

UMTRI-96-10

**EFFECTS OF REALISTIC LEVELS
OF DIRT ON LIGHT DISTRIBUTION
OF LOW-BEAM HEADLAMPS**

**Michael Sivak
Michael J. Flannagan
Eric C. Traube
Shinichi Kojima
Masami Aoki**

March 1996

EFFECTS OF REALISTIC LEVELS OF DIRT ON LIGHT DISTRIBUTION
OF LOW-BEAM HEADLAMPS

Michael Sivak
Michael J. Flannagan
Eric C. Traube
Shinichi Kojima
Masami Aoki

The University of Michigan
Transportation Research Institute
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-2150
U.S.A.

Report No. UMTRI-96-10
March 1996

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. UMTRI-96-10		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Effects of Realistic Levels of Dirt on Light Distribution of Low-Beam Headlamps				5. Report Date March 1996	
				6. Performing Organization Code 302753	
7. Author(s) Michael Sivak, Michael J. Flannagan, Eric C. Traube, Shinichi Kojima, and Masami Aoki				8. Performing Organization Report No. UMTRI-96-10	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute 2901 Baxter Road Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-2150 U.S.A.				10. Work Unit no. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address The University of Michigan Industry Affiliation Program for Human Factors in Transportation Safety				13. Type of Report and Period Covered	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes The Affiliation Program currently includes Adac Plastics, Bosch, Chrysler, Delphi Interior and Lighting Systems, Ford (Automotive Components Division), GE, GM NAO Safety and Restraints Center, Hella, Ichikoh Industries, Koito Manufacturing, LESCOA, Libbey-Owens-Ford, Magneti Marelli, North American Lighting, Osram Sylvania, Philips Lighting, PPG Industries, Reflexite, Stanley Electric, TEXTRON Automotive, United Technologies Automotive Systems, Valeo, Wagner Lighting, and 3M.					
16. Abstract <p>This study evaluated changes in the light output of low-beam headlamps as a function of dirt accumulated during a 482-km route, representing a 10-day amount of driving for a typical U.S. driver. The complete route was traversed on three separate occasions, under each of the following environmental conditions: summer while dry, summer while wet, and winter with road salt. Candela matrices were obtained for a rectangular central portion of the beam, extending from 20° left to 20° right, and from 5° down to 5° up (in 0.5° steps). Photometry for each of two lamps was performed twice after the completion of each drive, first "as is" and then after cleaning.</p> <p>The results indicate that dirt deposits tended to cause the light output to decrease below horizontal and increase near and above horizontal. The changes in the light output differed between the driver-side and passenger-side lamps, especially after the two summer drives. The largest changes occurred after the winter drive, with the decreases and increases in a large part of the beam for both lamps exceeding 25%, and with some of the increases exceeding 50%. At the U.S., European, and Japanese test points that control road illumination, the dirt effects tended to reduce the light output, and some of these decrements exceeded 25%. On the other hand, at test points that control glare, the dirt effects tended to increase illumination, but none of these increases exceeded 25%.</p>					
17. Key Words headlighting, headlamps, low beams, dirt, luminous intensity, visibility, glare				18. Distribution Statement Unlimited	
19. Security Classification (of this report) None		20. Security Classification (of this page) None		21. No. of Pages 19	22. Price

Acknowledgments

Appreciation is extended to the members of the University of Michigan Industry Affiliation Program for Human Factors in Transportation Safety for support of this research. The current members of the Program are:

Adac Plastics
Bosch
Chrysler
Delphi Interior and Lighting Systems
Ford (Automotive Components Division)
GE
GM NAO Safety and Restraints Center
Hella
Ichikoh Industries
Koito Manufacturing
LESCOA
Libbey-Owens-Ford
Magneti Marelli
North American Lighting
Osram Sylvania
Philips Lighting
PPG Industries
Reflexite
Stanley Electric
TEXTRON Automotive
United Technologies Automotive Systems
Valeo
Wagner Lighting
3M

We thank II Stanley for allowing us to use their facilities to perform the photometry.

