

## Geophysical Survey Techniques

### INTRODUCTION

Geophysical survey techniques indirectly measure the presence of resources concealed within the earth's subsurface as a result of geologic processes or human disturbances. Geophysical survey techniques detect subsurface contrasts, including mass-density relationships, ionic or electrical potentials, magnetic susceptibilities, and elemental decay. The surveys can reveal the location of archeological resources and lead to their identification.

Geophysical survey equipment is used to investigate buried prehistoric and historic structures and artifacts. The use of geophysical survey equipment and computer aided interpretation has increased the accuracy of archeological surveys to the point where potentially destructive, random excavations can be minimized.

Geophysical survey techniques cannot positively identify a buried cultural resource, but they can provide data for interpretation from which strong inferences can be made. Geophysical surveys use remote sensing techniques, which examine earth features from a distant platform situated above a target area and usually employ high altitude aircraft or satellites. From a platform situated on or just above the earth's surface, geophysical survey equipment remotely sense earth features in a target area located beneath the earth's surface.

### APPLYING GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY TECHNIQUES TO CULTURAL LANDSCAPE RESEARCH

Geophysical survey techniques are either passive or active. Passive techniques measure naturally occurring earth-related processes, such as the earth's electromagnetic or gravitational field. Magnetometry is a passive geophysical survey technique. Active techniques involve transmitting an electrical, electromagnetic, or acoustic signal into the

subsurface. Interaction of the input signal with subsurface materials produces a modified return signal that can be measured. A familiar, amateur active technique is the metal detector. Other active geophysical techniques include ground penetrating radar, electrical resistivity, and electromagnetic conductivity.

Geophysical techniques were used in an archeological survey of Virginius Island, a nonextant, nineteenth century industrial community in Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. (See Figure 1.) Geophysical services were contracted to determine the location of twelve, nineteenth century residential structures and their associated outbuildings, buried within four acres of river terrace landscape. (See *A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Appendices*, “Appendix J: Project Agreements.”) The general location of these residences was derived from historical documentation, maps, and photographs, but the precise location of the outbuildings and their yards was unknown. The project agreement for the geophysical survey specified ground penetrating radar and electromagnetic conductivity, but allowed for the possibility of using additional techniques to verify the location of a feature. The results of the geophysical survey led to the excavation or “ground-truthing” of specific sites to produce an accurate site plan of Virginius Island. Results of the survey facilitated development of a treatment plan, which included an interpretive program. (See Figures 2 and 3.)

## Passive Geophysical Survey Techniques

Passive geophysical survey techniques measure naturally occurring, local, or planetary fields created by earth processes. Passive techniques

---

## IMPLEMENTATION AND LIMITATIONS OF A GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY

---

Successful implementation of a geophysical survey depends on the following:

- A comprehensive survey design that specifies the set of techniques chosen for a survey (multiple techniques are requisite for a thorough site investigation), the order in which the techniques are implemented, the size and location of the survey grid applied, and the compatibility of the techniques with the site (that is, compatible with geology and physical access).
- An experienced geophysicist contractor who is skilled in multiple geophysical methods and knowledgeable about the physical and historic context of the survey and the nature of the expected results.

Possible limitations of geophysical surveys include the following:

- Geophysical surveys are equipment-intensive and may be expensive to conduct.
- Geophysical survey equipment cannot distinguish between cultural and geologic anomalies.
- Geophysical survey techniques are limited to near-surface detection. There are limits to the depth and scale of resolution.
- Geophysical survey equipment may not detect subtle contrasts or weak signals. If the contrast between the sought-after archeological material and incubating soil is small, detection is hindered.
- Erroneous readings may occur as a result of distortion from nearby cultural entities with physical or electromagnetic properties, such as subterranean utilities, powerlines, metal fences, transmission towers, buildings, roads, railroads, aircraft, and two-way radios.

---

include magnetic surveying with a magnetometer and gravity surveying using a gravitometer. A magnetometer measures the earth’s total magnetic field. It is useful for detecting buried ferrous objects or magnetic anomalies in soils. A gravitometer measures the anomalous acceleration of gravity due to mass/density relationships of buried features. Currently, the technique has limited use because detection is very subtle.



