

Vehicle occupancy estimation in Automated Guideway Transit via deep learning with Wi-Fi probe requests

Ziyue Li^a and Qianwen Guo^a

^aDepartment of Civil and Environmental Engineering, FAMU-FSU College of Engineering, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, USA

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled January 29, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study contributes to the advancement of vehicle occupancy estimation in Automated Guideway Transit (AGT) systems using Wi-Fi probe requests and deep learning models. We propose a comprehensive framework for evaluating various approaches to occupancy estimation, particularly in the context of MAC address randomization. While many methods proposed in the literature claim effectiveness in simpler experimental settings, our research reveals that those methods are unreliable in the complex environment of AGT systems. Specifically, techniques for handling randomized MAC addresses and distinguishing between passenger and non-passenger data do not perform well in AGT systems. Despite challenges in tracking individual devices, our study demonstrates that accurate occupancy estimation using Wi-Fi probe requests remains feasible. A pilot study conducted on the Miami-Dade Metromover, an AGT system characterized by frequent stops, significant occupancy fluctuations, and absence of fare collection devices, provides a robust testing ground for the framework. Additionally, our findings show that deep learning models significantly outperform machine learning models in this context. The insights from this study can significantly enhance decision-making for transit agencies to optimize operations and elevate service quality.

KEYWORDS

vehicle occupancy estimation, Wi-Fi probe requests, randomized MAC address, deep learning, Automated Guideway Transit

1. Introduction

Transit occupancy information is imperative for transit planners and policy makers to deliver high-quality transit services. Based on in-vehicle occupancy, transit agencies can judiciously allocate resources (Nitti et al., 2020). This information also facilitates efficient trip planning for passengers (Mehmood et al., 2019). Despite the importance of occupancy data, transit agencies encounter challenges in its collection. Historically reliant on manual counting, they have increasingly adopted Automated Fare Collection (AFC) systems for occupancy estimation due to the advent of transit cards and ticket vending machines (Sun and Schonfeld, 2016). Technological advancements drive the evolution of Automatic Passenger Counting (APC) systems employing diverse technologies, such as infrared sensors, cameras, or weight sensors (Rakebrandt, 2007). Presently, with




Figure 1. Wi-Fi technology in public transit

over 90% Americans using smartphones (Pew Research Center, 2024), opportunities for occupancy estimation have expanded through the utilization of Bluetooth (Kostakos, Camacho, and Mantero, 2010) and Wi-Fi (Oransirikul and Takada, 2019).

Occupancy estimation using Wi-Fi technology offers several advantages (Mikkelsen et al., 2016; Ryu, Park, and El-Tawab, 2020). First, it is cost-effective and easy to install the device. Second, it can achieve real-time occupancy estimation when Wi-Fi frames are collected and processed timely. Third, it demonstrates strengths in privacy protection, as the designed algorithm does not require the physical device identifier.

As illustrated in Figure 1, the fundamental concept of estimating vehicle occupancy using Wi-Fi technology involves analyzing Wi-Fi packets generated by passengers' mobile devices while they are onboard (Mikkelsen et al., 2016). Even if not connected to a wireless network, Wi-Fi-enabled devices send out probe requests - periodic scans to search for available Wi-Fi networks by broadcasting packets (frames) (Freudiger, 2015). These probe requests can subsequently be captured by Wi-Fi sniffers. The probe request contains unencrypted information, including the Media Access Control (MAC) address, Received Signal Strength Indicator (RSSI), Service Set Identifier (SSID), and data rate, facilitating data analysis through a digital fingerprint (Pu et al., 2020).

A MAC address serves as a unique identifier assigned to a network interface for intra-network communications, enabling the distinction of individual devices (Pu et al., 2020). However, with the advancement of privacy protection measures, most smart devices now feature MAC address randomization enabled by default. This feature results in nearly every field in a probe request from a single device showing inconsistent values (Newell, 2023), presenting a substantial challenge in accurately identifying and tracking devices. Previous research utilizing Wi-Fi technology, while demonstrating satisfactory performance, often did not account for MAC address randomization (Oransirikul and Takada, 2019; Pu et al., 2020). Even recent studies focusing on inferring travel patterns, such as Gao and Schmöcker (2024), analyzed only a subset of devices with non-randomized MAC addresses. This oversight results in significant data underutilization and introduces potential biases. Another study, Fabre et al. (2024b), collected data with true MAC addresses, claiming that “the MAC addresses are pseudonymized within very short delays and posters are displayed in the bus to warn passengers that some sensors are active” to comply with personal data protection laws. However, passengers might choose to disable their devices' Wi-Fi to protect privacy upon noticing the warning.