Contents

Acknowledgments	ii
Introduction.....	1
Method.....	2
Results and Discussion	4
Summary and Conclusions	15
References	16

Introduction

Dirt deposits on headlamp lenses have two major effects, a reduction in the total amount of emitted light, and an increase in scattered light. The net effect is that, in many situations, the amount of light below horizontal (the light used for visibility) is reduced, while the amount of light above horizontal (glare light, as well as light needed for retroreflective traffic signs) is increased.

Past research has provided some indication of the magnitude of this problem. Relevant information concerning changes in the light output has been collected, for example, in the United Kingdom by Cox (1968), in Sweden by Rumar (1974), in Germany by Schmidt-Clausen (1978), in Yugoslavia by Cargonja and Rotim (1986), and in The Netherlands by Alferdinck and Padmos (1988) and by van Laarhoven (1994). This information indicates, for example, that decreases in intensity below horizontal can exceed 50% and in some cases even 90% (Cox, 1968; Rumar, 1974).

The effects of the changes in the light output on driver performance were evaluated by Rumar (1974) and Schmidt-Clausen (1978). The findings indicate that, for example, a 50% reduction in seeing intensity results in a reduction in seeing distance between 10% (Rumar, 1974) and 23% (Schmidt-Clausen, 1978).

The present study had three goals. The first goal was to obtain information relevant to the situation in the U.S; all of the above-cited studies were performed in Europe. The second goal was to obtain detailed information about the changes in a large portion of the beam pattern. In comparison, the previous studies provided information either about changes at a limited number of test points or about the locations of only certain isocandela/isolux curves. The third goal was to evaluate the effects of dirt on the light output at the current U.S., European, and Japanese test points.

Specifically, this study evaluated changes in the light output of low-beam headlamps as a function of dirt accumulated during a 482-km route, representing a 10-day amount of driving for a typical U.S. driver. The complete route was traversed on three separate occasions, under each of the following environmental conditions: summer while dry, summer while wet, and winter with road salt. Candela matrices were obtained for a rectangular central portion of the beam, extending from 20° left to 20° right, and from 5° down to 5° up (in 0.5° steps). Photometry for each of two lamps was performed twice after the completion of each drive, first “as is” and then after cleaning.

Method

Test vehicle

A midsize car was used for this experiment. The car was equipped with its original headlamps (HB4s). The headlamps were clear lens, dual-reflector lamps with replaceable bulbs and faceted reflectors. Headlamp lens size was 160 mm wide by 96 mm high, with a 600 mm center-to-ground distance. Center-to-center lateral separation between the two headlamps on the vehicle was 1,160 mm.

Test route

The test route was approximately 482-km long. It included roads in the southern and central portions of the lower peninsula of the state of Michigan. The surface of the route was asphalt (67%), concrete (30%), and unpaved (3%). In terms of the road type, the route included rural two-lane roads (53%), limited-access multi-lane highways (39%), and city streets (8%).

Test conditions

The test route was driven three times. The first drive took place on June 27, 1995, on a somewhat rainy and humid day. In terms of distance, about 18% of the drive involved wet roads and/or active precipitation.

The second drive took place on July 13, 1995, on a hot, humid, sunny day, with many insects present in the air. No precipitation occurred during the drive, and the pavement was dry throughout.

The third and final drive was on January 25, 1996, on a very cold day. Snow had fallen on a large part of the route within the previous 24 hours (but there was no active snowfall during the drive), and most of the route was heavily salted. Approximately 22% of the length of the route involved snowy or wet pavement (presumably with salt), 19% was classified as “damp and salty,” and 59% was mostly “dry and salty.” The level of salt on the roads varied, but it was clearly visible on the road surface for over 80% of the route.

Test equipment

The headlamp measurements were made in a photometry lab, using a full-size height-adjustable goniometer. The distance from the headlamp to the measuring screen was 30 m.

Procedure

During the test drives, data were recorded for road condition, pavement type, weather, and mileage. Data were recorded every 5 minutes, or when the condition changed. The headlamps were turned on and off using the following repeated schedule: 25 km on, 12.5 km off.

The headlamps were cleaned at the beginning of each drive. At the end of the test route, the headlamps were removed from the vehicle. After they had been measured in the “dirty” condition, they were cleaned and measured a second time.