*Figure 1. This photograph of Virginus Island shows the proximity of the former industrial community to the Shenandoah River. The nineteenth century buildings were largely destroyed by successive floods by the turn of the century. A geophysical survey of selected areas of the island yielded information about the location of ruined residences and outbuildings. This information was used in developing a treatment plan for the cultural landscape. Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. (NPS, 1865)*

## Magnetometry

Magnetometry is used within a large landscape area to detect the presence and location of archeological resources with magnetic properties. It is useful for a preliminary level of a subsurface investigation and is particularly suitable for detecting brick structures and metallic artifacts.

Magnetometry, or magnetic surveying, uses the proton magnetometer to measure the magnetic susceptibility of buried materials. The earth's total geomagnetic field can be measured and used as a control point of reference to compare local magnetic interferences. When compared to the total geomagnetic field, local disturbances or anomalies can indicate the position of ferrous objects, displaced soils, and earthen structures.

The magnetometer is a highly sensitive instrument, capable of measuring perturbations or anomalies with an accuracy of one part in 100,000. The proton magnetometer is one of the simpler, less expensive, and more accurate geophysical instruments, and consequently is used frequently for geophysical surveys. Acquisition of spatial data over large areas is relatively easy, and qualitative interpretations can be made rapidly with relatively less geophysical experience. (See Figure 4.)

## Active Geophysical Survey Techniques

Active geophysical survey techniques involve transmitting electrical currents, electromagnetic, or acoustic energies into the earth's surface.




Figure 2. Proposed treatment plan for the cultural landscape of Virginius Island. Data from geological surveys, archeological site investigations, and historical research contributed to the development of this plan. Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. (NPS, 1992)




Figure 3. Proposed management zones for Virginius Island. The management zones are based upon historic land uses on the island, which were identified through historical research and archeological site investigation. Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. (NPS, 1992)

Active techniques include ground penetrating radar, electrical resistivity, and electromagnetic conductivity. Earthen material, such as soil or rock, are generally considered to be relatively poor conductors of energy. Much of the energy that geophysical equipment introduces is dissipated into the subsurface. Often geophysical receivers magnify the return signal to compensate for the poor conduction of energy. A comparison of amplitude, frequency, wavelength, and time delay between the input and return signals leads to the detection of buried cultural resources.

### **Ground Penetrating Radar**

Ground penetrating radar (GPR) is used to determine the depth and physical properties of buried cultural and geologic features. It can effectively map soil layers, depth to bedrock, cavities, buried stream channels, burial sites, underground utilities, structures (including concrete structures), and metallic objects.

GPR is most often used to measure reflected low frequency electromagnetic energy, which is introduced into the subsurface via a surface-contact, transmitting antenna. (See Figure 5.) As the energy passes through the earth, it may encounter buried materials of varying electrical properties. At these electrical interfaces, energy may be either reflected or attenuated. A receiving antenna on the earth's surface detects reflected energy. The receiving antenna is positioned in close proximity to the transmitting antenna. Comparison of the return signal time delay with the input signal (in billionths of a second) is a function of the speed of the signal as



*Figure 4. A magnetic survey using a GEM 19 magnetometer. Fort Laramie National Historic Site. (NPS, 1993)*

it passes through the buried material. This comparison can be used indirectly to calculate the depth of the buried material. A comparison of the amplitude and frequency of the reflected signal with the input signal provides information about the physical properties of the buried material.

Site-specific conditions may limit the success of GPR in geophysical surveys. The presence of highly conductive clay soils in proportions of 10 percent or more is probably the greatest limiting factor affecting radar signals. Highly conductive soil conditions result in the attenuation of electromagnetic energy, a reduction in signal velocity, and a decrease in depth of signal penetration. Water-saturated soils also produce a highly conductive environment. Seasonal groundwater level variations may be relevant in timing a ground penetrating radar survey.



**Figure 5.** A ground penetrating radar being pulled across the ground. Lockwood Stage Stop, Pinon Canon Maneuver Site, Colorado. (NPS, 1991)

### **Electrical Resistivity**

Electrical resistivity uses electrical resistance (poor conductivity) properties to identify buried cultural resources. A highly refined electrical resistivity survey may be the most revealing geophysical technique, but it is expensive to perform because it requires a high number of readings per unit area.

