TRANSPORTATION **LEARNING NETWORK** A partnership with MDT•NDDOT•SDDOT•WYDOT and the Mountain-Plains Consortium Universities

Welcome!

Automated Image-Based Aircraft Tracking

Presented by:

Mohammad Farhadmanesh

Our partners:



UPPER GREAT PLAINS TRANSPORTATION INSTITUTE RANSPORTATION LEARNING NETWOR

This material is subject to change at the discretion of the presenter. If there are changes, TLN will obtain a revised copy to be posted on the LMS for download after the presentation. Thank you.



Contents

- Importance of the project (non-towered airports)
- Review of the existing methods
- · Benefits of a vision-based method
- · The developed camera-based method
 - Camera layouts
 - Machine vision
- Case studies (data collections)
- System performance
 - · Counting, activity recognition, and identification accuracy
 - Limitations (OCR friendly, night time)
- Implementation (airports configurations)
 - $\cdot\,$ Hardware and software and cost analysis
 - + Spin-off benefit (automating of ST/C cameras)
- Future Research (prototyping and edge computing)

 $\mathbf{2}$

Non-Towered Airport Operations

Airport Operation Measurement Necessity

- · Fair allocation of federal and state level budgets
- Accurate preparation of airport master plans
- Facilitating environmental studies
- $\cdot\,$ Air traffic control tower justification
- Operation Identification Benefits
 - Security purposes (unauthorized landings)
 - Safety purposes (incursions)







Non-Towered Airport Operations

- · Control Towers deliver operation measurement
- 97% of the U.S. airports are non-towered



Existing Methods

1. Acoustical counting method

- 2. ADS-B based counting
- 3. Radio click counting

Existing Methods

- 1. Acoustical counting method
 - Misses most landing operations
 - Misses quieter aircraft
 - Inaccurate counting
 - No identification



Existing Methods

2. ADS-B based counting

- Low equipage rate of the current GA aviation fleet with transponders
- Mode C the prevalent mode (Requires an interrogator + No ID)
- Most non-towered airports are not inside the airspace where ADS-B enabled avionics will be required by FAA



Existing Methods

3. Radio click counting (GARD)

- Inaccurate counting
- Not for airport with shared Unicom frequency
- No identification



 $\overline{7}$

Benefits of a Vision-based Method

- Do not need cooperative aircraft
- Do not rely on radar or radio information
- Not sensitive to aircraft model (sound of engine, ...)
- · Has been used for automation of many tasks in the aviation systems



Developed Camera-based Method

- Major elements:
 - Camera Layout
 - Machine Vision

















- \cdot Each operation footage has between ~150 to ~300 frames
- Each frame ----- > one detected tail number
- Errors:
 - noise and blurry effects
 - + D looks like 0, 4 and A, S and 5, T and 7 and 1,....
 - Occlusion: some hidden and unread characters
- * 150-300 tail number recognition for one operation
- Joint Probabilistic Analysis:











Is there any other way to increase the system reliability?

FAA Database

- ~ 300,000 Registered Aircraft in the U.S.
- Similar registered N-Numbers (Tail Numbers)
 - + e.g., N127BF could be seen as N1278F or N121BF or \ldots

• Solution? Aircraft Type/Model Recognition Prior to Aircraft Tail Number Identification

• Removes irrelevant tail numbers to the recognized aircraft type



Registration Database







Case Studies: Test Locations

• Weather Conditions:

- · Snowy
- · Cloudy
- Sunny
- Time
 - Day-time
 - Night-time
- Locations
 - 5 public-use Utah airports











Case Studies: Experimental Setup

• The traffic was recorded separately during the data collection time using a **radio** and by direct **observation**





System Performance Limitations

• Not OCR-friendly Tail Numbers



- Runway lighting alleviate the nighttime visibility issues (operation count)
- Infrared night vision cameras for layout 2 in airports with no lighting
- Lower frequency of aircraft operations mitigate the low visibility issue (The ACRP Report 129)

ACRP Report 129 "Evaluating methods for counting aircraft operations at non-towered airports"



31

Implementation

- Optimum placement of the cameras at the five test location airports
 - Camera Layout 1:
 - Two cameras for each runway lane
 - Counts Departures and Landings
 - Less accurate identification
 - Camera Layout 2:
 - One camera at each strategic passage
 - Counts Departures, Arrivals, Touch&Goes
 - More accurate identification





J-I

Associate Costs

Option	Base (WIFI)	Cellular	Solar
Implementation/initial setup cost per project	\$1,500		
Camera (outdoor rated, PTZ)	\$500		+\$600
Installation	\$500		+\$450
Data (maximum 1000 flights per month for cellular option)		+\$6400	
AiViON [™] 8-month License	\$3,000		
Total (for two camera system)	\$11,900	\$24,300	

Implementation Spin off Benefit (S/TC)











Acknowledgment

- Mountain-Plains Consortium
- Utah Department of Transportation

Airport Authorities:

- Steve Durtschi (Skypark Airport manager)
- Tyler Pugsley (Brigham Municipal Airport manager)
- Cris Child (Spanish Fork Airport assistant manager)
- Travis Biggs (Heber Valley Airport manager)
- Dakota Mahan (Heber Valley Airport assistant manager)
- Lee Ivie (Logan-Cache Airport manager)

Student Team Members:

- Chandler Cross
- Ali Hassandokht
- Behnam Sherafat
- Zhongming Zhiang
- Vitoria Bini
- Cyrus Safai

TRANSPORTATION LEARNING NETWORK

A partnership with MDT•NDDOT•SDDOT•WYDOT and the Mountain-Plains Consortium Universities

Thank you for participating!

Please take a moment to complete the evaluation included in the reminder email.

We appreciate your feedback.

Contact Information

Chris Padilla chris.padilla@ndsu.edu (701) 202-5730

Susan Hendrickson susan.Hendrickson@ndsu.edu (701) 238-8646

Shannon Olson shannon.l.olson@ndsu.edu (701) 552-0672

Amanda Miller amanda.jean.miller@ndsu.edu (701) 515-8774

https://tln.learnflex.net https://www.translearning.org

Thank you to our partners:





Be Legendary."