Prior to photometry, the lamps were placed in stands built specifically for the style, shape, and model used in the experiment, and attached to the goniometer platform. Lamps were measured in 0.5° steps from 20° left to 20° right, and from 5° down to 5° up. Both measurements of one lamp (dirty and clean) were taken before the other lamp was measured.

Evaluation of the effects of the changes in the beam pattern

Any decrease in the light directed towards the roadway and potential obstacles will contribute to a decrease in visual performance of drivers. Similarly, any increase in glare light will result in reduced visual performance of the oncoming drivers. However, a nonzero criterion has to be established for evaluating the practical importance of light changes. For this study we selected a change of 25% as such a criterion. This selection was based on a finding by Huey, Dekker, and Lyons (1994) that subjects required stimulus intensity to change by 25% to be noticeably different.

Results and Discussion

Changes in the light output throughout the beam pattern

Summer/wet. Percentage change in luminous intensities from clean to dirty after the completion of the summer/wet drive are shown in Figure 1 for each lamp. For the left lamp, virtually all of the beam pattern below horizontal showed a decrease in luminous intensity. Conversely, virtually all of the beam pattern above horizontal showed an increase in luminous intensity. However, none of these changes were greater than 25%. For the right lamp, the decreases were confined to an area below about 2° below horizontal, with the remaining part of the beam pattern exhibiting increases. The changes that exceeded 25% were decreases in a small area centered around 4° below horizontal and 6.5° to the right of vertical, and increases near horizontal from about 6° to the left of vertical to about 10° to the right of vertical.

Summer/dry. Percentage change in luminous intensities from clean to dirty after the completion of the summer/dry drive are shown in Figure 2 for each lamp. The left lamp, generally, showed decreases in luminous intensity below horizontal and increases above horizontal. However, the changes were all within $\pm 25\%$. For the right lamp the decreases were from 2-3° below horizontal to about 2° above horizontal. The other parts of the beam pattern tended to show increases. However, the only changes that exceeded 25% were the decreases just below horizontal (primarily from about 6° to the left of vertical to about 5° to the right of vertical).

Winter/salty. Percentage change in luminous intensities from clean to dirty after the completion of the winter/salty drive are shown in Figure 3 for each lamp. For the left lamp, the decreases covered most of the beam pattern, except for an area above about 1-2° above horizontal. A large proportion of the changes were greater than 25%, with some of the increases (near 5° above horizontal) exceeding 50%. A similar pattern (with somewhat less extreme changes and with the decreases confined mostly below horizontal) was also present for the right lamp.




Figure 1. Percentage changes in luminous intensities after the summer/wet drive. The changes ranged from -11% to +24% for the left lamp, and from -28% to +49% for the right lamp.





Figure 2. Percentage changes in luminous intensities after the summer/dry drive. The changes ranged from -5% to +15% for the left lamp, and from -36% to +24% for the right lamp.





Figure 3. Percentage changes in luminous intensities after the winter/salty drive. The changes ranged from -35% to +66% for the left lamp, and from -31% to +55% for the right lamp.

Left lamp versus right lamp. The magnitudes of the changes (both increases and decreases) after the two summer drives were greater for the right lamp than for the left lamp. On the other hand, the changes after the winter drive tended to be greater for the left lamp. It is possible that these differences are due to chance. On the other hand, it is also possible that these patterns are caused by more dirt being on the right side of the road during the summer months (due to the crown of the road). This speculative explanation assumes that the dirt present on the road in the summer is a product of longer-term accumulation, while the dirt in winter is somewhat more uniformly distributed across the width of the road because it includes recently applied salt. Alternatively, it is possible that in winter, with road salt and snow present on the road, splash from oncoming traffic contributes more to the dirt deposits on left lamps than on right lamps.

The amounts and locations of the largest changes

The magnitudes and locations of the largest decreases and increases in luminous intensities are shown in Table 1.

Table 1.
Magnitudes and locations of the largest percentage increases and decreases in luminous intensities.

