

---

# MULTI-AGENT VISUAL-LANGUAGE REASONING FOR COMPREHENSIVE HIGHWAY SCENE UNDERSTANDING

---

Yunxiang Yang, Ningning Xu, Jidong J. Yang\*  
Smart Mobility and Infrastructure Lab  
College of Engineering, University of Georgia  
{yyang117, Ningning.Xu, Jidong.Yang}@uga.edu

## ABSTRACT

This paper introduces a multi-agent framework for comprehensive highway scene understanding, designed around a mixture-of-experts strategy. In this framework, a large generic vision-language model (VLM), such as GPT-4o, is contextualized with domain knowledge to generate task-specific chain-of-thought (CoT) prompts. These fine-grained prompts are then used to guide a smaller, efficient VLM (e.g., Qwen2.5-VL-7B) in reasoning over short videos, along with complementary modalities as applicable. The framework simultaneously addresses multiple critical perception tasks, including weather classification, pavement wetness assessment, and traffic congestion detection, achieving robust multi-task reasoning while balancing accuracy and computational efficiency. To support empirical validation, we curated three specialized datasets aligned with these tasks. Notably, the pavement wetness dataset is multimodal, combining video streams with road weather sensor data, highlighting the benefits of multimodal reasoning. Experimental results demonstrate consistently strong performance across diverse traffic and environmental conditions. From a deployment perspective, the framework can be readily integrated with existing traffic camera systems and strategically applied to high-risk rural locations, such as sharp curves, flood-prone lowlands, or icy bridges. By continuously monitoring the targeted sites, the system enhances situational awareness and delivers timely alerts, even in resource-constrained environments.

**Keywords** Vision-Language Models (VLMs), Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompt, multimodal foundation models, highway scene understanding, traffic congestion detection, pavement wetness assessment, road weather classification

## 1 Introduction

Multimodal foundation models, particularly Vision-Language Models (VLMs), have emerged as powerful artificial intelligence (AI) agents capable of understanding and reasoning across diverse data modalities, such as images, video, audio, and text [1–3]. These models are typically built on transformer-based architectures that integrate information from different modalities into a shared embedding space, enabling the generation of semantically rich, cross-modal representations. A common design pairs a visual encoder (e.g., Vision Transformer) with a language decoder or a unified encoder-decoder architecture, pretrained on large-scale image-text or video-text datasets [4, 5]. This large-scale pretraining endows VLMs with strong generalization capabilities across a wide range of vision-and-language tasks, such as image or video captioning, visual question answering (VQA), visual entailment, scene retrieval, among others.

Importantly, the adoption of multimodal foundation models marks a paradigm shift in infrastructure monitoring. Traditional systems often rely on dedicated physical sensors - such as weather stations, embedded pavement sensors, or radar - which entail significant installation, calibration, and maintenance costs. In contrast, multimodal models can leverage existing video camera infrastructure (e.g., CCTV cameras) for robust visual reasoning [6]. These models are not only capable of assessing environmental attributes (e.g., wet pavement, snow accumulation, visibility reduction) but also recognizing specific hazards such as fallen debris or stalled vehicles. Interactive frameworks like *SeeUnsafe* exemplify this potential by using VLMs to identify safety-critical events in large-scale traffic video data [7].

---

\*Corresponding author.

Moreover, recent research has explored multi-task learning paradigms that unify diverse downstream tasks within a shared modeling framework [3]. These foundation models learn transferable representations that span perception, prediction, and decision-making, enabling joint optimization and reducing the need for extensive data annotation. By leveraging shared knowledge across tasks, they offer a holistic and efficient approach to complex transportation scenarios. However, deploying such models in time-critical transportation systems remains challenging due to their large model size and computational overhead. To mitigate these constraints while preserving performance, researchers are exploring strategies such as model distillation, sparse expert routing, and task-specific Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting, each aiming to improve inference efficiency and adaptability in resource-constrained environments.

## 1.1 Related Work

While deep learning has enabled considerable progress in traffic scene understanding, most existing approaches remain limited to single-task settings. This study aims to advance multitask visual understanding for comprehensive scene interpretation in the transportation domain. Specifically, we focus on jointly modeling and understanding road weather, pavement surface and traffic conditions, enabling a more holistic and robust perception of real-world transportation environments.

### 1.1.1 Road Weather Understanding

Accurately assessing weather conditions from roadside or in-vehicle perspectives is critical for maintaining traffic safety and ensuring operational resilience. Conventional approaches are grounded in Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP), which relies on data assimilation of satellite, radar, and in situ observations [8–12]. Recent advancements incorporate deep learning for localized weather understanding—[13, 14] uses Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Conditional Generative Adversarial Networks (CGANs) for weather classification from road images, while [15] and [16] utilize LSTM and GAN models for short-term forecasting of solar irradiance and cloud patterns. On the language side, foundation models such as ClimateBERT [17] and ClimateGPT [18] have been proposed for climate-focused text understanding.

However, these approaches either focus exclusively on visual inputs or treat weather as a standalone forecasting problem. They often lack real-time road-level granularity or integration with traffic scene contexts, limiting their utility for real-time hazard detection and warning. In contrast, VLMs offer the ability to infer weather directly from traffic videos and reason about its impact on safety conditions (e.g., reduced visibility, road surface conditions), thus closing the gap between meteorological modeling and transportation decision-making.

