

Experimental Validation of Dedicated Methods to In-Vehicle Estimation of Atmospheric Visibility Distance

Nicolas Hautière, Didier Aubert, Éric Dumont, and Jean-Philippe Tarel, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—In the framework of the French Research Action for Secure Driving (ARCOS) Project, we developed a system that uses in-vehicle charge-coupled device (CCD) cameras, aiming to estimate the visibility distance in adverse weather conditions, particularly fog situations. The topic of this paper is the validation of the system. First, we present Koschmieder's model of apparent luminance of objects observed against the background sky on the horizon and deal with the definitions of the different visibility distances we use in our measurement framework, as well as the links that bind them. Then, we describe the two specific onboard techniques we designed to estimate the visibility distance. In the third section, we present a dedicated site and how we use it to validate the previous techniques. Finally, we give the results of a quantitative validation of our onboard techniques, using actual pictures of the validation site in foggy weather.

Index Terms—Driving assistance, experimental validation, fog, intelligent transportation systems, meteorological visibility.

I. INTRODUCTION

MOST of the information used by drivers comes from vision. It follows that reduced visibility is a cause of road accidents. A system to inform drivers of the appropriate speed with regard to the measured weather conditions would obviously contribute to road safety. However, such a system has other applications. Onboard perception equipment (cameras, radar, laser, etc.) is designed to operate within a range of conditions, which is only adjustable to a certain extent. An atmospheric visibility measurement system would therefore be expected to adapt the sensor operation and the associated processing (obstacle detection, lane keeping, etc.) to the prevailing weather conditions or to warn the driver that his assistance system is momentarily inoperative.

Manuscript received October 15, 2007; revised February 28, 2008.

N. Hautière was with the Interactions Vehicle–Infrastructure–Drivers Research Laboratory (LIVIC), French Public Works Laboratory (LCPC)/French National Institute for Transportation and Safety Research (INRETS), 78000 Versailles, France. He is now with the Division for Road Operation, Signalling, and Lighting, French Public Works Laboratory (LCPC), 75732 Paris, France.

D. Aubert is with the Interactions Vehicle–Infrastructure–Drivers Research Laboratory (LIVIC), French Public Works Laboratory (LCPC)/French National Institute for Transportation and Safety Research (INRETS), 78000 Versailles, France.

É. Dumont and J.-P. Tarel are with the Division for Road Operation, Signalling, and Lighting, French Public Works Laboratory (LCPC), 75732 Paris, France.

Color versions of one or more of the figures in this paper are available online at <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TIM.2008.922096

Within the French Research Action for Secure Driving (ARCOS) Project [15], we developed such a system that uses onboard charge-coupled device (CCD) cameras and is composed of three modules. The first module detects daytime fog and estimates the meteorological visibility. The second module, which is not discussed here, uses the “v-disparity” representation [11] to detect obstacles that occlude part of the road and the traffic. The last module estimates the distance to the most distant visible picture element that belongs to the road surface under any condition. One application of these methods is to automate the lighting of fog lamps and even to adjust their intensity according to the visibility condition.

So far, these methods have only been qualitatively evaluated. Quantitative assessment has yet to be endeavored, due to the lack of a reference visibility sensor. To fill this gap, we equipped our test track in Versailles, France, with five large specific targets. The idea is to take pictures of these targets in adverse visibility conditions and to estimate the visibility distance thanks to the attenuation of their contrast. This static measurement, which uses reference targets, can then be compared to the results of our in-vehicle methods, which require no reference.

In the following, we first deal with the definitions of the different visibility distances we estimate, as well as the links that bind them. Then, our two onboard techniques are summarized. In the third section, we present our validation site and how we use it to evaluate the previous techniques. The experimental protocol is validated by means of simulated pictures using a photometric model of fog visual effects. Finally, we give the first results of a quantitative validation using actual pictures of the validation site in foggy weather.

