


Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. FHWA/TX-05/7-4975-1		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Development of an Automatic Pavement Surface Distress Inspection System				5. Report Date October 2003	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Bugao Xu and Yaxiong Huang				8. Performing Organization Report No. 7-4975-1	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Center for Transportation Research The University of Texas at Austin 3208 Red River, Suite 200 Austin, TX 78705-2650				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. 7-4975	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Texas Department of Transportation Research and Technology Implementation Office P.O. Box 5080 Austin, TX 78763-5080				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Technical Report 9/1/99-8/31/03	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes Project performed in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration.					
16. Abstract This paper presents a newly developed image-processing algorithm that was customized for high-speed, real-time inspection of pavement cracking. The algorithm was based on the "grid cell" analysis, in which a pavement image is divided into grid cells of 8x8 pixels and each cell is classified as a non-crack cell or a crack cell based on the statistics of the grayscales of the cell pixels. Whether a crack cell can be regarded as a basic element (or seed) depends on its contrast to the neighboring cells. If a number of crack seeds can be called a crack cluster if they can form a linear string. A crack cluster should correspond to a dark strip in the original pavement image that may or may not be a section of a real crack. Additional conditions to verify a crack cluster include the requirements in the contrast, width and length of the strip. If verified crack clusters are oriented in similar directions, they can be joined to become one crack. Because many operations are performed on crack seeds rather than on the original image, crack detection can be done simultaneously when the frame grabber is forming a new image from the linescan camera. This high-speed process algorithm permits real-time, highway speed pavement survey. The trial test results show a good repeatability and accuracy when the system conducts multiple surveys and runs at different speeds and different weather conditions.					
17. Key Words Pavement distress, crack detection, image-processing, repeatability.				18. Distribution Statement No restrictions. This document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161; www.ntis.gov .	
19. Security Classif. (of report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of pages 28		22. Price



DEVELOPMENT OF AN AUTOMATIC PAVEMENT SURFACE DISTRESS INSPECTION SYSTEM

Bugao Xu and Yaxiong Huang

CTR Research Report:	7-4975-1
Report Date:	October 2003
Research Project:	7-4975
Research Project Title:	<i>Implementation of an Automated Pavement Surface Rating System for Asphaltic Pavements</i>
Sponsoring Agency:	Texas Department of Transportation
Performing Agency:	Center for Transportation Research at The University of Texas at Austin

Center for Transportation Research
The University of Texas at Austin
3208 Red River
Austin, TX 78705

www.utexas.edu/research/ctr

Copyright © 2005
Center for Transportation Research
The University of Texas at Austin

All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Disclaimers

Authors' Disclaimer: The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official view or policies of the Federal Highway Administration or the Texas Department of Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

Patent Disclaimer: The researcher has filed the technology disclosure to the Office of Technology Commercialization for patent and copyright evaluations.

Engineering Disclaimer

NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION, BIDDING, OR PERMIT PURPOSES.

Project Supervisor: Bugao Xu

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful for the financial support provided by TxDOT, and would like to thank the project directors, Brian Michalk and Carl Bertrand, and many other members at the Pavement Design Section of TxDOT for their advice and help in the project.

Table of Contents

Development of an Automatic Pavement Surface Distress Inspection System.....	1
Summary	13
References.....	14

List of Figures

Figure 1. TxDOT Pavement Inspection Vehicle.....	3
Figure 2. Flow chart.....	4
Figure 3. Cell characteristics in a pavement image	5
Figure 4. Pavement image and cell map, original image (a) and cell map (b)	6
Figure 5. Templates for crack seed verification.....	7
Figure 6. Tracing cracks from the seeds, verified seeds (a), seed clusters (b) and traced cracks (c)	7
Figure 7. A 10-meter pavement image (a) and its crack map (b)	8
Figure 8. Repeatability test with multiple scans	9
Figure 9. Repeatability test under different weather conditions	10
Figure 10. Repeatability test with different vehicle speed.....	10
Figure 11. Reproducibility of multiple units.....	11
Figure 12. Repeatability test of AASHTO data in LWP	12