### 1.1.2 Pavement Wetness Assessment

Timely detection of pavement wetness is essential for highway safety and operations, as surface water significantly reduces tire–pavement friction and increases the likelihood of hydroplaning, particularly at high speeds. These conditions not only elevate crash risk but also complicate traffic management and roadway maintenance decisions. Traditional approaches rely on embedded sensors or road weather stations, which are accurate but sparse and expensive to maintain [19]. Modern deep learning systems have applied CNNs and segmentation networks to RGB or infrared images to classify wet, dry, snowy, or icy surfaces [20, 21]. Acoustic sensing systems, such as those by [22], utilize tire-road interaction sounds to estimate surface wetness using Support Vector Machines and logistic regression models.

Recent webcam-based methods [19] leverage pre-trained CNNs (e.g., ResNet18) to identify pavement conditions from roadside imagery. Thermal imaging has also been explored to detect sub-surface anomalies and transient wetness features [20]. Hybrid approaches like RMSDC [23] fuse temporal sensor data using ConvLSTM for robust, interpretable predictions. Despite the progress, these methods are typically static, infrastructure-specific, and lack adaptability across domains. They often require extensive re-labeling or fine-tuning when deployed in new regions or under different weather conditions.

### 1.1.3 Congestion Analysis

Traffic congestion detection is another domain where deep learning methods has gradually replaced traditional models. Hybrid CNN-LSTM architectures [24] and encoder-based deep networks [25] have been developed to model spatio-temporal traffic dynamics from loop detectors and speed sensors. Vision-based methods have also been applied, enabling real-time congestion classification directly from traffic video feeds [26].

However, most of these models operate as task-specific detectors trained on specific datasets. They lack semantic understanding and struggle with context-sensitive reasoning (e.g., distinguishing construction-induced slowdown from other congestion scenarios). Recent reviews [27] advocate for more explainable and generalizable frameworks.

Vision-language models have shown promise in this direction, offering semantic alignment between scene content and user-defined queries, enabling interpretable diagnostics and causality analysis of congestion [1, 7].

Despite rapid advancements, most existing approaches remain task-specific, requiring frequent retraining and exhibiting limited adaptability to new scenarios. To overcome these limitations, we propose a VLM-driven framework for comprehensive highway scene understanding. Our approach employs a mixture-of-agents strategy, in which a large generic VLM (e.g., GPT-4o) generates fine-grained CoT prompts tailored to three core perception tasks spanning the environment (weather classification), roadway (pavement wetness assessment), and traffic (congestion detection). These prompts are then used to guide a smaller, computationally efficient VLM (e.g., Qwen2.5-VL-7B) in reasoning over short video inputs, enabling robust and scalable multi-task scene understanding.

To support rigorous evaluation, we curated three dedicated datasets, each aligned with one of the target tasks. Notably, the pavement wetness dataset is multi-modal, combining video footage with road weather station data to demonstrate the advantages of multimodal reasoning. Experimental results validate the effectiveness of our approach and highlight the potential of collaborative VLM agents for understanding comprehensive highway scenes.

## 2 Dataset

We collected the publicly accessible traffic video data from the states of Georgia, Virginia, and California. Camera locations were strategically chosen to cover urban, suburban, mountain, and coastal regions, ensuring a diverse set of highway scenes.

### 2.1 Category Definition

For weather classification, we focus on three primary conditions: clear (including sunny and cloudy, with no precipitation), rainy, and snowy. For pavement wetness level assessment, we defined seven categories aligned with corresponding weather conditions: dry, rainy fully wet, rainy partially wet, rainy flooded, snowy fully wet, snowy partially wet, and snowy wet with icy warning. A detailed description of each category is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Pavement wetness level definitions and visual cues

Category	Key Visual and Contextual Cues
Rainy fully wet	Uniformly dark and glossy surface with consistent reflections. Tire sprays are visible across lanes; vehicles often leave moderate water trails.
Rainy partially wet	Mixed appearance with wet patches and dry zones. Water sprays are intermittent or limited to certain lanes. Some vehicles show water trails, others do not.
Rainy flooded	Standing or pooling water is clearly visible. Vehicles generate large water splashes and long, wide spray plumes. Water trails are thick and persistent.
Dry	Light-colored, matte surface with no visible moisture or reflections. No tire sprays or water trails; vehicle movement is clean and uninhibited.
Snowy fully wet	Entire surface is dark and wet from melted snow. Slush may appear near curbs or median dividers. Tire water spray may be visible. No snow patches.
Snowy partially wet	Uneven surface with a mix of wet, dry, or slushy zones. Residual snow or damp spots are visible. Minimal and inconsistent water sprays.
Snowy wet with icy warning	Surface has a faint shine or frosty gloss suggesting potential black ice. This is often coupled with low temperature and high humidity conditions. Sprays are minimal or absent. Vehicles may move slowly with extra caution.

For congestion detection, we grouped traffic flow conditions into two categories: congested and unobstructed. The detailed descriptions are given in Table 2. The distribution of video clips across weather conditions is presented in Table 3.