II. VISION AND ATMOSPHERIC VISIBILITY DISTANCE

A. Koschmieder's Law and Meteorological Visibility Distance

In the atmosphere, visible light is mainly attenuated by the scattering phenomenon characterized by an extinction coefficient k . The phenomenon is particularly strong in fog and causes a luminous veil, which impairs visibility in the daytime [14]. In 1924, Koschmieder [13] established a simple relationship between the apparent luminance L of an object at a distance d and its intrinsic luminance L_0

$$L = L_0 e^{-kd} + L_f (1 - e^{-kd}) \quad (1)$$




Fig. 1. (a) Estimation of the meteorological visibility distance using the technique based on inflection point detection. The curve on the left depicts the median intensity measured on the vertical band. The visibility distance is represented through the use of a horizontal black straight line. (b) Estimation of the mobilized visibility distance. The most distant window having a contrast above 5, on which a disparity point is known, is painted white. The point is represented with a black cross on the white window.

where L_f denotes the luminance of the background sky. Based on these results, Duntley [13] derived a law for the atmospheric attenuation of contrasts

$$C = \frac{|L - L_f|}{L_f} = C_0 e^{-kd} \quad (2)$$

where C designates the apparent contrast at distance d , and C_0 is the intrinsic contrast of the object against the sky. The International Commission on Illumination (CIE) [1] adopted a contrast threshold of 5% to define V_{met} , which is the “meteorological” visibility distance and is defined as the greatest distance at which a black object ($C_0 = 1$) of suitable dimensions can be recognized by day against the horizon sky:

$$V_{\text{met}} = -\frac{1}{k} \log(0.05) \simeq \frac{3}{k}. \quad (3)$$

To our knowledge, Koschmieder’s model is consistent with our application apart from the fog inhomogeneities, which are not taken into account.

B. Mobilized and Mobilizable Visibility Distances

We now define V_{mob} , the “mobilized” visibility distance: the distance to the most distant visible object on the road surface, which is assumed to be black or at least dark. V_{mob} has to be compared with V_{max} , the “mobilizable” visibility distance: the maximum distance at which a potential object on the road surface would be visible. V_{max} can be expressed as a function of V_{met} and the contrast threshold C_{BW} between a “white” object and a “black” object to be visible. Using (1) and (2), we show the following [5]:

$$V_{\text{max}} = -\frac{V_{\text{met}}}{3} \log \left[\frac{C_{BW}}{1 + C_{BW}} \right]. \quad (4)$$

We obtain the value $\tilde{C}_{BW}$ so that $V_{\text{max}} = V_{\text{met}}$:

$$\tilde{C}_{BW} = \frac{1}{e^3 - 1} \approx 5\%. \quad (5)$$

Thus, by using a 5% contrast threshold, V_{max} is very close to V_{met} . It follows that we have the following relationship between

TABLE I
DISTANCE AND DIMENSIONS L AND t [SEE FIG. 2(b)] OF THE DIFFERENT REFERENCE TARGETS ON THE VALIDATION SITE

Target index	1	2	3	4	5	6
Distance [m]	0-35	65.2	97.6	130.7	162.4	195
L [m]	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3
t [m]	0.1	0.19	0.28	0.37	0.47	0.56

mobilized, mobilizable, and meteorological visibility distances in the daytime:

$$V_{\text{mob}} \leq V_{\text{max}} \approx V_{\text{met}}. \quad (6)$$

Finally, (6) means that the maximum visibility distance of a white object located on a black road surface is the same one that a black object observed against its background sky.

III. IN-VEHICLE ESTIMATION OF ATMOSPHERIC VISIBILITY DISTANCE

We developed two methods to estimate the atmospheric visibility distance through the use of in-vehicle cameras.

A. Fog Detection and Estimation of Meteorological Visibility Distance

1) *Theoretical Framework*: By adopting the hypothesis of a flat road, which makes it possible to associate a distance d with each line v of a digital image, the distance d is expressed as follows:

$$d = \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda}{(v - v_h)}, & \text{if } v > v_h \\ \infty, & \text{if } v \leq v_h \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where v_h is the vertical position of the horizon in the image plane, and $\lambda = (H\alpha / \cos^2 \theta)$ depends on the intrinsic and extrinsic parameters of the camera. H denotes the camera mounting height, θ is the pitch angle, and α is the ratio between the focal length and the pixel size.