List of Tables

Table I Correlations (R^2) of Multiple Scans of Multiple Vehicles	11
Table II Correlations (R^2) of Multiple Scans in AASHTO Data	12

Development of an Automatic Pavement Surface Distress Inspection System

Introduction

Pavement surface distresses are common failures of pavement constructions. Among them, cracking is a major cause, jeopardizing road serviceability and requiring prompt surface rehabilitation. In the early 1970's, researchers started to use digital imaging technology to develop automated pavement surface distress inspection (APSDI) systems for pavement distress surveys^[1,3,4]. An APSDI system may reduce disturbance to the public traffic and road hazard to human inspectors during the survey. A true APSDI system needs to be able to detect thin cracking distress of 2 mm in width in various background textures while traveling at highway speed. Given the complexity of pavement conditions and textures, implementing such a system remains challenging.

The commercially available APSDI systems differ in their image acquisition devices. These devices include area-scan, linescan, and time delay integration (TDI) linescan cameras. An area-scan camera grabs one frame of image at a time, and requires to be mounted to have a clear and perpendicular view of a rectangle area of the pavement. This makes the system vulnerable to the vehicle vibration due to the long extension of the mounting device. It is also difficult to provide a uniform lighting to a large area under different weather conditions. The TDI technology integrates photo charges from multiple CCD line arrays. It is useful in the high-speed image acquisition where the exposure time is limited or when the illumination is low. However, a TDI camera is sensitive to the optical alignment to the target. Vehicle vibrations will blur the image, especially at high speed. Recent development on CCD technology not only dramatically increases the camera's resolution and line scan rate, but also greatly enhance the sensitivity of CCD sensors. For example, the Dalsa Piranha2 2048 pixel linescan camera can grab 44,000 line images per second, and its sensitivity is high enough to get good quality images while moving 112 km/h (70 mph) without artificial lighting.

Another main characteristic that differentiates APSDI systems is the image processing technique used for the feature extraction. The processing speed is one of main concerns when developing an effective image processing algorithm for real-time crack detection. If the image size is 2048 x 512 pixels, covering a pavement area of 3.05 x 0.76 m² (10 x 2.5²) and the vehicle speed is 112 km/h (70 mph), the computer has only 32 ms to acquire and process an image. This is why many existing systems use an offline approach to extract data from grabbed images. The offline processing, however, provides no real-time data on site, and it requires additional work and equipment for the post processing. A recent study conducted by the Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center concluded that an offline APSDI system and the manual survey provided consistence pavement condition index (PCI) measurements, and the costs of both surveys were at the same level^[5]. Many offline image processing techniques such as digital filter, adaptive threshold, and expert system can be readily found in the literatures^[6,7,8]. In 1998, the CSIRO Manufacturing Science & Technology, in Australia, developed an automated pavement surface inspection system, RoadCrack, which can be operated at a vehicle speed up to 105 km/h while processing images in real time. The system uses four CCD cameras to grab images of a 500 mm wide wheel path with a 1 mm resolution. Although it was the first fully functional online APSDI system, RoadCrack guarantees only a minimum of 10% distance coverage.

From 1999, we started a project to develop an APSDI system called "VCrack" for the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT). The VCrack system was designed to run at a

vehicle speed ranging from 5 to 112 km/h (3 to 70 mph), to characterize cracking distress in real time and report the data via a local network to the database at a given distance interval. The data format was required to be compatible with both the Texas PMIS (pavement management information system) protocol and the AASHTO (American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials) protocol. The system also needed to cover the full width of the pavement (3.65m) and 100% of the pavement in traveling distance. The system has been used by TxDOT for pavement inspections since 2003. This paper intends to report the image processing algorithm used in the VCrack for crack detections.