In addition to the video data, we collected information from the nearest road weather stations, resulting in a multimodal dataset. Depending on the availability of sensor readings at the time of data collection, we distinguish between partial and full multimodal data. Partial multi-modal data includes: date/time, current weather, weather precipitation, temperature high/low, elevation. In contrast, full multimodal data provides more detailed environmental context, including: date/time, relative humidity, wind speed/direction, air/surface temperature, visibility, dew point temperature, surface condition, and precipitation. For our downstream tasks, we primarily leverage this multimodal data for pavement wetness assessment under snowy conditions, where cross-modal reasoning provides the greatest benefit. A detailed summary of this dataset is shown in Table 4, and some examples are given in Figure 2.

Table 2: Traffic flow condition definitions and visual cues

Category	Key Visual and Contextual Cues
Congested	Lanes are visibly full or nearly full of vehicles with minimal open space. Vehicle spacing is tight, making lane changes difficult. Motion is uneven; cars exhibit stop-go patterns, frequent surging and braking, or shock-wave movements. Multiple vehicles display delayed following, indicating disrupted flow.
Unobstructed	Traffic flows smoothly at or near posted speeds. Vehicles are evenly spaced. Motion is steady with little to no deceleration. The road appears open with no apparent disruptions to traffic flow.

Table 3: Summary of the weather video dataset

Weather Condition	Total Videos
Clear	66
Snowy	21
Rainy	73
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>

Table 4: Summary of the pavement wetness video dataset

Category	Total Videos	Multi-Modal Data Type
Rainy partially wet	51	46 Full, 5 Partial
Rainy fully wet	73	68 Full, 5 Partial
Rainy flooded	18	Full only
Snow partially wet	5	Partial only
Snow fully wet	9	Partial only
Snow wet with icy warning	21	Partial only
Sunny dry	66	Full only
<b>Total</b>	<b>243</b>	



Figure 1: Examples from the road weather classification dataset. The leftmost column: clear weather conditions. The middle column: rainy conditions. The rightmost column: snowy conditions.

It is important to note that for congestion analysis, rather than assigning a single label (e.g., congested or unobstructed) to an entire road segment within a video, we explicitly specify the traffic direction of the segment. This distinction accounts for the possibility of direction-dependent traffic patterns. Specifically, inbound refers to vehicles moving toward the traffic camera, while outbound refers to those moving away from it.



Figure 2: Examples from the pavement wetness assessment dataset. The leftmost column: 1st and 2nd rows – rainy partially wet; 3rd row – snowy partially wet. The middle column: 1st and 2nd rows – rainy fully wet; 3rd row – snowy fully wet. The rightmost column: 1st and 2nd rows – rainy flooded; 3rd row – snowy wet with icy warning.

Table 5: Summary of the traffic congestion video dataset

Congestion Level	Direction	Total Videos
Congested	Inbound	10
	Outbound	18
Unobstructed	Inbound	20
	Outbound	16
<b>Total</b>		<b>64</b>



Figure 3: Examples from the congestion analysis dataset. The left column: 1st row – inbound congested; 2nd row – outbound congested. The right column: 1st row – inbound unobstructed; 2nd row – outbound unobstructed.

### 3 Method

This section introduces our proposed method, which leverages multiple agents to understand traffic scenes (weather, pavement wetness, congestion, etc.). The process begins by extracting sequential frames from a video input to retain temporal dynamics. An initial prompt, incorporating relevant domain knowledge, is constructed and provided to a VLM, referred to as Agent 1. In our experiment, we use GPT-4o [28] in this role. Agent 1 analyzes a scene based on the initial

prompt and generates a detailed Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [4] prompt that systematically address multiple aspects of the scene from the surrounding environment to vehicles. Depending on the downstream task, such as pavement wetness assessment under snowy conditions, multimodal data can also be ingested to enhance reasoning. Prompt tuning [5] is also applied to ensure accurate description of the scene is aligned with human observations and domain knowledge. The refined CoT prompt is then passed to Agent 2, which perform inference directly on video inputs and, if applicable, with associated multi-modal data. For Agent 2, we use QWEN 2.5-VL-7B [29], which performs CoT-guided reasoning to generate the final output. This multi-agent framework is illustrated in Figure 4.




Figure 4: The multi-agent framework for highway scene understanding.

### 3.1 CoT Prompts Design and Generation

As introduced previously, the definitions used as part of the prompt for Agent 1 (e.g., GPT-4o) integrate human observations and transportation domain knowledge tailored to specific types of scenes. For example, in the case of pavement wetness assessment under snowy conditions, these definitions are combined with sequential video frames and multimodal data (e.g., temperature high/low, humidity, wind speed/direction, dew-point temperature, etc.), and passed to Agent 1 to analyze the scene and acquire the fine-grained CoT prompt. This process is illustrated in Figure 5.

Following a similar process, we generate CoT prompts for different downstream tasks. Specifically, Figures 6, 7, and 8 show the generated CoT prompts by Agent 1 (GPT-4o) for road weather understanding, pavement wetness level assessment, and congestion analysis, respectively. To improve classification accuracy for pavement wetness levels, We introduce a threshold for identifying "fully wet" surface condition, which is defined as over 80% of vehicles per frame consistently have water sprays, mist or strong reflections, which helps the model better distinguish partially wet and fully wet.