Resistivity experts interpret electrical resistivity patterns to identify the presence of nearly all forms of constructed features, such as foundations, paths, and roads. The technique can also reveal compacted soils, indicative of a former pathway, and disturbed soils, such as those found at burial sites and cultivated fields. Electrical resistivity is useful for measuring depth to bedrock and is often performed before GPR in geophysical surveys involving multiple techniques. Depth to bedrock measurements are useful in calibrating GPR equipment.

Electrical resistivity uses current electrodes to introduce into the soil an electrical current of known amplitude (amps) and frequency (volts), and potential electrodes with an ohmmeter to measure resistance changes in the soil, vertically and horizontally. (See Figure 6.) Measurements of vertical changes in resistivity are called “soundings” and measurements of horizontal changes in resistivity are called “profiling.” The technique requires at least three individuals to move two current electrodes and two potential electrodes along a survey grid. It is assumed that the incubating soil has a homogeneous resistivity (due to an assumed even distribution of soil and water) and that buried cultural resources can be identified as anomalous readings of resistance.

Along survey gridlines, changes in resistance readings are used to create “contour maps” of soil resistivity. On the map, concentric contours emanating from a location (called a “spot elevation”) represent material of lowest conductivity,



**Figure 6.** An electrical resistivity survey using a Gossen resistivity meter. Scott Air Force Base. (NPS, n.d.)

or conversely, greatest resistance. Because soil conductivity is directly related to the presence of water, locations measuring the greatest resistance will have a lower soil-water content. Nonsaturated soil conditions reveal more contrasts between potentially buried cultural resources (that have lower water content) and native soil material (having higher water content).

Ideally, electrical resistivity tests should be performed in more than one season with varying soil-water conditions. In some geologic conditions the native soil may have a lower water content and therefore higher resistivity than buried cultural resources. Because resistivity is directly related to permeability, degree of saturation, and the chemical nature of entrapped fluids, prior knowledge of indigenous geologic conditions is requisite to accurately interpret resistivity data.

### ***Electromagnetic Conductivity***

Electromagnetic conductivity, also called EM and induction, is used to detect and differentiate metallic artifacts buried near the earth's surface. The technique locates near-surface cultural features (structures, compaction, excavation, and habitation sites) by their various water saturations (their conductivity). A conductivity measurement is the reciprocal of resistivity, so in theory the results of a lateral conductivity survey should mirror the results of a resistivity profile.

The main advantage to using conductivity over resistivity is that the measuring instrument does not require surface contact. Two individuals are required to perform the technique, but the

conductivity instrument can be moved from station to station by one operator. Resistivity requires a crew of at least three to move and place electrodes in the ground along a survey line. (See Figure 7.)

Electromagnetic conductivity uses a nonsurface contacting radio transmitter and receiver. The transmitter induces an electromagnetic field in the earth, causing an electrical current to flow. The electrical current generates a secondary magnetic field that causes the flow of an electrical current signal in the receiver. The receiver signal is measured for conductivity by a voltmeter incorporated in the EM instrument. The voltmeter is calibrated to measure the soil as having a homogeneous level of conductivity. It is assumed that buried cultural resources cause anomalies in the homogenous level of conductivity detected along survey lines. Large fluctuations in conductivity are indications of highly conductive subsurface materials, such as buried



***Figure 7. An electromagnetic conductivity survey using a Geonics EM38 soil conductivity meter. Fort Laramie National Historic Site. (NPS, 1993)***

utilities. Observing the physical extent and orientation of the anomaly can provide clues to its identification.

## SOURCES OF GEOPHYSICAL PROSPECTING EQUIPMENT AND SURVEYORS

### United States Governmental Agencies

United States Geological Survey  
United States Bureau of Reclamation  
United States Bureau of Mines  
Environmental Protection Agency

### State Agencies

Geologic Surveys  
Health & Environmental Agencies

### Universities and Colleges

Geological Departments  
Geophysical Departments  
Engineering Departments

### Private and Nonprofit Organizations

### Private Concerned Citizens

### Geophysical Equipment Manufacturers

### Geophysical Equipment Rental Companies

### Geophysical Consultants

For access to the last five groups, acquire a copy of the Geophysical Directory, published each March. This directory provides the most

comprehensive listing of sources of equipment and geophysical survey experts available.