If a change of variable based on (7) is carried out, we can take twice the derivative of (1) with respect to v and obtain

$$\frac{d^2 L}{dv^2} = k \frac{\lambda(L_0 - L_f)}{(v - v_h)^3} e^{-k \frac{\lambda}{v - v_h}} \left(\frac{k\lambda}{v - v_h} - 2 \right). \quad (8)$$




Fig. 2. (a) Actual picture of the validation site dedicated to visibility measurement taken during sunny weather conditions. (b) Graphic design of the reference targets.




Fig. 3. Photometrically simulated pictures of the validation site. (a) Without fog. (b) With fog: $V_{\text{met}} = 200$ m.

(d^2L/dv^2) has two zeros, only one of which is useful: $k = (2(v_i - v_h)/\lambda)$, where v_i denotes the position of the inflection point. Hence, parameter k of Koschmieder's law is obtained once v_i is known. Finally, by virtue of (3), we are able to deduce V_{met}

$$V_{\text{met}} = \frac{3\lambda}{2(v_i - v_h)}. \quad (9)$$

2) Method Implementation: To implement this method, we measure the median intensity on each line of a vertical band in the image. As this band should only take into account a homogeneous area and the sky, we identify a region within the image that displays minimal line-to-line gradient variation when crossed from bottom to top using a region-growing algorithm. A vertical band is then selected in the segmented area. Thus, we obtain the vertical variation of the intensity in the image and deduce V_{met} using (8). An example of meteorological visibility distance computation is given in Fig. 1(a). This method was patented in 2002 [12]. Details can be found in [6].

B. Estimation of Mobilized Visibility Distance

The previous method leads to good results in daytime foggy weather. To extend the range of covered meteorological situations, we developed a different approach, which consists of

estimating V_{mob} . With this aim, three tasks must be achieved, which are successively described.

1) Estimation of Local Contrasts Above 5%: Based on a classical image segmentation method [8], we developed an original method that computes local contrasts above 5%. It consists of scanning the image using small windows, which are segmented by searching the border that maximizes Weber's contrast [2] between the two parts of the window. This method was compared with the rare existing methods and proves to be precise as well while making fewer false detections [7].

2) Computation of a Precise Depth Map of the Road Surface Using Stereovision: Stereovision allows depth information to be recovered by triangulation. However, a classical disparity map may contain numerous false matches, which prevents using it as a depth map of the environment. The "v-disparity" transform, in which the detection of straight lines is equivalent to the detection of planes in the scene, allows us to compute in two passes a high-quality depth/disparity map of the road surface [10]. We use it for estimating V_{mob} .

3) Fast Combination of Both Information: This disparity map contains depth information of the road surface only. Consequently, if this is scanned from top to bottom, the objects encountered in the road surface get increasingly nearer the equipped vehicle. Estimating V_{mob} consists, therefore, of scanning the disparity map from top to bottom, starting at the horizon line, and computing the contrast for each pixel of

known disparity. Once the process finds a pixel with a contrast higher than 5%, the computation ends. On the basis of the disparity of this pixel, it is possible to obtain V_{mob} . An example of V_{mob} computation is given in Fig. 1(b). This method was patented in 2004 [4]. Details can be found in [5].

IV. EXPERIMENTAL PROTOCOL BASED ON A DEDICATED SITE

A. Setting Up a Dedicated Site

So far, our methods were only qualitatively evaluated, through a subjective analysis of the mean and standard deviation of measures in the cases of different rides, assuming constant adverse visibility conditions. Quantitative assessment has yet to be endeavored due to the lack of a reference visibility sensor. To fill this gap, we equipped our test track in Versailles, France, with five large specific targets, located between 65 and 200 m from the cameras onboard the stationed vehicle (cf. Table I). An additional mobile target is used at a closer range when the fog is very dense. The idea is to take pictures of these targets in adverse weather conditions and to estimate the meteorological visibility distance based on the attenuation of their contrast. This static measurement, which uses reference targets, can then be compared on the same images to the results of our onboard dynamic techniques, which require no reference. The targets are designed for maximum intrinsic contrast, as illustrated in Fig. 2(b). A picture of the validation site in sunny weather is given in Fig. 2(a). Compared with [9], we see two advantages to our approach. First, the different targets have the same apparent size in the image and take only the effects of the atmosphere into account. Second, the white and the black parts of each target have the same size and have the same *a priori* confidence in the estimation of their intensities.