We prioritize the "flooded" condition whenever clear visual cues are present (see Figure 7) and explicitly instruct the model: "If uncertain between fully wet and flooded, always choose flooded to reflect the potential real-world hazard." This safety-oriented directive biases the model toward conservative decision-making, helping ensure reliable detection of flooded scenes.

For congestion analysis, we design tailored strategies to address the following challenges: (1) For inference efficiency, all video clips have a short length of 4-7 seconds; the acute signs of traffic congestion may not be obvious within a short video clip. (2) Each traffic camera has a different height and angle, which brings different visual perspectives on

# Multi-Agent Visual-Language Reasoning for Comprehensive Highway Scene Understanding




Figure 5: Example of CoT prompt generation for pavement wetness level assessment under snowy conditions.




Figure 6: Generated CoT prompt for road weather understanding.

traffic flow. (3) During normal peak hours (i.e., without accidents or road closures), the space headway can be short, but vehicles can still move relatively fast. (4) VLMs show limited ability to accurately assess traffic flow speed or other related dynamic features, especially in such short video clips. Our proposed solution introduces a two-variable gating logic that incorporates *visual\_pressure* and *flow\_slow*, with the initial flow impression serving as a soft flag to provide contextual bias (e.g., "The flow appears smooth, but let me verify"). This design reduces over-reliance on

## Multi-Agent Visual-Language Reasoning for Comprehensive Highway Scene Understanding

You are analyzing a traffic camera video to determine the pavement wetness level. Use both visual evidence and environmental clues to classify the scene. Categories: Dry, Partially Wet, Fully Wet, or Flooded.

##### Think step-by-step:

1. Scene Context:

- What type of road is shown (e.g., freeway, arterial)?
- How many lanes are visible in each direction?
- Are there overhead signs, guardrails, medians, vegetation, or entrance ramps present?
- Is the camera angle elevated, and how much of the road and surroundings are visible?

2. Weather and Lighting Conditions:

- Does the sky appear overcast, rainy, foggy, or dim?
- Are there signs of active precipitation, such as rain streaks or visible raindrops?
- Is visibility reduced in the distance due to weather conditions?
- What time of day might it be, based on lighting and shadows?

3. Road Surface Condition:

- Is the pavement highly reflective or glossy, suggesting water accumulation?
- Are lane markings visible or partially obscured by water or glare?
- Is there visual evidence of sheeting or pooling water on the surface?
- Are there areas where standing water distorts reflections or textures?

4. Vehicle and Surface Interaction:

- Do tires disturb shallow water or create visible splashes or spray?
- Are spray trails consistent across multiple vehicles or lanes?
- Do large trucks generate heavy mist, bow waves, or long water sprays?
- Do any tires appear partially submerged?
- Is there evidence of wake-like displacement or turbulent splashes from deeper water?

5. Driver Behavior:

- Are vehicles reducing speed, increasing following distance, or changing lanes to avoid certain areas?
- Are brake lights or hazard lights frequently activated?
- Is there any erratic driving or lane drift suggesting poor traction or caution due to road conditions?

##### Classification Hints:

- **Partially Wet:** Pavement shows a mix of wet and dry patches with irregular surface glossiness. Spray is weak or limited to a few vehicles; reflections are intermittent. Lane markings remain mostly visible.
- **Fully Wet:** Pavement appears uniformly glossy across all visible lanes. Water sprays, mist, or strong reflections are observed consistently (these visual cues present over 80% of all frames). Lane markings are partially or fully obscured. Persistent mist or splash patterns are evident across multiple vehicles.
- **Flooded (prioritize classification if any of the following are observed):** Long, wide, and persistent water sprays behind vehicles — especially if spray lingers or extends across the lane. Standing or pooling water visibly present on lanes. Tires appear partially submerged, even briefly. Large trucks create bow waves, heavy splashes, or wake-like movement. Reflections appear distorted or refracted due to uneven water depth. Drivers slow down, activate hazard lights, or change lanes to avoid water.

##### Final Inference: Follow this strict rule-based decision process: If any Flooded indicators are clearly observed, classify the condition as Flooded, even if direct standing water isn't visible due to camera angle. If there is high risk of surface flooding, classify as Flooded. Only classify as Fully Wet if water is evenly distributed across the lanes, causing strong reflections and mist — but no flooding behavior. Use Partially Wet only when spray and reflections are weak, surface coverage is inconsistent, and no clear hazard is seen. If the pavement shows no signs of moisture, classify as Dry. Important: If uncertain between Fully Wet and Flooded, always choose Flooded to reflect potential real-world hazard.

Figure 7: Generated CoT prompt for pavement wetness level assessment under rainy conditions.

visual cues alone for congestion detection. We further define three levels of *visual\_pressure* (i.e., strong, moderate, and weak) based on the number of visual congestion features identified. In parallel, the *flow\_slow* variable is evaluated as a Boolean flag ('true' or 'false') depending on evidence of flow disruption. The CoT prompt implementing this gating logic is illustrated in Figure 8.

You are a highway traffic engineer. Your task is to analyze a short traffic camera video (3-5 seconds) and classify the traffic in the INBOUND direction (vehicles moving toward the camera) as either: Congested or Unobstructed.

Congestion must involve both strong visual signs of traffic pressure (tight spacing, full lanes, low maneuverability) and observable disruption in movement. Do not classify as Congested if traffic is moving smoothly — even if spacing is tight.