Additionally, previous studies were mostly conducted in experimental settings or in

vehicles where both the range and maximum occupancy were relatively small. Real-world complex transit systems, such as the Automated Guideway Transit (AGT), present other distinctive challenges for occupancy estimation (Pastor, 1988). First, the travel time between two stops is relatively short, with vehicles in extreme cases passing through multiple stations within one minute. Therefore, the approach to data aggregation must be meticulously designed. Second, due to the system’s fare-free operation (passengers can board and alight freely), AFC data, typically utilized in algorithms or as ground truth validation, are unavailable. Notably, no studies have yet explored the use of Wi-Fi technology to estimate occupancy within AGT systems. This study marks the first attempt to apply Wi-Fi technology for monitoring occupancy in AGT systems, which differ significantly from other transit modes.

This study aims to investigate the challenges of Wi-Fi-based occupancy estimation for AGT systems. Our contributions are outlined as follows:

- (1) A comprehensive framework for occupancy estimation using Wi-Fi is developed. We tackle prevalent obstacles such as MAC addresses randomization, differentiating between passengers and non-passengers, and the data aggregation process.
- (2) Deep learning is applied for occupancy estimation. This approach is relatively unexplored and it enhances the precision and reliability of occupancy estimation.
- (3) A pilot study in the Miami-Dade Metromover is conducted. The study navigates through the intricate challenges unique to AGT, setting a foundational precedent for future research and development in this domain.

Our research reveals a series of key findings:

- (1) There are no reliable density-based methods to handle randomized MAC addresses or fuzzy clustering algorithms to classify passengers and non-passengers in AGT.
- (2) Our experiments reveal an important concept not extensively discussed in the literature: the burst. During each burst, the MAC address remains constant (Kumar and Cunche, 2024). Consequently, the number of bursts becomes an important feature for occupancy estimation. This may explain why, even without MAC address de-randomization, satisfactory occupancy estimation accuracy can still be achieved by leveraging this feature along with others.
- (3) A notable improvement in occupancy estimation accuracy is demonstrated by implementing deep learning techniques. It is found that treating vehicle occupancy as a time series and incorporating past data spanning 8 to 10 time lags (corresponding to 8-10 minutes) results in robust performance.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature. Section 3 describes the data collection and pre-processing procedure. Section 4 discusses the detailed methodology and Section 5 shows the experimental results. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

2. Literature review

2.1. *Wi-Fi sniffing system applications in public transit*

Wi-Fi sniffing system applications in public transit can be categorized into two groups based on the deployment scale: those implemented in systems covering a limited number of spots and those deployed across extensive networks encompassing numerous locations (Ryu, Park, and El-Tawab, 2020).

Within the first group where the Wi-Fi sniffing system is deployed in a confined area, Chon et al. (2014) detected the movement of surrounding users in a room, while Schauer, Werner, and Marcus (2014) estimated the spatial density of pedestrians at a German airport. Pronello et al. (2024) counted the number of waiting passengers at bus stops, while Mehmood et al. (2019) estimated bus occupancy in Melbourne, Australia.

For Wi-Fi sniffers deployed at multiple locations, studies based on MAC re-identification (i.e., matching MAC addresses of individuals’ mobile devices from multiple spots) make it possible to track trips and measure travel information. Dunlap et al. (2016); Fabre et al. (2023) have estimated origin-destination (OD) information from the passive data collected by the sniffers. Gao and Schmöcker (2024) combined Wi-Fi sensing data and GPS traces to infer the travel patterns and the attractiveness of touristic areas. However, these studies did not account for MAC address randomization. Without access to the true MAC address, estimating OD pairs becomes nearly intractable.

2.2. MAC address randomization and handling methods




Figure 2. MAC address structure

A MAC address consists of 48 bits, typically represented in hexadecimal format (Martin et al., 2017). The first half (24 bits) of a MAC address, named the Organization Unique Identifier (OUI), is associated with the device manufacturer, while the second half is unique to the device itself. Key bits determine its characteristics. For instance, the least significant bit (b_0) of the first byte distinguishes between unicast (0) and multicast (1) addresses, with unicast addresses designated for one-to-one communication and multicast for one-to-many communication. The second least significant bit (b_1) indicates whether the address is globally administered (0) or locally administered (1). Specifically, when b_0 denotes unicast and b_1 signifies locally administered, it implies a randomized MAC address (see Figure 2). This delineation allows for the recognition of specific byte patterns, ‘2,6,A,E’, derived from the hexadecimal representation of ‘??10’, to identify randomized MAC addresses. It is worth noting that certain Android devices may deviate from these conventions, maintaining a fixed Google OUI (DA:A1:19) while randomizing the remaining portion of the MAC address (Fenske et al., 2021). Nonetheless, in this study, we assume that ‘2,6,A,E’ represents randomized MAC addresses. Today, most mobile device manufacturers incorporate MAC address randomization to protect user privacy. This technique varies significantly across devices and operating systems (Fenske et al., 2021). Devices may change MAC addresses after each network connection or at regular intervals, presenting a substantial challenge for device identification.