### The Geophysical Directory

2200 Welch Avenue  
P.O. Box 130508  
Houston, TX 77219  
Phone 713-529-8789  
Fax 713-529-3646

## REFERENCES

### Contracting Archeological Services Reference

Jameson, J.H. Jr. et al. 1990. Federal Archeological Contracting: Utilizing the Competitive Procurement Process. *Technical Brief*, no. 7, ISSN 1057-1574. Georgia: USDI, NPS, Interagency Resources Archeological Services Division, Southeast Regional Office.

### General References

Lyons, T.R., and J.L. Elbert, eds. 1977. *Remote Sensing: A Handbook for Archeologists and Cultural Resource Managers*. Washington, DC: USDI, NPS, Cultural Resources Management Division.

Lyons, T.R., R.K. Hitchcock, and W.H. Wills. 1978. *Remote Sensing: Aerial Anthropological Perspectives: A Bibliography of Remote Sensing in Cultural Resource Studies*, Supplement No.3. Supplement to "Remote Sensing: A Handbook for Archeologists and Cultural Resource Managers." Washington, DC: USDI, NPS, Cultural Resources Management Division.

Morain, S. A., and T.K. Budge. *Remote Sensing: Instrumentation for Non-destructive Exploration of Cultural Resources*, Supplement No.2. Supplement to "Remote Sensing: A Handbook for Archeologists and Cultural Resource Managers." Washington, DC: USDI, NPS, Cultural Resources Management Division.

Wood, W.R., R.K. Nickel, and D.E. Griffin. 1984. *Remote Sensing: The American Great Plains*, Supplement No.9. Supplement to "Remote Sensing: A Handbook for Archeologists and Cultural Resource Managers." Washington, DC: USDI, NPS, Cultural Resources Management Division.

## Magnetometry References

Barrows, L., and J.E. Rocchio. Summer 1990. Magnetic Surveying for Buried Metallic Objects. *Ground Water Monitoring Review*. 204-209.

Bennet, C.B., and J.W. Weymouth. 1982. *Magnetic Reconnaissance Program in the Dolores Archeological Project: Interpretation of Data Collected During the Field Season 1980*. Colorado: University of Colorado Dolores Archeological Program.

Burns, P.K. 1981. Magnetic Reconnaissance in the Dolores Archeological Program. Master's thesis. Nebraska: University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Department of Anthropology.

Burns, P.K., R. Huggins, and J.W. Weymouth. 1983. Study of Correlation Between Magnetic Reconnaissance and Excavation in the Dolores

Program. *Dolores Archeological Program Technical Reports*, Report No. DAP-078. Utah: USDI, Bureau of Reclamation, Salt Lake City.

Heimmer, D.H. 1992. *Near Surface, High Resolution Geophysical Methods for Cultural Resource Management and Archeological Investigations*. Denver: USDI, NPS, Rocky Mountain Regional Office, Interagency Archeological Services.

Huggins, R. 1981. *Magnetic Reconnaissance Program in the Dolores Archeological Program: Interpretation of Data Collected During Field Years 1981 and 1982*. Colorado: University of Colorado Dolores Archeological Program.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1983. Magnetometer Results. *Dolores Archeological Program: Field Investigations and Analysis—1978*. 193-251. Edited by D. A. Bretevnitz. Denver: USDI, Bureau of Reclamation.

Kaczor, J., and J. Weymouth. 1981. Magnetic Prospecting: Preliminary Results of the 1980 Field Season at the Toltec Site, 3LN42. *Southeastern Archeological Conference Bulletin* 24: 118-123.

Mason, R.J. 1984. An Unorthodox Magnetic Survey of a Large Forested Historic Site. *Historical Archeology* 18(2): 54-63.