B. Using the Targets

We consider the black part of two black targets located at distances d_1 and d_2 from the camera. We assume that they have a null intrinsic luminance ($L_B(0) = 0$). In daytime fog, according to Koschmieder's law (1), their apparent luminances are

$$\begin{cases} L_B(d_1) = (1 - e^{-kd_1})L_f \\ L_B(d_2) = (1 - e^{-kd_2})L_f \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Taking the ratio $r = (L_B(d_1)/L_B(d_2))$ of these values allows us to deduce the value of the extinction coefficient k in different ways:

$$k = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{d_1} \log[r - 1], & \text{if } d_2 = 2d_1 \\ -\frac{1}{d_1} \log \left[\frac{\sqrt{4r-3}-1}{2} \right], & \text{if } d_2 = 3d_1 \\ -\frac{1}{d_1} \log \left[\frac{(r-1)(\sqrt{r+3}-\sqrt{r-1})^2}{4} \right], & \text{if } d_2 = \frac{3}{2}d_1. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

An alternative technique consists of using the white and the black parts of the targets, whose apparent luminances $L_W(d)$

TABLE II
ESTIMATED VISIBILITY AND VARIANCE (BETWEEN BRACKETS) ON
SIMULATED PICTURES USING THE REFERENCE TARGETS AND
(a) AVERAGE ESTIMATES OF (11) OR (b) AVERAGE ESTIMATES OF (13)

$\hat{V}_{met}(\sigma)$ [m]		V_{met} [m]				
		200	166	133	100	66
couple of targets	1 → 2	172 (5)	144 (3)	119 (2)	92 (2)	61 (1)
	1 → 3	183 (3)	151 (2)	124 (2)	95 (1)	-
	2 → 3	199 (5)	161 (4)	132 (3)	100 (2)	-
	2 → 4	197 (3)	162 (2)	132 (2)	-	-
	2 → 6	198 (2)	-	-	-	-
	3 → 6	197 (3)	-	-	-	-
	4 → 6	199 (4)	-	-	-	-
	$\hat{V}_{met}$	194 (1)	155 (1)	126 (1)	95 (1)	61 (1)

$\hat{V}_{met}(\sigma)$ [m]		V_{met} [m]				
		200	166	133	100	66
couple of targets	1 → 2	203 (14)	170 (12)	138 (10)	103 (9)	74 (1)
	1 → 3	198 (10)	173 (10)	135 (10)	103 (11)	-
	1 → 4	201 (11)	162 (11)	138 (13)	-	-
	1 → 5	189 (13)	172 (15)	-	-	-
	1 → 6	203 (17)	-	-	-	-
	2 → 3	194 (21)	176 (23)	133 (20)	103 (23)	-
	2 → 4	200 (16)	158 (16)	138 (20)	-	-
	2 → 5	184 (17)	172 (20)	-	-	-
	2 → 6	203 (21)	-	-	-	-
	3 → 4	206 (39)	143 (29)	142 (46)	-	-
	3 → 5	180 (25)	170 (31)	-	-	-
	3 → 6	207 (30)	-	-	-	-
	4 → 5	160 (42)	210 (105)	-	-	-
	4 → 6	207 (46)	-	-	-	-
	5 → 6	294 (214)	-	-	-	-
	$\hat{V}_{met}$	197 (4)	168 (5)	137 (6)	103 (7)	74 (11)

and $L_B(d)$ are given by Koschmieder's Law (1)

$$\begin{cases} L_W(d_1) - L_B(d_1) = e^{-kd_1} L_{W_0} \\ L_W(d_2) - L_B(d_2) = e^{-kd_2} L_{W_0} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Again, taking the ratio of these values, we deduce the value of extinction coefficient k

$$k = -\frac{1}{d_2 - d_1} \log \left[\frac{L_W(d_2) - L_B(d_2)}{L_W(d_1) - L_B(d_1)} \right]. \quad (13)$$