In the realm of occupancy estimation utilizing Wi-Fi technology, there exists a body of research addressing the challenges posed by randomized MAC addresses (Delzanno et al., 2023; Newell, 2023; Pronello et al., 2024; Uras et al., 2020), among which the

predominant technique is density-based clustering. Uras et al. (2020) pioneered the application of clustering algorithms, such as Density Based Spatial Clustering of Application with Noise (DBSCAN) and Ordering Points to Identify the Clustering Structure (OPTICS), to analyze features for device identification. Despite achieving high accuracy, their experiments occurred within controlled laboratory settings, involving only 23 devices. Delzanno et al. (2023) designed a simplified DBSCAN algorithm, named DBSCAN_L, to cluster MAC addresses according to RSSI and data rate. Tan and Chan (2021) proposed the ESPRESSO algorithm, leveraging Bayes’ theorem to establish the associative probability between bursts of probe requests. Brik et al. (2008) analyzed the physical layer and suggested a method by performing passive analysis of radio frequencies and employing machine learning to achieve a 99% accuracy in device counting, but it is impractical in real-world scenarios due to radio interference and the complexity of data collection setup. Matte et al. (2016) proposed a way to fingerprint the probe requests sent by a single device. Although they showed that such time-based signature is consistent over time, the methodology highly relied on the fact that “the frames sent by Wi-Fi devices follow regular patterns that can be used for time-based fingerprinting (Franklin et al., 2006).” Timing information is not reliable due to scattering problems and multi-path phenomena that occur in realistic settings (Uras et al., 2020).

2.3. Occupancy estimation using Wi-Fi technology

There are two Wi-Fi-based vehicle occupancy estimation approaches, depending on whether users are required to connect their devices to a specific Wi-Fi network. For the first method termed ‘active collecting,’ devices are required to be connected to a certain wireless network that covers the entire study area (Ozbay, Shlayan, and Nassif, 2017). Thus, the area under study cannot be expanded without extending the network coverage, which may be challenging in some cases (Lesani and Miranda-Moreno, 2018). In contrast, our focus lies on ‘passive sniffing’ methods (Fabre et al., 2023; Mehmood et al., 2019; Mishalani, McCord, and Reinhold, 2016). Compared to active collecting, passive sniffing offers superior privacy protection and does not require device connection to specific Wi-Fi networks. However, most passive sniffing studies rely on non-randomized MAC addresses emitted by Wi-Fi devices. The increasing adoption of MAC address randomization by smartphone manufacturers disrupts device identification accuracy.

Furthermore, distinguishing between noise and actual passenger signals poses a significant challenge. While Pu et al. (2020) proposed a fuzzy c-means (FCM) clustering method to address this issue, their approach did not account for MAC address randomization. Consequently, there is a need for further investigation to evaluate the efficacy of fuzzy clustering methods under MAC address randomization.

Moreover, exploring the occupancy estimation models is essential. While traditional machine learning algorithms, such as random forests, are commonly employed, there is a growing interest in utilizing deep learning methodologies. Pronello et al. (2024) applied Convolutional and Recurrent Neural Networks (CRNN) to address people counting at bus stops, yielding satisfactory results. Chen et al. (2020) utilized Convolutional Deep Bi-directional Long Short-Term Memory (CDBLSTM) for building occupancy estimation models. Additionally, Zhang et al. (2020) investigated various deep learning models for short-term passenger flow forecasting, with their proposed ResLSTM model demonstrating superior performance. These studies highlight the potential of deep learning approaches in improving the accuracy and efficiency of occupancy estimation models.

2.4. Summary

Based on the literature review discussed above, this study aims to improve the existing studies in the following aspects:

- Existing studies have yet to develop a comprehensive and up-to-date method that leverages Wi-Fi technology for occupancy estimation. Most approaches either lack integration of recent advancements or are limited in scope.
- The validity of clustering-based methods for addressing randomized MAC addresses, which has become more prevalent with privacy-enhanced devices, remains under-explored. Current research has not sufficiently tested or validated these techniques in occupancy estimation.
- While there have been attempts to separate passengers from non-passengers in various contexts, the application of these methods to occupancy estimation given MAC address randomization is under-researched. The effectiveness of such separation techniques in improving occupancy estimates requires further validation.
- The field of Wi-Fi-based occupancy estimation has seen limited application of deep learning methods. Despite its potential, further investigation is needed to fully understand how deep learning can be effectively applied to this domain.
- Existing studies often focus on simplified or controlled environments, but it is necessary to test Wi-Fi-based occupancy estimation in real-world settings where data is characterized by high frequency, significant variance, and wide-ranging values. This gap presents an opportunity for further investigation.