#### Step 0: Initial Flow Impression (Not Final Decision)

Make a preliminary judgment based on first-glance impression:

- Does the traffic appear uniform, fluid, and consistent across multiple lanes?
- Is there no visible braking, hesitation, or pulsing in any direction?
- If both are true, mark `initial\_flow\_smooth = True`, but continue to Step 1 and 2 for confirmation. If either is unclear, set `initial\_flow\_smooth = False`

#### Step 1: Evaluate Visual Congestion Features (Stricter)

Mark whether each of the following is clearly visible:

- Most or all lanes are filled and appear at capacity — minimal gaps, dense pattern
- Vehicle spacing is tight across multiple lanes, nearly bumper-to-bumper for > 1s
- Clusters of vehicles hold shape — packs of cars stay together without internal shifts
- No lane change attempts — vehicles appear boxed in across front/back/sides
- The road is full of vehicles all the way to the distance — no visible gaps or empty road ahead

If **all 5** are true → `visual\_pressure = Strong`; If **3-4** → `visual\_pressure = Moderate`; Fewer than 3 → `visual\_pressure = False`

#### Step 2: Evaluate Flow Disruption

Mark whether 3 or more of the following are true:

- Vehicles clearly move under 30 mph
- Heavy traffic moving and stopping in waves
- Braking or hesitation appears across multiple lanes
- Flow compresses in wave-like pulses along lanes

If **3+** signs set `flow\_slow = True`; Otherwise, set `flow\_slow = False`

#### Step 3: Final Classification Logic

**If** `visual\_pressure = Strong`, classify as **Congested**

**If** `visual\_pressure = Moderate` and `flow\_slow = True`, classify as **Congested**

**Else**, classify as **Unobstructed**

> **Do not use Step 0 alone** for final classification. It only guides your impression — verification depends on Step 1 and 2.

#### Final Classification:

Choose one and justify: **Congested**, **Unobstructed**

Figure 8: Generated CoT prompt for congestion analysis.

## 4 Experiments and results

We conducted extensive experiments to compare the performance of simple prompts (see Figure 9) versus CoT prompts presented in the preceding section. Exemplar results are shown in Figures 10 - 16.

**Simple Prompt for Road Weather Classification**  
 Given the video from the traffic camera, please make a judgement of the weather condition in the scene, then pick one from the following categories as your answer and justify: clear, rainy, or snowy.

**Simple Prompt for Pavement Wetness Assessment without Multi-modal Data**  
 Given the video from the traffic camera, please make a judgement of the road pavement wetness level, then pick one from the following categories as your answer and justify: dry, partially wet, fully wet, flooded or wet with icy warning.

**Simple Prompt for Pavement Wetness Assessment with Multi-modal Data**  
 Given the video from the traffic camera and the following weather conditions: {env\_summary}, please make a judgment of the road pavement wetness level. Choose one from the following mutually exclusive categories as your answer:  
 - **Dry**  
 - **Partially Wet**  
 - **Fully Wet**  
 - **Wet with Icy Warning**  
 You may consider visual features such as reflections, spray, snow coverage, tire paths, and vehicle behavior, along with temperature, humidity, elevation, and other environmental cues when making your decision.

**Simple Prompt for Congestion Level Classification**  
 You are analyzing a traffic camera video to determine the traffic flow speed in the {outbound/inbound} direction: Return one of the following categories with high confidence:  
 - **Congested**  
 - **Unobstructed**

Figure 9: Simple prompts.

### 4.1 Road Weather Classification

Road weather classification is relatively straightforward using either simple or CoT prompts, as VLMs can effectively leverage the abundant visual cues present in most conditions. For clear and snowy weather, performance differed only slightly: the model achieved over 90% accuracy for clear conditions and perfect accuracy for snowy conditions, where the visual evidence of snow is highly distinctive. In contrast, performance declined under rainy conditions, with some rainy scenes misclassified as clear when the visual cues were insufficiently pronounced.

**Raw Video**





**Results of CoT Prompt**

Based on the analysis of the video:

1. **Scene Context:** The camera angle is elevated, showing a wide view of the highway and some surrounding areas. There are no visible buildings, roadsides, or vegetation that show signs of weather effects.
2. **Sky and Atmosphere:** The sky appears overcast and gray, indicating an overcast condition rather than clear skies. There is no direct sunlight or bright patches, and the overall lighting suggests diffuse light typical of overcast weather.
3. **Active Precipitation:** There are no visible rain streaks or mist. However, the presence of snow on the roadside and the reduced visibility suggest active precipitation.
4. **Ground and Surroundings:** The pavement has a layer of snow, and the roadside is covered with snow. There is no indication of wet or slushy surfaces, and the road appears to be clear of water or slush.
5. **Vehicle Behavior and Clues:** Vehicles have their headlights on, which could indicate reduced visibility due to overcast conditions or snow. There are no visible spray trails or tire mist suggesting rain.
6. **Judgment Criteria:** The sky is overcast, and the ground is covered with snow. The reduced visibility and the presence of snow on the roadside and vegetation align with the criteria for a snowy weather condition.