An estimation $\mathcal{V}(k)$ of the variance of k is associated with (11) or (13) and is expressed by

$$\mathcal{V}(k) \approx \mathcal{V}_I \sum \left[\frac{\partial k}{\partial L_{B,W}(d_{1,2})} \right]^2 \quad (14)$$

where $\mathcal{V}_I$ is the variance on the pixel value due to the digitalization of the pictures, assuming a Gaussian centered distribution with a standard deviation of 1/2. From (3), we deduce the variance of V_{met}

$$\mathcal{V}(V_{\text{met}}) \approx \left[\frac{V_{\text{met}}}{k} \right]^2 \mathcal{V}(k). \quad (15)$$

Thus, from previous equations, we have different estimates of the meteorological visibility distance, and we have an evaluation of the variance of these estimates. Assuming that the



Fig. 4. Images grabbed on the validation site under various weather conditions and with occlusions of the road. (a) Sunny weather $\hat{V}_{\text{met}} \approx 5000$ m. (b) Haze $\hat{V}_{\text{met}} \approx 2000$ m. (c) Snow fall $\hat{V}_{\text{met}} \approx 1000$ m. (d) Light fog $\hat{V}_{\text{met}} \approx 255$ m (five visible targets). (e) and (f) Dense fog + obstacles $\hat{V}_{\text{met}} \approx 120$ m (two or three visible targets).

measurements are not correlated, these estimates are optimally averaged using the variances

$$\hat{V}_{\text{met}} = \frac{\sum_i \frac{V_{\text{met}_i}}{\mathcal{V}(V_{\text{met}_i})}}{\sum_i \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}(V_{\text{met}_i})}}. \quad (16)$$

The variance of this estimator is $(\sum_i (1/\mathcal{V}(V_{\text{met}_i})))^{-1}$.

C. Protocol Validation on Photometric Simulations

To check the validation process, we first ensure that the site suits our objectives and that the equations that were presented in the previous section are relevant for estimating the meteorological visibility distance. With this aim, using a photometric model of fog effects on vision based on Koschmieder's Law and detailed in [3], we simulated pictures of a virtual make-up of our validation site in daytime fog for different values of V_{met} : 33, 66, 100, 133, 166, and 200 m (cf. Fig. 3).

Table II(a) gives the values of $\hat{V}_{\text{met}}$ obtained thanks to the average estimates of (11). Table II(b) gives the values of $\hat{V}_{\text{met}}$ obtained thanks to the average estimates of (13). First, some results at the bottom of the tables are bad. The reason for that is the roundoff caused by the digital nature of the simulated images. Thereafter, the logarithmic formula is more sensitive to the weak differences in intensity of the targets that are far away than to the great differences in intensity of the closer targets. The estimated visibility distance is thus necessarily worst using the most distant targets. All these considerations are confirmed by the standard deviation values, which are given between brackets in Table II. Second, the standard deviations in Table II(a) are smaller than those in Table II(b). Unfortunately,

the method seems to be skewed, because the estimated visibility distance is biased and always smaller than the ground truth. This may be due to the fact that the targets are not really black, as is assumed for establishing (11). In our simulations, we implemented a reflectance factor of 1% to stick to reality. Consequently, in the following tests, we will only rely on the average estimates of (13) to compute the reference measurement $\hat{V}_{\text{met}}$.