System Configuration

Figure 1 shows a TxDOT pavement inspection vehicle equipped with the VCrack system, which consists of a linescan CCD camera, a PCI frame grabber, and a PC computer. The linescan camera, mounted in a waterproof enclosure, is a Dalsa Piranha2 camera that has a linear array of 2048 pixels. When the camera covers 3.65 m in width, it has a ground resolution of 1.786 mm/pixel. The camera captures a line image at a time and sends individual lines to the frame grabber through a high speed Camlink interface. Once 512 lines, covering 914.4 mm (3 ft) in distance, are accumulated on the board, an image of 2048 x 512 pixels is transferred to the main memory of the computer. The cumulative lines per image can be set to a different number. The line scan rate of the camera can be dynamically adjusted either by the frame grabber or by the computer through Camlink's communication port. The rate must be synchronized with the vehicle speed to ensure that each line covers exactly the same distance on the pavement. The exposure time of the CCD array is also controlled for each scan through the communication port. The brightness of the current image can be used to calculate a reasonable exposure time for the next scan to avoid an over or under exposed image. It takes about 5 ms to transfer this 8-bit grayscale image from the frame grabber to the system memory, leaving only less than 25 ms for image processing when the vehicle travels at the speed of 112 km/h. The VCrack can communicate to the other inspection modules on the vehicle through a local network. It supports multiple data clients during run time. It also accepts external GPS and time data from other modules for the system synchronization.




Figure 1. TxDOT Pavement Inspection Vehicle

Figure 2 shows the flowchart of the crack detection algorithm. A special designed grid cell analysis (GCA) method is applied to the original image to extract features in each cell. A cell represents an 8×8 pixel sub-image. It takes about 5 ms for a 3.0 GHz Pentium VI processor to perform this GCA. After this GCA, all further analysis will take place at the cell level for fast crack detection. The GCA will be discussed in detail later.

The average pixel grayscale values of cells and their vertical and horizontal projections are used to calculate the overall brightness of the image. According to the nature of the linescan image acquisition, when the survey vehicle stands still or makes a sharp turn, its grabbed image shows vertical strips or blurs in some areas. These images should be excluded from further processing. The vertical cell value projection and its contrast between each neighbor cell can be used to detect this defect. If an image is affected by a shadow of the vehicle body or camera mounting post under nature lighting, the distribution of its vertical cell value projection will show a clear pattern reflecting the affected area.




Figure 2. Flow chart

Grid Cell Analysis (GCA)

A primary clue for detecting cracks in a pavement image is that a crack is a thin strip of pixels whose intensities are appreciably darker than the surrounding background. In order to save time in crack tracing and classification, we attempt to divide an image into grid cells of 8 x 8 pixels and to extract cracking information of small cells rather than the entire image. The cracking information from each cell, the length, width, and contrast of a dark object, includes its mean brightness and minimum brightness and the presence of a dark strip within the cell. A cell is then categorized as either a non-crack cell or a crack seed by comparing its features to the preset thresholds. Only crack cells will be used as potential seed that may form cracks in further processing.

Figure 3 (a) shows three different grid cells. The top one contains crack pixels (dark), the middle one does not have crack pixels and the bottom one has crack pixels on its border. The average grayscale of the border pixels, indicated by arrows in Figure 3 (b), can be used as an overall brightness of the cell. Figure 3 (c) shows the brightness profiles of the border pixels of the three cells. In the top profile, the brightness shows two sharp valleys, indicating the crossing points of a crack on the border. The center of these two valley pixels can be selected as crack seed, and its grayscale can be replaced by one of its immediate neighbors that has the minimum grayscale value. This minimum grayscale and the coordinates of the center of the original image are recorded for later crack verification. This information is useful for checking the orientation, length, width and contrast of the crack. When a cell does not contain a crack, its border profile (middle) shows no apparent valley. This cell will be marked with a non-crack flag at the pixel that has the minimum grayscale in the cell. If the border grayscale profile shows only one significant valley (bottom), the cell may have an edge crack. The darkest pixel on the border is

selected as a crack seed. Whether this cell is part of a crack depends on the characteristics of its neighbor cells.