**\*\*Final Inference\*\*:** Based on the evidence of snow on the ground, the overcast sky, and the reduced visibility, the weather condition affecting the scene is **\*\*Snowy\*\***



**Results of Simple Prompt**

The weather condition in the scene is snowy. The road appears to be covered with snow, and there is a visible accumulation on the sides of the highway. The vehicles are driving cautiously, which is typical behavior when roads are slippery due to snow. The overall visibility seems reduced, which is common during snowy conditions. Therefore, the category that best describes the weather condition in this scene is "snowy."

Figure 10: Results of road weather classification via CoT prompt.

Table 6: Accuracy comparison between simple and CoT prompts for weather understanding using QWEN 2.5-VL 7B model

Weather Condition	Simple Prompt (%)	CoT Prompt (%)
Clear	92.42	95.45 ( $\uparrow$ 3.03)
Snowy	100.00	100.00 ( $\text{—}$ )
Rainy	73.24	71.23 ( $\downarrow$ 2.01)

## 4.2 Pavement Wetness Level Classification

First of all, prompting the model via CoT or simple prompt can result in significantly different results and accuracies. A simple case in Figure 11 shows the prediction results under a flooded condition. The simple prompt appears to make a judgment based on the first glance without careful attention. In contrast, The CoT prompt instructs the model to look through several aspects, from the scene to road surface, weather, vehicle and driver behaviors, particularly inspect the existence of standing water. Eventually the model tags the video as flooded with the evidence of persistent tire splash-and-spray effects behind vehicles.




Figure 11: Results of pavement wetness level classification via CoT prompt and simple prompt under flooded condition.

Snowy partially wet condition presents a particularly challenging and ambiguous case since it can easily be misinterpreted as fully wet or icy, even by human observers without careful inspection. This is where the CoT approach outperforms a simple prompt. As shown in Figure 12, the model, guided by a well-crafted CoT prompt, arrived at the correct assessment by systematically examining multiple wetness indicators and ruling out conditions that did not meet the criteria.

## 4.3 Congestion Level Classification

Figure 13 illustrates that even when the initial flow appears smooth, the model can still identify the congestion by leveraging the values of *visual\_pressure* and *flow\_slow*. This two-variable gating logic, combined with an initial soft flag, significantly enhances accuracy by striking a balance between the VLM model's strengths, such as identifying visual congestion features, and its limitations, particularly in estimating traffic flow speed. In contrast, the simple prompt relied on the initial impression of traffic flow without further verification, leading to an incorrect judgment.




Figure 12: Results of pavement wetness level classification via CoT prompt and simple prompt under snowy partially wet condition.




Figure 13: Results of congestion level classification via CoT prompt and simple prompt under congested condition.

Table 7 presents improved performance for different directions and cases after implementing our carefully designed CoT prompt.

#### 4.4 Multimodal Reasoning

We utilize the multimodal pavement condition dataset to highlight the benefits of multimodal reasoning. As shown in Figures 14 and 15, while the model can perform basic scene analysis based on snow coverage and other visual cues,

Table 7: Accuracy comparison between simple and CoT prompts for congestion analysis using QWEN 2.5-VL 7B model

Congestion Level	Direction	Simple Prompt (%)	CoT Prompt (%)
Congested	Inbound	40.00	100.00 (↑ <b>60.00</b> )
	Outbound	72.22	100.00 (↑ <b>27.78</b> )
Unobstructed	Inbound	60.00	80.00 (↑ <b>20.00</b> )
	Outbound	81.25	100.00 (↑ <b>18.75</b> )

the inclusion of additional modalities substantially improves its ability to generate more comprehensive and accurate assessments. By incorporating data such as temperature, dew point, and humidity, the model was able to successfully identify icy conditions, a capability particularly valuable for downstream transportation safety applications.




Figure 14: Pavement wetness level classification via CoT prompt without multimodal data under snowy fully wet condition.

We also evaluated the performance of multimodal reasoning on additional icy scenarios using the simple prompt. Surprisingly, even when the model could accurately infer conditions using only video data, the simple prompt sometimes produced incorrect results (see Figure 16). This suggests that while simple prompts may suffice in cases with strong and unambiguous visual cues, they fail when handling multimodal inputs, particularly when visual information is incomplete or ambiguous. Our results indicate that CoT (Chain-of-Thought) prompting is essential for robust performance with multimodal data (as shown in Table 8); otherwise, the model may struggle when processing environmental parameters without sufficient visual context. For instance, the model misclassified "snowy fully wet" scenes as "partially wet," and similar mistakes were observed for rainy conditions. These errors may stem from the model's over-reliance on explicit visual cues (e.g., reflections, water spray, and road gloss) that are often subtle, inconsistent, or missing due to environmental and data limitations. In snowy scenes, slush and snow accumulation can obscure pavement texture, leading to misclassification of fully wet surfaces. Likewise, icy conditions can visually resemble fully wet roads, increasing the likelihood of false positives. In rainy scenarios, diminished sprays or weak headlight reflections may also cause false negatives. These findings highlight the challenges of relying solely on visual cues and underscore the importance of complementary modalities and thought-provoking prompt design for robust multimodal reasoning.

These challenges are further exacerbated by two key factors: (1) the short duration of the video clips, ranging from only 4 to 7 seconds, which limits the availability of temporal cues such as sustained water trails or subtle vehicle motion




Figure 15: Pavement wetness level classification via CoT prompt with multimodal data under snowy fully wet condition.

dynamics, and (2) the varying video resolution, with many clips being of low-quality, hinders the model’s ability to detect fine-grained visual features essential for accurately reasoning about surface conditions.