3. Framework design

The proposed framework is shown in Figure 3. This section describes how Wi-Fi probe requests are collected and pre-processed.

3.1. Hardware setup and data collection

Wi-Fi probe requests are captured by a Wi-Fi sniffer in monitor mode. We employ a USB Wi-Fi adapter TP-Link TL-WN722N that operates within the 2.4–2.4835 GHz frequency range. The adapter is plugged into a single-board computer Le Potato (AML-S905X-CC), which runs Wireshark to save captured Wi-Fi frames. The computer is equipped with a portable monitor and a compact keyboard with a touchpad for monitoring during the data collection, as illustrated in Figure 4. The above hardware setup has flexibility for customization, i.e., it can further incorporate a Bluetooth sensor, a GPS tracker, and a real-time clock depending on specific research needs.

The Wi-Fi sniffer captures all Wi-Fi packets in its range, including those from Wi-Fi devices that are not connected to any Wi-Fi networks. When the sniffer is placed inside a vehicle, it may capture Wi-Fi frames originating from outside the vehicle, as illustrated in Figure 5. Capturing Wi-Fi frames from non-passenger devices, such as those from people in nearby buildings, introduces the problem of potential overestimation (Dunlap et al., 2016; Mehmood et al., 2019). Additionally, other sources of error include not all passengers carrying Wi-Fi-enabled devices, while some carrying multiple devices (Longo, Redondi, and Cesana, 2019).




Figure 3. Proposed analysis framework



Figure 4. Hardware setup




Figure 5. Range of Wi-Fi sniffer deployed inside the vehicle

3.2. Data pre-processing and aggregation

3.2.1. Wi-Fi data collection and cleaning

After collecting all Wi-Fi frames, we use the Python package *Pyshark* to extract data from pcapng files and apply the following procedure to filter the data:

- Step 1: Select probe requests only by specifying Wi-Fi frame type as 0 (management frame) and subtype as 4 (probe request).
- Step 2: Choose only those broadcasting probe requests, i.e., with destination address `ff:ff:ff:ff:ff:ff`.
- Step 3: Select unicast probe requests ($b_0 = 0$).
- Step 4: Remove data with RSSI values below -60 dBm.
- Step 5: For non-randomized MAC addresses ($b_1 = 0$), perform an OUI lookup to identify recognized smartphones using the Python package *Ouillookup*.

In Step 2, we filter out probe requests that are not directed to the broadcast address `ff:ff:ff:ff:ff:ff`. According to Bravenec et al. (2023), when the broadcast address is used, the packet is generally directed to all devices on the network, or in the case of wireless communications to all devices in the proximity. In some cases where the packet request is directed to other addresses, it is typically for active scanning and reconnection purposes (IEEE Computer Society LAN/MAN Standards Committee, 2007). For occupancy estimation objectives, we exclude these cases as it is likely that such requests do not originate from passenger devices. Since the Metromover does not provide Wi-Fi access, no passenger device would reconnect.

In Step 4, we set an RSSI threshold due to the high volume of noise in AGT. Based on our preliminary study detailed in Section 5.2, as well as prior research by Delzanno et al. (2023); Oransirikul, Piumarta, and Takada (2019), probe requests with RSSI below -60 dBm are very likely to originate from non-passenger devices and are thus treated as noise. Unlike Pu et al. (2020), we do not apply fuzzy classification directly because fuzzy algorithms are known for noise sensitivity (Dave, 1993). Instead, fuzzy classification is applied in later stages after most noise has been excluded, as indicated in Figure 3.

3.2.2. Passenger data collection and cleaning

Since the Metromover operates as a fare-free system, there is no available AFC data for passenger counts. Instead, vehicle occupancy data were manually recorded. A sample data collection form is depicted in Figure 6.