Figure 3. Cell characteristics in a pavement image

The cell map of a pavement image can be created by setting the grayscales of the 8 x 8 pixels of each grid cell to the selected minimum value (Figure 4). Furthermore, each cell can be reduced to one pixel to form a scaled down image in which potential crack seeds are marked. The scaled down image of crack seeds is the one to be used for further verifications of cracks.




Figure 4. Pavement image and cell map, original image (a) and cell map (b)

Crack Verification

A crack is a fissure on a pavement surface with a high length to width ratio and a significant contrast to its neighboring area. Analyzing the contrast between a crack seed and its neighbor is the main cue for verifying if the crack seed is indeed a part of a crack. In addition, the crack seed must have at least one dark neighbor to be considered as a crack portion, not an isolated pixel. A set of templates is designed to calculate the contrast of a crack seed (Figure 5). Each template contains six pixels. The black pixel represents a crack seed to be evaluated; the gray pixel represents the direction in which the contrast is calculated, and the four white pixel are the neighbors of the seed. The contrast C_c of the seed is defined by as follows:

$$C_c = \frac{2 \times \bar{V} - V_b - V_g}{\bar{V}},$$

where \bar{V} is the average value of all the six cells, and V_b and V_g are the values of the black and gray cells, respectively. If the contrast passes the threshold, the crack seed is validated. Otherwise, the computer continues to try with another template. If none of the six templates yields a satisfactory contrast, the seed will be discarded. If the C_c s from multiple templates exceed the threshold, the one that gives the maximum C_c will be selected. From the template, a seed can be also determined as a longitudinal, transverse, or diagonal seed. This directional information is useful for avoiding false connections in the crack-tracing process. A longitudinal crack may consist of only longitudinal and diagonal seeds, while a transverse crack should have only transverse and diagonal seeds.




Figure 5. Templates for crack seed verification

Crack Cluster Connection

The white dots in Figure 6 (a) present all verified seeds of the image in Figure 4 (a). Compared to the original image, the volume of data has been dramatically reduced. The next step is to connect individual seeds into seed clusters. Starting from one seed, a crack cluster grows by accepting adjacent seeds one at a time until no close seed can be taken. The size of crack clusters varies in the image. The information, such as the weight or the number of seeds in the cluster, the GCA parameters of each seed, the direction, and the starting and ending seeds, should be stored for each cluster. Figure 6 (b) shows the crack clusters of Figure 6 (a).




Figure 6. Tracing cracks from the seeds, verified seeds (a), seed clusters (b) and traced cracks (c)

A crack cluster can be used to draw a path in the corresponding pavement image. A valid crack cluster must have a clear, dark, and narrow strip along the path. To verify whether a crack cluster corresponds to a real crack, we need to examine three features of the crack path in the original image. First, the contrast of the pixels on the path to the neighbor pixels on both sides should not exceed a threshold to avoid light marks of skid or paint. Second, the width and the width variation of the strip should not go beyond the given limits to omit shadows, pavement joints, and other non-crack objects. Finally, the path must have a certain length to be separated from short segments that may be simply caused by pavement noise or unwanted features. After crack clusters are verified and short clusters are deleted, the clusters that are in the vicinity and have similar orientations can be traced to become a long crack (Figure 6 (c)). The direction of a traced crack is calculated based on its starting and ending coordinates, and therefore the crack can be classified as longitudinal or transverse.

Validation Tests

To facilitate the validation tests, the VCrack system also provides the functions for capturing and saving pavement images over a long distance and the functions for visual feedback (crack maps) of the detection results. It continuously records the full size images of 1 km (0.62 mile) pavement or the compressed images of 16 km (10 miles) pavement. The VCrack measurements are compared with those obtained from the on-screen visual examinations of the same images. Figure 7 shows a 10-meter pavement section with its crack map output from the VCrack. The cracks in the crack maps are the simplified drawings of verified crack clusters, which do not intend to reflect the fine details of cracks rather than their locations and orientations. Continuous crack maps are stored along with interval crack, providing both summary data and distributed data for scanned pavements.