Largest	Summer/wet		Summer/dry		Winter/salty	
	Left lamp	Right lamp	Left lamp	Right lamp	Left lamp	Right lamp
Decrease	11% at 3D, 4R	28% at 4D, 6.5R	5% at 1D, 18.5R	36% at 0.5D, 0.5R	35% at 1.5D, 4.5R	31% at 5.0D, 14L
Increase	24% at 5U, 6L	49% at 0.5D, 0.5R	15% at 5U, 5L	24% at 5D, 5.5R	66% at 5U, 5.5L	55% at 5U, 18.5L

“Clean” luminous intensity as a predictor of “dirty” luminous intensity

Inspection of the Figures 1 through 3 suggests that the effect of dirt, in general, was to increase intensities at points in the beam pattern that have low intensity when the lamp is clean, and to decrease intensities at points that have high intensity when the lamp is clean. This pattern of results can be formally described and quantified by regressing “dirty” intensities on corresponding “clean” intensities. The relationship between luminous intensities of clean headlamps and dirty headlamps proved to be reasonably well described by linear models (all r^2 values were .98 or greater). The fact that linear models provide a good first approximation implies that the effects of dirt can be modeled by two parameters, a slope (quantifying the degree of proportional reduction in the luminous intensity throughout the beam pattern) and an intercept (quantifying the amount of superimposed uniform intensity throughout the beam pattern).

An example of a scatter plot of the dirty versus clean luminous intensity for one lamp (right) and one environmental condition (winter/salty) is shown in Figure 4, along with a best fitting linear model. The slope of this equation (.72 or 72%) is an estimate of the proportional reduction in luminous intensity throughout the beam pattern, presumably caused by both absorption and scattering. The intercept of this equation (112) is an estimate of the amount of the superimposed intensity (in cd) throughout the beam pattern, presumably caused by scattering. In another words, the regression equation indicates that the best estimate is that after the winter/salty drive for the right lamp, the dirt deposits reduced luminous intensity at each test point to 72% of the original value, coupled with a superimposed uniform addition of 112 cd throughout the beam pattern.

To the extent that linear regressions provide good first approximations to the relationships between “clean” and “dirty” luminous intensities, we can estimate which levels of intensity will increase due to dirt and which will decrease. Using the best fitting linear equations, we calculated the “pivot” intensities. Luminous intensities of clean headlamps that are smaller than the corresponding pivot intensity would be expected to increase due to dirt, because at these intensity levels the uniform intensity increase is greater than the proportional decrease. On the other hand, the luminous intensities that are greater than the pivot intensity would be expected to decrease, because at these intensity levels the uniform intensity increase is smaller than the proportional decrease. (Points with luminous intensities equal to the pivot intensity are predicted to remain unchanged.) The specific calculation involved solving the regression equation ($y = ax + b$) for $y = x$. The pivot intensity for the example shown in Figure 4 (the right lamp after the winter/salty drive) proved to be 400 cd.




Figure 4. Relationship between the luminous intensities for the right lamp after the winter/salty drive. The graph shows the values for all 1701 test points. The solid line is the best fitting linear model ($y = .72x + 112$). For comparison, the dashed line shows where points would fall if intensities were unaffected by dirt ($y = x$).

Changes in the light output at the U.S., European, and Japanese test points

U.S. test points. Table 2 lists the changes in luminous intensities from clean to dirty after the completion of each drive at the current U.S. test points. The only consistent changes across both lamps exceeding 25% were present after the winter/salty drive at the following test points: Increases at 4U, 8L (illumination serving primarily retroreflective traffic signs), and decreases at 1.5D, 2R (illumination for the right side of the road at about 23-29 m [assuming headlamp mounting height between 600 and 750 mm]), at 1.5D, 9R (lateral illumination for curves and intersections), and at 4D, 4R (foreground illumination).

European test points. Table 3 lists the changes in luminous intensities from clean to dirty after the completion of each drive at the current European test points. Again, the only consistent changes across both lamps exceeding 25% were all present after the winter/salty drive. These changes were as follows: Increases at 4U, 8L (serving primarily retroreflective traffic signs; the same test point as in the U.S.), and decreases at 0.86D, V (illumination of the center of the lane at about 40-50 m), at 0.86D, 1.72R (illumination for the right side of the road at about 40-50 m), at 1.72D, 9R (lateral illumination for curves and intersections), and in Zone 1 (foreground illumination).