Tabbagh, A. 1984. On the Comparison Between Magnetic and Electromagnetic Prospection Methods for Magnetic Features Detection. *Archaeometry* 26(2): 171-182.

Von Frese, R.R.B. 1984. Archeomagnetic Anomalies at Midcontinental North American Archeological Sites. *Historical Archeology* 18(2): 4-19.

Von Frese, R.R.B., and V.E. Noble. 1984. Magnetometry for Archeological Exploration of Historical Sites. *Historical Archeology* 18(2): 38-53.

Von Frese, R.R.B., and B. Bevan. 1983. Combined Magnetic and Ground Penetrating Radar Survey of an Archeological Site in Oklahoma. *International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*. San Francisco, digest, vol. 1, section WP.3. New York: IEEE.

## Ground Penetrating Radar References

Amato, L., and G. Di Maio. 1990. Ground Penetrating Radar for the Identification of the Volcanoclastic Sequence of AD 79 Vesuvian Eruption—Pompeii—Southern Italy. *Third International Conference on Ground Penetrating Radar*, Lakewood, Colorado.

Annan, A.P., J.L. Davis, and D. Gendzwill. 1988. Radar Sounding in Potash Mines, Saskatchewan, Canada. *Geophysics* 53(12): 1556-1564.

Bevan, B., D.G. Orr, and B.S. Blades. 1984. The Discovery of the Taylor House at the Petersburg National Battlefield. *Historical Archeology* 18(2): 64-74.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1979. *A Ground Penetrating Radar Survey at the Deer Creek Site*. Report prepared for the US Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa District, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1980. *A Second Season at Deer Creek: Radar and Electromagnetic Surveys*. Report prepared for the US Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa District, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1991. The Search For Graves. *Geophysics* 56: 1310-1319.

Bevan, B., and J. Kenyon. 1975. Ground Penetrating Radar for Historical Archeology. *MASCA Newsletter* 11(2): 2-7.

Butler, Dwain K., ed. March 1992. Miscellaneous paper GL-92-40. In *Proceedings of the Government Users Workshop on Ground Penetrating Radar Applications and Equipment*. Vicksburg, Mississippi: Department of the Army, Waterways Experiment Station, COE.

Daniels, J. March 1988. Locating Caves, Tunnels and Mines. *Geophysics: The Leading Edge of Exploration*.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Fundamentals of Ground Penetrating Radar. *Symposium on the Application of Geophysics to Engineering and Environmental Problems*. Golden, Colorado.

Davis, J.L., and A.P. Annan. 1989. Ground Penetrating Radar for High-Resolution Mapping of Soil and Rock Stratigraphy. *Geophysical Prospecting* 37: 531-551.

De Vore, S.L. 1990. Ground Penetrating Radar as a Tool in Archeological Investigations: An Example from the Fort Laramie National Historic Site. *The Wyoming Archeologist* 33(1-2): 23-38.

Fischer, P.M., S.G.W. Follin, and P. Ulriksen. 1992. Surface Interface Radar Survey at Hala Sultan Tekke, Cyprus. *Studies in Mediterranean Archeology* 57: 495-508.

Geophysical Survey Systems, Inc. 1989. *Radan Instruction Manual*. MN43-101 Release 3.0.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *Surface Interface Radar 10 Manual*. New Hampshire, New Salem.

Heimmer, D.H. 1992. *Near Surface, High Resolution Geophysical Methods for Cultural Resource Management and Archeological Investigations*. Denver: USDI, NPS, Rocky Mountain Regional Office, Interagency Archeological Services.

Heimmer, D.H., G.C. Davenport, J. Lindemann, and J. Gilmore. 1989. Geophysics for Archeological Assessment: Ft. William Discovered? Fort Laramie National Historic Site, Wyoming. *Symposium on the Application of Geophysics to Engineering and Environmental Problems*. Golden, Colorado.

Mellett, J., and J. Geismar. 1990. GPR Survey of an African-American Cemetery in Little Ferry, New Jersey. *Third International Conference on Ground Penetrating Radar*. Lakewood, Colorado.