Figure 7. A 10-meter pavement image (a) and its crack map (b)

The accuracy of the VCrack was evaluated by comparing the results of the on-screen visual assessment of the 100 pavement images chosen from pavement sections representing various cracking situations. It is found that the correlations (R^2) between the two evaluation methods are 0.91 for longitudinal cracking and 0.96 for transverse cracking.

The repeatability test of the VCrack was performed by scanning the same pavement (asphalt) section multiple times. The survey data were recorded at an interval of 30.5 m (100 ft). The correlations of the cracking data of any two scans were used to examine the consistency or repeatability of multiple tests. Figure 8 shows the cracking data of the three scans (#1, #2, and #3) on a 3.2 km (2 mile) pavement at a constant speed of 88 km/h (55 mph). The correlations of both longitudinal and transverse cracking data between two scans are all above 0.9. Similar results were achieved on many other pavements. Since it is difficult to maintain the driving path of the vehicle to be the same in different runs, it is logical to see the difference in the outputs as shown in Figure 8. Other factors that may contribute to the variations of multiple scans are the difference in the lighting condition and the vehicle speed.




Figure 8. Repeatability test with multiple scans

The weather condition can affect the image quality and the output data since the VCrack just uses the natural lighting for image capturing at the reporting time. Figure 9 shows the longitudinal cracking of an asphalt pavement measured on three days which had different weather conditions (sunny, cloudy and heavily cloudy). The correlation analysis of these scans suggested that the VCrack can provide fairly consistent measurements under different lighting conditions, but the consistency drops significantly. The cloudy day had sufficient natural lighting for image capturing, but did not cause any shadow in the images. Therefore, it provided an ideal lighting condition for the VCrack. On the heavily cloudy day, the image became dark and the contrast was low. Detecting shallow cracks became more problematic. On the sunny day, the sunlight might be partially obstructed by the vehicle, causing errors for the cracks under the shadow. It is asserted that a device that is able to provide a constant lighting condition is essential for an automated pavement cracking inspection system to ensure the reliable and consistent performance. A linear lighting device is being developed for the VCrack system. Besides the lighting variations in those days, the difference in driving path and speed may be another main factor contributing to the lower correlations.




Figure 9. Repeatability test under different weather conditions

The scanning rate of the linescan camera varies with the speed of the vehicle to keep the image resolution in the longitudinal direction constant. The vehicle may generate different levels of vibrations when it travels at different speeds. Therefore, the vehicle speed may affect output results. Figure 10 displays the longitudinal cracking data collected at three different speeds on a shorter distance pavement (asphalt) where public traffic was limited. The data show that the VCrack can provide consistent results when the vehicle travels at a speed varying from 56 to 88 km/h. However, it is observed that at 88 km/h the system seemed less sensitive to small cracks.




Figure 10. Repeatability test with different vehicle speed

The reproducibility of the VCrack was also tested by comparing the data generated by multiple units installed on different vehicles (V1 and V2). This test was performed on a concrete pavement, and the two vehicles output highly consistent counts for transverse cracks (Figure 11). Table I provides further information about the correlations of the multiple scans (#1, #2, and #3) of the two vehicles on the same pavement. Both vehicles have a similar level of correlations for their multiple scans.




Figure 11. Reproducibility of multiple units

Table I Correlations (R^2) of Multiple Scans of Multiple Vehicles

	V1	V2
#1 - #2	0.88	0.96
#1 - #3	0.96	0.96
#2 - #3	0.91	0.97

The same concrete pavement was tested in the AASHTO protocol in which a pavement is longitudinally divided into four paths, left wheel path (LWP), right wheel path (RWP), between wheel path (BWP) and outside wheel path (OWP), and the linear density of cracks in each path is calculated. The high repeatability of the VCrack is also evident by the AASHTO data presented in Figure 12 and Table II. The cracking data in Figure 12 are the percentiles of the cracks in each interval within the left wheel path. Three different scans on LWP show the consistent trend. The correlations of the AASHTO data in all the paths are presented in Table II.