Figure 16: Comparison of pavement wetness level classification via simple prompt with/without multi-modal data under snowy wet with icy warning condition.

Table 8: Accuracy comparison between simple and CoT prompts across input modalities (Video alone versus Multimodal data) using Agent 2 (QWEN 2.5-VL-7B model)

Input Type	Condition	Simple Prompt (%)	CoT Prompt (%)
Video alone	Rainy partially wet	37.25	58.82 ( <b>↑21.57</b> )
	Rainy fully wet	23.29	57.33 ( <b>↑34.04</b> )
	Rainy flooded	0.00	57.89 ( <b>↑57.89</b> )
	Snowy partially wet	20.00	100.00 ( <b>↑80.00</b> )
	Snowy fully wet	55.56	0.00 ( <b>↓55.56</b> )
	Snowy wet with icy warning	76.19	14.29 ( <b>↓61.90</b> )
	Sunny dry	83.33	95.45 ( <b>↑12.12</b> )
Multimodal (Video and Sensor Data)	Snowy fully wet	10.00	100.00 ( <b>↑90.00</b> )
	Snowy wet with icy warning	14.29	100.00 ( <b>↑85.71</b> )

## 5 Conclusions and Future Work

In this work, we proposed a general multi-agent framework for comprehensive highway scene understanding. The framework leverages a large VLM (e.g., GPT-4o) to generate CoT prompts enriched with domain knowledge, which are then used to guide a smaller, efficient VLM (e.g., Qwen2.5-VL-7B) in reasoning over video inputs, with complementary modalities as applicable. This design enables robust performance across multiple core perception tasks, including weather classification, pavement wetness assessment, and traffic congestion detection.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed framework, we curated three datasets. For the pavement wetness assessment task in particular, we constructed a multimodal dataset to demonstrate the benefits of multimodal reasoning. By leveraging carefully designed CoT prompts, the framework achieves significantly improved reasoning performance and substantial gains in overall accuracy. This zero-shot, multi-agent approach leverages domain knowledge through a large VLM and unlocks the potential of small VLMs, offering a scalable, cost-effective solution for diverse transportation applications. Our framework can be readily integrated with the abundant network of existing traffic cameras, enabling large-scale deployment. In rural regions, where traditional sensor coverage is sparse, our method supports strategic monitoring by focusing on high-risk locations such as sharp curves, flood-prone lowlands, or icy bridges. By continuously analyzing scene conditions at these targeted sites, the system enhances situational awareness and provides timely alerts even in disconnected environments. Additionally, the ability to automatically detect congestion and road hazards allows transportation agencies to efficiently screen regional or statewide traffic camera feeds and quickly identify problem areas without intensive manual review.

Nonetheless, there remains substantial room for improvement. A promising direction is to distill or design a more compact VLM tailored to the target tasks. Such a lightweight model would be well-suited for edge deployment, facilitating the integration of advanced AI capabilities into existing traffic camera networks and enabling scalable, real-time intelligent scene understanding.

## 6 Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology (OST-R), University Transportation Centers Program, through the Center for Regional and Rural Connected Communities (CR2C2) under Grant No. 69A3552348304.

## 7 Author Contributions

Conception and design: J.J.Y. and Y.Y.; data processing: Y.Y. and N.X.; analysis and interpretation of results: Y.Y., N.X., and J.J.Y.; draft manuscript preparation: Y.Y. and N.X.; review and editing: J.J.Y.; visualization, Y.Y.; supervision, J.J.Y.; project administration, J.J.Y.; funding acquisition, J.J.Y. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## References