Sheets, P.D., W.M. Loker, H.A.W. Spetzler, R.H. Ware, and G.R. Olhoeft. 1985. Geophysical Exploration for Ancient Maya Housing at Ceten, El Salvador. *National Geographic Society Research Reports*.

Ulriksen, C.P. 1983. *Application of Impulse Radar to Civil Engineering*. Hudson, New Hampshire: Geophysical Survey Systems.

Vickers, R.S., and L.T. Dolphin. 1975. A Communication on an Archeological Radar Experiment at Chaco Canyon, New Mexico. *MASCA Newsletter* 11(1): 6-8.

## Electrical Resistivity References

Atkinson, R.F.C. 1963. Resistivity Surveying in Archeology. *The Scientist and Archeology*. 1-30. Edited by E. Pyddoke. London: Phoenix House.

Bevan, B. 1991. *A Resistivity Survey at the Lockwood Stage Station*. Denver: USDI, NPS.

Carr, C. 1977. A New Role and Analytical Design for the Use of Resistivity Surveying in Archeology. *Midcontinental Journal of Archeology* 2: 161-193.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1982. *Handbook on Soil Resistivity: Interpretation of Data from Earthen Archeological Sites*. Illinois: Evanston, Center for American Archeology Press.

Ellwood, B.B. 1990. Electrical Resistivity Surveys in Two Historical Cemeteries in Northeast Texas: A method for delineating unidentified burial shafts. *Historical Archeology* 24: 91-98.

Ford, R.I., and R.O. Keslin. 1969. A Resistivity Survey at the Norton mound Group, 20KT1, Kent County, Michigan. *The Michigan Archeologist* 15(3): 86-92.

Goodyear, Frank H. 1971. *Archeological Site Science*. Chapter 8, "Wood and Charcoal." New York: American Elsevier Publishing.

Heimmer, D.H. 1992. *Near Surface, High Resolution Geophysical Methods for Cultural Resource Management and Archeological Investigations*. Denver: USDI, NPS, Rocky Mountain Regional Office, Interagency Archeological Services.

Hranicky, W.J. 1972. Application of Resistivity Surveying to American Archeology. *The Chesopiean* 10: 43-50.

Huggins, R., and J.W. Weymouth. 1981. A Probe Resistivity Survey and Analysis at the Deer Creek Site (34KA3), Oklahoma. Report submitted to the US Army Corps of Engineers, Tulsa District, Oklahoma.

## Electromagnetic Conductivity References

Bevan, B. 1983. Electromagnetics for Mapping Buried Earth Features. *Journal of Field Archeology* 10(1): 47-54.

Heimmer, D.H. 1992. *Near Surface, High Resolution Geophysical Methods for Cultural Resource Management and Archeological Investigations*. Denver: USDI, NPS, Rocky Mountain Regional Office, Interagency Archeological Services.

Howell, M. 1966. A Soil Conductivity Meter. *Archaeometry* 9: 20-23.

McNeill, J.D. 1980. *Electromagnetic Terrain Conductivity Measurement at Low Induction Numbers*. Ontario, Canada: Geonics Limited.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *Operating Manual for EM31-d Non-Contacting Terrain Conductivity Meter*. Canada: Mississauga, Geonics Limited.

Musson, C.R. 1968. A Geophysical Survey at South Cadbury Castle, Somerset. Using the Howell Soil Conductivity Anomaly Detector (SCM). *Prospezioi Archeologiche* 3: 115-121.

Parchas, C., and A. Tabbagh. 1979. Simultaneous Measurements of Electrical Conductivity Prospecting. *Archaeo-Physika* 10: 682-691.

Tabbagh, A. 1986. Applications and Advantages of the Slingram Electromagnetic Method for Archeological Prospecting. *Geophysics* 51: 576-584.

Tite, M.S., and C. Mullins. 1970. Electromagnetic Prospecting on Archeological Sites Using a Soil Conductivity Meter. *Archeometry* 12(1): 97-104.

---

The mission of the Department of the Interior is to protect and provide access to our Nation's natural and cultural heritage and honor our trust responsibilities to tribes.



**U.S. Department of the Interior**  
**National Park Service**  
**Cultural Resources**  
**Park Historic Structures & Cultural Landscapes**