

## PROJECT SUMMARY

# Passive Pedestrian Detection Analysis

### Project Location:

Minneapolis, MN

### Start – Finish Date:

March 2021 – January 2023

### Project Status:

Complete

### Project Partners:

SRF Consulting Group

### MnDOT Project Cost:

\$135,000

### Projects with Similar Characteristics:

Variable Pedestrian Clearance Interval

### Project Description:

The Passive Pedestrian Detection Analysis project reviewed a variety of commercially available passive detection systems. Vendors that were selected for this study included:

- Flir, Mivision, Econolite, Gridsmart, and Iteris

After vendor selection, the project went through the following phases:

- Ground-truth Testing:
  - Verified the rate at which the systems accurately recognized a pedestrian at the intersection.
- Pushbutton Compliance Testing:
  - Determined the rate at which pedestrians activated the pushbuttons when they intended to cross the street.
  - Verified the accuracy of each system compared to pushbutton compliance.
- Vendor Result Summarization

### Project Objective:

- Test and verify the accuracy of the selected passive detection systems.
- Provide MnDOT with a robust procedure for future testing.
- Provide an evaluation matrix comparing each tested vendor system.



Figure 1: Pedestrian Detection Test View

### Project Accomplishments:

- Receiving a robust testing procedure to be applied to future technology installations.
- Gaining a better understanding on where detection technology stands on the spectrum of technology readiness.



## Key Findings:

### Ground-truth Testing

The system accuracies for detecting pedestrians at the intersections ranged from 23% to 83%.

### Pushbutton Compliance Testing

Pushbutton compliance at study intersections ranged from 55% to 82%.

The system accuracies against pushbutton compliance ranged from 18% to 72%.

### Vendor Re-Evaluation

After being able to make updates to their systems, the re-evaluation accuracy changes were inconsistent with some vendors seeing an increase in accuracy and others showing a decrease. Below is a vendor accuracy summary after re-evaluation.

| System           | Detection Accuracy | Direction Accuracy | Total Accuracy |
|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Flir             | 21% (23%)          | 89% (67%)          | 19% (16%)      |
| Iteris           | 72% (58%)          | 78% (61%)          | 56% (35%)      |
| Autoscope Vision | 69% (83%)          | 89% (94%)          | 62% (78%)      |
| Miovision        | 18% (57%)          | 43% (82%)          | 8% (47%)       |
| Gridsmart        | 32% (61%)          | N/A                | N/A            |

Figure 2: Phase 2 and Phase 3 Accuracy Summary

## Lessons Learned:

- Installation of new systems require testing, recalibration, and updates throughout deployment to improve detection accuracy.
- Pedestrian detection systems have significant improvements to make before they can be counted on as reliable technology.
  - None of the vendors met the pass/fail thresholds even after making updates to their systems and re-evaluating results.
- Pedestrian detection has more challenges than vehicles due to being smaller in size, being unpredictable, and varying in appearances.

## Potential Next Steps for MnDOT:

- Continue to test pedestrian detection systems as the market grows and evolves.
- Apply the created testing procedures to future technology installations to compare existing and new system accuracies.
- Explore potential applications for passive pedestrian detection, such as identifying Vulnerable Road Users (VRUs) in a V2I environment.
- Perform similar evaluation for passive vehicle detection and identification for use in a V2I environment.