Japanese test points. Table 4 lists the changes in luminous intensities from clean to dirty after the completion of each drive at the current Japanese test points (converted to right-hand traffic). As was the case for the U.S. and European test points, the only consistent changes across both lamps exceeding 25% were all present after the winter/salty drive. Furthermore, they were all decreases, and they all occurred below horizontal. These test points (all in common with the U.S. test points) were as follows: 1.5D, 2R (illumination for the right side of the road at about 23-29 m), 1.5D, 9R (lateral illumination for curves and intersections), and 4D, 4R (foreground illumination).

Changes at test points controlling visibility, foreground, and glare. As is evident from the above discussion, all of the consistent changes for both lamps were after the winter/salty drive, and they were all at test points controlling either visibility (both below and above horizontal) or foreground. The changes at the primary test points that control glare for the oncoming drivers (0.5U, 1.5L to L in the U.S. and Japan, and 0.57U, 3.43L in Europe) did not reach 25% for either lamp in any of the environmental conditions.

Table 2.
 Percentage changes in luminous intensities for dirty lamps compared to clean lamps at the
 U.S. test points. (Highlighted entries indicate changes of at least 25%.)

Test point/ region	Summer/wet		Summer/dry		Winter/salty	
	Left lamp	Right lamp	Left lamp	Right lamp	Left lamp	Right lamp
4U, 8L	15	20	8	7	43	35
4U, 8R	9	17	6	4	24	31
2U, 4L	10	13	11	5	22	18
1.5U, 1R to 3R	2	14	3	-3	-8	15
1.5U, 1R to R	2	17	3	-5	-8	12
1U, 1.5L to L	6	16	4	2	-1	14
0.5U, 1.5L to L	4	17	2	-4	-9	9
0.5U, 1R to 3R	2	22	2	-14	-12	-2
H, 4L	5	27	4	-12	-4	-3
H, 8L	1	18	3	-12	-6	-1
0.5D, 1.5L to L	1	39	0	-32	-22	-19
0.5D, 1.5R	-2	41	-2	-33	-27	-21
1D, 6L	-3	9	-2	-22	-23	-23
1.5D, 9L	-2	6	0	-12	-21	-20
1.5D, 2R	-8	-4	-3	-13	-34	-29
1.5D, 9R	-9	-3	-2	-8	-32	-27
2D, 15L	-3	7	-2	-13	-21	-23
2D, 15R	-7	-5	-1	0	-26	-19
4D, 4R	-9	-22	-1	15	-29	-27

Table 3.
Percentage changes in luminous intensities for dirty lamps compared to clean lamps at the European test points. (Highlighted entries indicate changes of at least 25%.)

Test point/ region	Summer/wet		Summer/dry		Winter/salty	
	Left lamp	Right lamp	Left lamp	Right lamp	Left lamp	Right lamp
4U, 8L	15	20	8	7	43	35
4U, V	13	16	7	3	24	31
4U, 8R	9	17	6	4	24	31
2U, 4L	10	13	11	5	22	18
2U, V	4	13	5	1	0	20
2U, 4R	4	13	5	2	-1	19
H, 8L	1	18	3	-12	-6	-1
H, 4L	3	26	3	-13	-5	-5
0.57U, 3.43L	7	16	6	3	6	10
0.57D, 3.43L	2	29	-1	-30	-19	-21
0.57D, 1.14R	-2	35	-1	-33	-28	-23
0.86D, V	-3	23	-2	-34	-29	-25
0.86D, 1.72R	-5	18	-2	-31	-31	-27
0.86D, 3.43R	0	13	-2	-24	-24	-23
1.72D, 9L	-2	5	0	-12	-22	-21
1.72D, 9R	-9	-6	-2	-5	-32	-27
Zone 1 ¹	-8	-8	-3	-6	-34	-29
Zone 3 ²	4	31	0	-18	-16	-3
Zone 4 ³	-3	13	-1	-25	-24	-23

¹1.72D to D.