V. EXPERIMENTAL VALIDATION

A. Construction of a Reference Data Set

Some images of the validation site have been grabbed under various weather conditions: sunny, light rain, haze, snow fall, fog, etc. $\hat{V}_{\text{met}}$ is estimated from each image. However, in our camera configuration (black-and-white phase alternating line (PAL) camera, $H = 1.4$ m, $\alpha = 1000$, and $\theta = 8.5^\circ$), the size of a pixel located beyond 250 m on a flat road is greater than 50 m, which already represents a quite important uncertainty. We thus compare the methods presented in Section III only if $\hat{V}_{\text{met}} < 250$ m. Consequently, we only focus on foggy conditions. We have approximately 60 pictures of our validation site under foggy conditions. In some pictures, a car (light on/off) and a pedestrian are set on the road at various distances from the equipped vehicle to test the robustness of the methods. Some samples of the processed images are given in Fig. 4. We have computed $\hat{V}_{\text{met}}$ and its variance for each image. The visible targets are selected interactively. In Fig. 5, $\hat{V}_{\text{met}}$ is plotted for each image (marked with a +) as well as the interval $[\hat{V}_{\text{met}} - \sigma, \hat{V}_{\text{met}} + \sigma]$ (vertical segment). Unfortunately, due to the instability of the fog phenomenon, it is difficult to assume that time-consecutive images represent the same




Fig. 5. Estimation of $\hat{V}_{met}$ marked with a + for each image of the data set and interval $[\hat{V}_{met} - \sigma, \hat{V}_{met} + \sigma]$ (vertical segment).

visibility conditions, which could have been used to reduce the variance.

B. Results and Discussion

To evaluate the accuracy of our methods, we estimated for each image the reference visibility distance $\hat{V}_{met}$ obtained from the targets with the method described in Section IV-B, the meteorological visibility distance V_{met} obtained with the method described in Section III-A, and the mobilized visibility distance V_{mob} obtained with the method described in Section III-B.

In Fig. 6, we plot V_{met} versus $\hat{V}_{met}$, as well as the least squares line, whose equation is on the graph. The linear correlation coefficient between both measurements is good (about 97%). By neglecting the offset of the least squares line, the method seems to slightly underestimate the visibility distance. This can be due to the facts that the road is actually not plane and that the calibration of the horizon line is inaccurate. In Fig. 7, we plot V_{mob} versus $\hat{V}_{met}$, as well as the least squares line. The linear correlation coefficient between both measurements is as good as in Fig. 6 (about 97%). The second method also slightly underestimates the visibility distance. However, in this case, this is quite normal. Indeed, according to (6), V_{mob} should be always inferior or equal to V_{met} and, consequently, to $\hat{V}_{met}$. Moreover, both methods seem to be robust to the presence of obstacles in the field of view of the camera. Finally, different error estimations between reference and in-vehicle measurements are given in Table III. The accuracy of in-vehicle methods is approximately 10%.

Even if some hypotheses must still be quantitatively validated, the results are satisfactory, taking into account the fact that the experimental validation of such methods is very difficult. Indeed, grabbing pictures under natural foggy conditions is a tough task, because we do not control the weather conditions and the fog homogeneity. Moreover, our validation site is a prototype. Consequently, it has some minor imperfections: The road is not plane and is not “black,” contrary to our assumptions. We also had to make a compromise between the size of the targets and their wind resistance. Using bigger targets




Fig. 6. Points: Estimation of the meteorological visibility distance V_{met} versus the reference visibility distance $\hat{V}_{met}$ obtained thanks to the reference targets. Line: Correlation line of the points, whose equation is shown in the graph. The linear correlation coefficient is about 97%.




Fig. 7. Points: Estimation of the mobilized visibility distance V_{mob} versus the reference visibility distance $\hat{V}_{met}$ obtained thanks to the reference targets. Line: Least squares line of the points, whose equation is shown in the graph. The linear correlation coefficient is also about 97%.