Figure 12. Repeatability test of AASHTO data in LWP

Table II Correlations (R^2) of Multiple Scans in AASHTO Data

	LWP	RWP	BWP	OWP
#1 - #2	0.96	0.91	0.93	0.97
#1 - #3	0.95	0.83	0.92	0.94
#2 - #3	0.92	0.82	0.92	0.93

Summary

An automated pavement surface distress inspection system needs both high-sensitivity image acquisition devices and high-speed image-processing software to provide real-time inspections. The acquisition devices should be able to capture quality pavement images under different moving speeds and weather conditions. The captured images should have a resolution high enough for distinguishing fine cracks required by the current pavement survey protocols. On the other hand, the image-processing algorithm should be able to detect various types of distresses accurately and consistently in a given time. The current digital imaging technology provides abundant selections for hardware that can meet these needs. The challenge to develop a high-speed image processing algorithm to fulfill real-time crack identification still remains.

In this project, we developed a customized image-processing algorithm for high-speed, real-time inspection of pavement cracking. In the algorithm, crack detection takes three steps. The first step is called the "grid cell" analysis (GCA). The GCA method divides a pavement image into grid cells of 8 x 8 pixels. Each cell is classified as a non-crack cell or a crack cell based on the statistics of the grayscales of the cell pixels and one pixel is selected to represent the cell in a scaled down image. The second step is to verify the crack seeds by using the contrast of a crack seed to its neighbors. This step can remove many seeds that result from pavement noise. The verified crack seeds may form a crack cluster if they fall on a linear string. The third step is to verify and connect crack clusters to form cracks for final measurements including count, length, and orientation. A crack cluster should correspond to a dark strip in the original pavement image that may or may not be a section of a real crack. Additional conditions to verify a crack cluster include the requirements in the contrast, width and length of the strip. If verified crack clusters are oriented in similar directions, they can be joined to become one crack. Because many operations are performed on crack seeds rather than on the original image, crack detection can be done simultaneously when the frame grabber is forming a new image from the linescan camera. This high-speed process algorithm permits real-time, highway speed pavement survey. The trial test results show a good repeatability and accuracy when the system conducts multiple surveys and runs at different speeds and different weather conditions.

References

1. T. Fukuhara, K. Terada, M. Nagao, A. Kasahara, S. Ichihashi, Automatic Pavement-Distress-Survey System, *J. Transportation Engineering*, ASCE 116 (3), 280-286, 1990.
2. S. McNeil and F. Humplik, Evaluation of Errors in Automated-Distress Data Acquisition, *J. Transportation Engineering*, ASCE, 117 (2), 224-241, 1991.
3. K. Wang, Design and Implementation of Automated System for Pavement Surface Distress Survey, *Journal of Infrastructure System*, 6 (1), 24-32, 2000.
4. L. Sjogren, State of the art: Automated Crack Measurement of Road Surface, research project report, Swedish National Road and Transportation Research Institute (VTI), 2002.
5. Gregory D. Cline, Mohamed Y. Shahin, and Jeffrey A. Burkhalter, Automated Data Collection for Pavement Condition Index Survey, annual meeting of Transportation Research Board, 2003.
6. J. Pynn, A. Wright, and R. Lodge, Automated Identification of Crack in Road Surface, Image Processing and its Application, Conference Publication No. 465, 671-675, IEEE, 1999.
7. H. Fukui, J. Takagi, Y. Murata, and M. Takeuchi, An Image Processing Method to Detect Road Surface Condition Using Optical Spatial Frequency, *Intelligent Transportation System*, Conference Publication, 1005-1009, IEEE, 1997.
8. K. David and S. Frances, Automatic Road-Distress Classification and Identification Using a Combination of Hierarchical Classifications and Expert System-Subimage & Object Processing, *Image Processing*, Conference Publication, Vol. 2, 414-417. IEEE, 1997.
9. Pavement Management Information System, Rater's Manual for Fiscal Year 2001, Published in June 2000, Texas Department of Transportation.