- [1] Aryan Keskar, Srinivasa Perisetla, and Ross Greer. Evaluating multimodal vision-language model prompting strategies for visual question answering in road scene understanding. In *2025 WACV Large Language Vision Models Challenge for Autonomous Driving (LLVM-AD)*. Computer Vision Foundation, 2025.
- [2] Sung-Yeon Park, Can Cui, Yunsheng Ma, Ahmadreza Moradipari, Rohit Gupta, Kyungtae Han, and Ziran Wang. Nuplanqa: A large-scale dataset and benchmark for multi-view driving scene understanding in multi-modal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.12772*, 2025.
- [3] Sheng Luo, Wei Chen, Wanxin Tian, Rui Liu, Luanxuan Hou, Xiubao Zhang, Haifeng Shen, Ruiqi Wu, Shuyi Geng, Yi Zhou, Ling Shao, Yi Yang, Bojun Gao, Qun Li, and Guobin Wu. Delving into multi-modal multi-task foundation models for road scene understanding: From learning paradigm perspectives. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2024. Accepted, pre-publication version available online.
- [4] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 35, pages 24824–24837, 2022.
- [5] Huxin Yang, Ji Lin, Aojun Yang, Peihao Wang, Chong Zhou, and Huacheng Yang. Prompt tuning for generative multimodal pretrained models, 2022. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.02532*.
- [6] Haoxiang Gao and Yu Zhao. Application of vision-language model to pedestrians behavior and scene understanding in autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.06680*, 2025.
- [7] Ruixuan Zhang, Beichen Wang, Juexiao Zhang, Zilin Bian, Chen Feng, and Kaan Ozbay. When language and vision meet road safety: Leveraging multimodal large language models for video-based traffic accident analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.10604*, 2025.
- [8] Peter Lynch. The origins of computer weather prediction and climate modeling. *Journal of computational physics*, 227(7):3431–3444, 2008.
- [9] Fuqing Zhang, Meng Zhang, and James A Hansen. Coupling ensemble kalman filter with four-dimensional variational data assimilation. *Advances in Atmospheric Sciences*, 26:1–8, 2009.
- [10] Peter Bechtold, Nouredine Semane, Philippe Lopez, Jean-Pierre Chaboureau, Anton Beljaars, and Niels Bormann. Representing equilibrium and nonequilibrium convection in large-scale models. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 71(2):734–753, 2014.
- [11] AJ Geer, F Baordo, N Bormann, P Chambon, SJ English, M Kazumori, H Lawrence, P Lean, K Lonitz, and C Lupu. The growing impact of satellite observations sensitive to humidity, cloud and precipitation. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 143(709):3189–3206, 2017.
- [12] Peter Bauer, Alan Thorpe, and Gilbert Brunet. The quiet revolution of numerical weather prediction. *Nature*, 525(7567):47–55, 2015.
- [13] Yuzhou Shi, Yuanxiang Li, Jiawei Liu, Xingang Liu, and Yi Lu Murphey. Weather recognition based on edge deterioration and convolutional neural networks. In *2018 24th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pages 2438–2443. IEEE, 2018.
- [14] H. Zhen, Y. Shi, J. Yang, and J. M. Vehni. Co-supervised learning paradigm with conditional generative adversarial networks for sample-efficient classification. *Applied Computing and Intelligence*, 3(1):13–26, 2023.
- [15] Xiangyun Qing and Yugang Niu. Hourly day-ahead solar irradiance prediction using weather forecasts by lstm. *Energy*, 148:461–468, 2018.
- [16] Victor Schmidt, Mustafa Alghali, Kris Sankaran, Tianle Yuan, and Yoshua Bengio. Modeling cloud reflectance fields using conditional generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07579*, 2020.
- [17] Nicolas Webersinke, Mathias Kraus, Julia Anna Bingler, and Markus Leippold. Climatebert: A pretrained language model for climate-related text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.12010*, 2021.
- [18] David Thulke, Yingbo Gao, Petrus Pelsler, Rein Brune, Rricha Jalota, Floris Fok, Michael Ramos, Ian van Wyk, Abdallah Nasir, Hayden Goldstein, et al. Climategpt: Towards ai synthesizing interdisciplinary research on climate change. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09646*, 2024.

- [19] Md Nasim Khan and Mohamed M Ahmed. Weather and surface condition detection based on road-side webcams: Application of pre-trained convolutional neural network. *International Journal of Transportation Science and Technology*, 11:468–483, 2022.
- [20] Sindhu Chandra, Khaled AlMansoor, Cheng Chen, Yunfan Shi, and Hyungjoon Seo. Deep learning based infrared thermal image analysis of complex pavement defect conditions considering seasonal effect. *Sensors*, 22(23):9365, 2022.
- [21] Yu Yuan, Zhihong Wang, Shaobo Wang, and Lirong Yan. Road surface state recognition based on semantic segmentation. *Journal of Highway and Transportation Research and Development*, 15(2):88–94, 2021.
- [22] M Kalliris, Olivier Haas, Stratis Kanarachos, Mike Blundell, and R Kotsakis. Machine learning algorithms for wet road surface detection using acoustic measurements. In *2019 IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*, pages 265–270. IEEE, 2019.
- [23] Haitham Elwahsh, Alaa Allakany, Maazen Alsabaan, Mohamed I Ibrahim, and Engy El-Shafeiy. A deep learning technique to improve road maintenance systems based on climate change. *Applied Sciences*, 13(8):8899, 2023.
- [24] Adriana-Simona Mihaita, Haowen Li, and Marian-Andrei RizoIU. Traffic congestion anomaly detection and prediction using deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13215*, 2020.
- [25] Yuanyuan Liu, Zhen Cai, and Huili Dou. Highway traffic congestion detection and evaluation based on deep learning techniques. *Soft Computing*, 27:12249–12265, 2023.
- [26] Pranamesh Chakraborty, Yaw Okyere Adu-Gyamfi, Subhadipto Poddar, Vesal Ahsani, Anuj Sharma, and Soumik Sarkar. Traffic congestion detection from camera images using deep convolution neural networks. *Transportation Research Record*, 2672(45):222–231, 2018.
- [27] Talha Azfar, Jinlong Li, Hongkai Yu, Ruey L. Cheu, Yisheng Lv, and Ruimin Ke. Deep learning-based computer vision methods for complex traffic environments perception: A review. *Data Science for Transportation*, 6:1–27, 2024.
- [28] Joshua Achiam, Samuel Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Liane Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Francisco L. Aleman, Bob McGrew, et al. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- [29] Shoujin Bai, Kewen Chen, Xiaodong Liu, Jie Wang, Weiming Ge, Shikun Song, Ji Lin, et al. Qwen2.5-vl technical report, 2025. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*.