²Above line H, 20L; H, V; 5.36U, 20R; or above line H, 20L; H, V; 0.57U, 0.57R; 0.57U, 20R.

³Corners: 0.86D, 5.14L; 0.86D, 5.14R; 1.72D, 5.14R; and 1.72D, 5.14L.

Table 4.
 Percentage changes in luminous intensities for dirty lamps compared to clean lamps at the Japanese test points for four-lamp systems (converted to right-hand traffic). (Highlighted entries indicate changes of at least 25%.)

Test point/ region	Summer/wet		Summer/dry		Winter/salty	
	Left lamp	Right lamp	Left lamp	Right lamp	Left lamp	Right lamp
1.5U, 1R to R	2	17	3	-5	-8	12
1U, 1L to L	6	16	4	2	-1	14
0.5U, 1L to L	4	17	2	-4	-9	9
0.5U, 1R to 3R	2	22	2	-14	-12	-2
0.5D, 1L to L	-2	16	-2	-30	-28	-23
0.5D, 2R	-3	37	-1	-31	-28	-22
1D, 6L	-3	9	-2	-22	-23	-23
1.5D, 2R	-8	-4	-3	-13	-34	-29
1.5D, 9L	-2	6	0	-12	-21	-20
1.5D, 9R	-9	-3	-2	-8	-31	-27
2D, 15L	-3	7	-2	-13	-21	-23
2D, 15R	-7	5	-1	0	-26	-19
4D, 4R	-9	-22	-1	-15	-29	-26

Summary and Conclusions

This study evaluated changes in the light output of low-beam headlamps as a function of dirt accumulated during a 482-km drive, representing a 10-day amount of driving for a typical U.S. driver. The complete route was traversed on three separate occasions, under each of the following environmental conditions: summer while dry, summer while wet, and winter with road salt. Candela matrices were obtained for a rectangular central portion of the beam, extending from 20° left to 20° right, and from 5° down to 5° up (in 0.5° steps). Photometry for each of two lamps was performed twice after the completion of each drive, first “as is” and then after cleaning.

The results indicate that dirt deposits tended to cause the light output to decrease below horizontal and increase near and above horizontal. The changes in the light output differed between the driver-side and passenger-side lamps, especially after the two summer drives. The largest changes occurred after the winter drive, with the decreases and increases in a large part of the beam for both lamps exceeding 25%, and with some of the increases exceeding 50%. At the U.S., European, and Japanese test points that control road illumination, the dirt effects tended to reduce the light output, and some of these decrements exceeded 25%. On the other hand, at test points that control glare, the dirt effects tended to increase illumination, but none of these increases exceeded 25%.

References

- Alferdinck, J.W.A.M. and Padmos, P. (1988). Car headlamps: Influence of dirt, age and poor aim on glare and illumination intensities. *Lighting Research & Technology*, 20, 195-198.
- Cargonja, N. and Rotim, F. (1986). Level of uncleanness of car headlights as a safety factor in night driving. In *Proceedings of the XXIth FISITA Congress* (pp. 3.287-3.290). Beograd, Yugoslavia: Yugoslav Society of Automotive Engineers.
- Cox, N.T. (1968). *The effect of dirt on vehicle headlamp performance* (RRL Report LR 240). Crowthorne, England: Road Research Laboratory.
- Huey, R., Dekker, D., and Lyons, R. (1994). *Driver perception of just-noticeable differences of automotive signal lamp intensities* (Report No. DOT HS 808 209). Washington, D.C.: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- van Laarhoven, W.G.C.R. (1994). *The measurement of the influence of dirt on a round H4 headlamp, a modern aerodynamic H4 headlamp and a headlamp equipped with a gasdischarge light source*. Arnhem, The Netherlands: KEMA.
- Rumar, K. (1974). Dirty headlights—frequency and visibility effects. *Ergonomics*, 17, 529-533.
- Schmidt-Clausen, H.-J. (1978). Einfluss der Verschmutzung von Scheinwerfer-Streuscheiben auf die Sehweite von Kraftfahren. *ATZ Automobiltechnische Zeitschrift*, 80, 519-522.