TABLE III
AVERAGE, ABSOLUTE GLOBAL, AND RELATIVE ERRORS BETWEEN REFERENCE AND IN-VEHICLE MEASUREMENTS

		V_{met}	V_{mob}
Average error [m]	$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{V}_i - V_i $	6.3	8.7
Absolute global error [m]	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{V}_i - V_i)^2}$	9.3	11.7
Relative global error [%]	$\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{V}_i - V_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{V}_i^2}}$	8	9.3

would have led to a better estimation of $\hat{V}_{met}$; however, it was not physically possible. Nevertheless, a camera with a better resolution could improve the reference estimates. Indeed, if the camera resolution is improved by a factor n , the number of pixels that belongs to a target is increased by a factor n^2 since all the targets have the same size in the image. By assuming that the pixels are independent from each other and keep a constant sensitivity, the uncertainty on $\hat{V}_{met}$ is reduced by a factor $(1/\sqrt{n^2}) = (1/n)$. Finally, a radiometric calibration of

the camera would also slightly improve the correlation of the data. In the future, it would be interesting to test the methods with a better camera and to have a transmissometer to be able to evaluate the meteorological visibility distance with a sensor dedicated to the measurement of the extinction coefficient of the atmosphere. The dynamic validation of the methods remains a challenging task.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented a measurement framework for different atmospheric visibility distances that are defined. A link between the different distances is built. Two onboard techniques to measure them are briefly presented. Then, the problem of the validation of such techniques is discussed. We proposed a solution based on a static calibration using a dedicated site with reference targets. The graphic design retained for the targets and the geometry of the site is presented. Then, the validation process is presented and applied on photometrically simulated pictures of the site. Then, we compare the results of the onboard techniques and the static one on actual pictures of the site. The first results are satisfactory and are in agreement with the theory. The validation site that is presented is quite well adapted to estimate the meteorological visibility distance. Finally, ideas for improving the results are indicated.

REFERENCES

- [1] *International Lighting Vocabulary*. Vienna, Austria: Commission Internationale de l'Éclairage, 1987, no. 17.4.
- [2] T. Cornsweet, *Visual Perception*. New York: Academic, 1970.
- [3] E. Dumont and V. Cavallo, "Extended photometric model of fog effects on road vision," *Transp. Res. Rec.*, vol. 1862, pp. 77–81, 2004.
- [4] N. Hautière, R. Labayrade, and D. Aubert, "Dispositif de mesure de distance de visibilité," French Patent 0411061, Oct. 19, 2004. LCPC/INRETS.
- [5] N. Hautière, R. Labayrade, and D. Aubert, "Real-time disparity contrast combination for onboard estimation of the visibility distance," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 201–212, Jun. 2006.
- [6] N. Hautière, J.-P. Tarel, J. Lavenant, and D. Aubert, "Automatic fog detection and estimation of visibility distance through use of an onboard camera," *Mach. Vis. Appl.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 8–20, Apr. 2006.
- [7] N. Hautière, D. Aubert, and M. Jorlin, "Measurement of local contrast in images, application to the measurement of visibility distance through use of an onboard camera," *Traitement du Signal*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 145–158, 2006.
- [8] R. Köhler, "A segmentation system based on thresholding," *CVGIP, Graph. Models Image Process.*, vol. 15, pp. 319–338, 1981.
- [9] T. M. Kwon, "Atmospheric visibility measurements using video cameras: Relative visibility," Univ. Minnesota Duluth, Duluth, MN, Tech. Rep. CTS-04-03, Jul. 2004.
- [10] R. Labayrade and D. Aubert, "In-vehicle obstacles detection and characterization by stereovision," in *Proc. 1st Int. Workshop In-Veh. Cogn. Comput. Vis. Syst.*, Graz, Austria, Nov. 2003.
- [11] R. Labayrade, D. Aubert, and J.-P. Tarel, "Real time obstacle detection in stereovision on non flat road geometry through "v-disparity" representation," in *Proc. IEEE Intell. Veh. Symp.*, Versailles, France, 2002, pp. 646–651.
- [12] J. Lavenant, J.-P. Tarel, and D. Aubert, "Procédé de détermination de la distance de visibilité et procédé de détermination de la présence d'un brouillard," French Patent 0201822, Feb. 14, 2002. LCPC/INRETS.
- [13] W. Middleton, *Vision Through the Atmosphere*. Toronto, ON, Canada: Univ. Toronto Press, 1952.
- [14] G. Paulmier, "Luminance evaluation in daytime fog," *Transp. Res. Rec.*, vol. 1862, pp. 82–88, 2004.
- [15] PREDIT, *ARCOS: Research Action for Secure Driving*. [Online]. Available: <http://www.arcos2004.com>



Nicolas Hautière received the M.S. degree in civil engineering from the National School of State Public Works (ENTPE), Lyon, France, in 2002 and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in computer vision from the Université Jean Monnet, Saint-Etienne, France, in 2002 and 2005, respectively.

