a very few exceptions) would be considered original and irreplaceable. The workprints and sound tapes would never have been held by the lab and therefore would not appear in these boxes. If you have work print or original 1/4 inch sound tracks, then you must have material in your possession from the lab and also from Sea Grant. I’d have to see these materials to know for sure what we are looking at. But in either case, the only way to ever access the original film would be to have the workprint to view. (You can’t look at original negative ECN without damaging it and you can’t tell what you are looking at anyway because it is a negative material. You must have the workprint to view.) So, I am afraid if you decide to keep the original irreplaceable material (the original ECN) you also have to keep the workprint or you would never be able to tell what you have in the can.

I would argue that all of this footage is irreplaceable and valuable and should be kept.

So if you have specific questions about line items, I might be able to help.

Jim

James Larison, PhD
Retired Professor
24665 SW Airport Ave.
Philomath, OR 97370
jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com
Re: More questions on the Farmers of the Sea films

James Larison <jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com>
Thu 24-Dec-20 8:45
To: Davila Gronros, Valeria E <valeria.davilagronros@oregonstate.edu>

[This email originated from outside of OSU. Use caution with links and attachments.]

Valeria;

Just some additional thoughts.

I cut work print for the 60-minute version and sent it to the lab. with the mixed sound track. The lab cut the original negative into A@B rolls for that version, then made an internegative of that show from which they would strike a check print and send that check print to me for approval. Then I must have requested the workprint back from them, recut it into a new 30-minute version, made a new sound track with new narration, and sent that to the lab. They may have cana-balized the original A@B rolls or they may have used an intermediate product and left the original A@B rolls intact. I don’t know which. They titles (with different fonts) look like the supers that would have been created in the lab to print through on the internegative. In other words, the A roll would have had the live image of the fishing nets (the original scene) and the B roll would have had the burned through (white against black) title. The printer would have burned the title through the live shot (B over A) and the finished internegative would then have the title superimposed on the live shot. I still don’t know for sure why there would be two fonts but I suspect what you are looking at are the B rolls from each of the two versions. The lab simply used a different font on the 30-minute version than they did on the 60-minute version, owing to the fact that one was done first, then the second done months later. The reason for the third font on the Video may be that WGBH came up with their own title sequence for the broadcast version.

Just a thought.

Jim

James R. Larison, PhD
Retired Professor
24665 SW Airport Ave.
Philomath, OR 97370
jim.elaine.larison@gmail.com