From 2002 to 2005, he was with the Interactions Vehicle–Infrastructure–Drivers Research Laboratory (LIVIC), Versailles, France, which is a mixed research unit between the French National Institute for Transportation and Safety Research (INRETS), Paris, and the French Public Works Research Laboratory (LCPC), Paris. During this period, he was involved in the French Research Action for Secure Driving (ARCOS) Project. Since October 2005, he has been a Researcher with the Division for Road Operation, Signalling, and Lighting, LCPC. Currently, he is involved in the FP6 Cooperative Systems for Road Safety (SAFESPOT) Integrated Project. He is a coleader of the French National Research Agency (ANR) Dialogue between the Infrastructure and Vehicles to Improve Road Safety (DIVAS) Project. He is establishing a partnership with the California Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways in the area of cooperative systems in the framework of the DIVAS America Project.



Didier Aubert received the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from the National Polytechnic Institute of Grenoble (INPG), Grenoble, France, in 1985 and 1989, respectively.

From 1989 to 1990, he was a Research Scientist with the Navigation Laboratory (NAVLAB), Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, working on the development of an automatic road following system. From 1990 to 1994, he was with the Research Department, ITMI, which is a private company. During this period, he was the Project Leader of several projects dealing with computer vision. In 1995, he joined the French National Institute for Transportation and Safety Research (INRETS), Paris, France. He is currently a Senior Researcher, the Manager of the Perception Team, and the Deputy Director of the Interactions Vehicle–Infrastructure–Drivers Research Laboratory (LIVIC), Versailles, France, which is a mixed research unit between INRETS and the French Public Works Research Laboratory (LCPC), Paris. He works on road traffic monitoring, crowd monitoring, automated highway systems, and driving assistance systems. He is an Image Processing Expert for several companies and teaches at several universities (Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris; Université Paris XI; Université Paris 12 Val de Marne; Université d'Évry Val-d'Essonne, Évry, France; and Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines University) and engineering schools (École Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, Paris; École Nationale Supérieure des Télécommunications, Paris; and École Nationale Supérieure des Mines de Paris). He is on the editorial board of *RTS (Research—Transport—Safety)*.



Éric Dumont received the M.S. degree in civil engineering from the National School of State Public Works (ENTPE), Lyon, France, in 1992, the M.S. degree in image processing from the Université Jean Monnet, Saint-Etienne, France, in 1992, and the Ph.D. degree in mathematics and computer science from the René Descartes University, Paris, France, in 2002.

Since 1992, he has been a Researcher with the Division for Road Operation, Signalling, and Lighting, French Public Works Research Laboratory (LCPC), Paris, where he has been the Head of the Lighting and Visibility Research Team since 2005. His research interests cover the synthesis, acquisition, and analysis of digital images for the assessment of road visibility in various lighting and weather conditions.



Jean-Philippe Tarel (M'98) received the degree in applied mathematics from the Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussees (ENPC), Paris, France, in 1991 and the Ph.D. degree in applied mathematics from Paris IX—Dauphine University in 1996.

From 1991 to 1996, he was with the Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et Automatique (INRIA), Le Chesnay, France. From 1997 to 1998, he was a Research Associate with Brown University, Providence, RI. Since 1999, he has been a Researcher with the Division for Road Operation, Signalling, and Lighting, French Public Works Research Laboratory (LCPC), Paris. From 2001 to 2003, he was with INRIA. His research interests include 3-D reconstruction, pattern recognition, and detection.