Several notable scenarios are described as follows. First, the vehicle could become

ON-BOARDPASSENGER CHECK

Checker: Tom **Page:** 4
Route: OMNI LOOP **Direction:** Downtown to Omni **Start Station:** Government Center
Month: January **Day:** 1 **Year:** 2023 **Start:** 2:19 AM / **PM**
Seats: 4 **Capacity:** 90 **On Board:** 30

STOP			TIME		PASSENGERS			NOTE
STOP	STATION	TRANSFER	ARR	DEP	ON	OFF	LOAD	
1	GOVERNMENT CENTER	METRORAIL	2:19 PM	2:19 PM			30	
2	THIRD STREET	BRICKELL LOOP	2:21 PM	2:22 PM	8	10	28	
3	KNIGHT CENTER		2:23 PM	2:23 PM	6	4	30	
4	BAYFRONT PARK		2:24 PM	2:25 PM	8	0	38	
5	FIRST STREET		2:26 PM	2:27 PM	3	4	37	
6	COLLEGE BAYSIDE		2:27 PM	2:29 PM	30	6	61	
7	FREEDOM TOWER		2:30 PM	2:30 PM	3	0	64	
8	PARK WEST		2:30 PM	2:31 PM	9	18	55	
9	ELEVENTH STREET		2:31 PM	2:31 PM	6	8	53	
10	MUSEUM PARK		2:32 PM	2:33 PM	7	9	51	
11	ADRIENNE ARSHT CENTER		2:35 PM	2:35 PM	8	16	43	
12	SCHOOL BOARD		2:35 PM	2:35 PM	12	14	41	
13	ADRIENNE ARSHT CENTER		2:37 PM	2:38 PM	10	2	49	
14	MUSEUM PARK		2:40 PM	2:41 PM	6	6	49	
15	ELEVENTH STREET		2:41 PM	2:41 PM	2	7	44	
16	PARK WEST		2:41 PM	2:42 PM	3	0	47	
17	FREEDOM TOWER		2:44 PM	2:44 PM	0	5	42	
18	COLLEGE NORTH	INNER LOOP	2:45 PM	2:46 PM	1	18	25	
19	WILKIE D. FERGUSON, JR	BRIGHTLINE	2:47 PM	2:47 PM	1	7	19	
20	GOVERNMENT CENTER	METRORAIL	2:48 PM	2:49 PM	0	6	13	

Figure 6. A sample manual count form as the ground truth

densely crowded, posing challenges for accurate manual passenger counting due to obstructed visibility. Second, the short intervals between stops meant that vehicles could pass through two stations within a minute, complicating data aggregation, as averaging Wi-Fi and passenger data over one minute introduced potential errors. In real-world cases, aggregating data over short intervals has received limited attention. However, addressing this issue is crucial for accurate occupancy estimation. To tackle this, we apply the following data processing techniques:

- If the vehicle was in motion during a specific minute, such as at 2:20 PM, no averaging was necessary; the onboard count of 30 sufficed.
- When the vehicle might be moving or stopped, as observed at 2:21 PM, where it might have not yet reached or might have been waiting at stop 2, the average of the load numbers (30 and 28) yielded an occupancy of 29.
- The more complicated cases arise when the same time appears in two or more rows of the form. For instance, at 2:27 PM, the vehicle might stop at station 5, travel between stations 5 and 6, or remain at station 6. In such cases, we calculate the average of all relevant load numbers within that minute: 38 (upon arrival at station 5), 37 (upon departure from station 5), 37 (upon arrival at station 6), and 61 (upon departure from station 6), resulting the average occupancy 43.25. This approach ensures that changes in occupancy are appropriately captured. Similar considerations apply to other cases, such as 2:30 PM and 2:35 PM.

Additionally, Figure 6 explains why time-based fingerprinting methods to deal with randomized MAC addresses are unreliable. Consider a passenger traveling from Stop 14 to Stop 16. The vehicle departed Stop 14 at 2:41:06 PM and arrived at Stop 16 at 2:41:53 PM, while the passenger boarded at 2:41:02 PM and alighted at 2:41:57 PM, with a travel time of less than 1 minute. Even if the passenger carried a device, it might not have sent a probe request, or only one during the period, making time-based fingerprinting impossible. Therefore, identifying every passenger’s device is not feasible.

4. Methodology

This section describes approaches applied to occupancy estimation using Wi-Fi technology, including clustering methods to deal with randomized MAC addresses, passenger and non-passenger separation using fuzzy clustering, prediction models, and evaluation metrics. The best-performing methodology is presented by Figure 10 in Section 5.5.

4.1. *Clustering methods to deal with randomized MAC address*

Clustering methods here do not aim to recover the true MAC address or identify the device sending the probe request. Instead, researchers cluster probe requests based on feature similarities (Delzanno et al., 2023; Uras et al., 2020). The rationale is that, despite MAC addresses randomization, a device’s probe requests should exhibit similar data rates (e.g., a Samsung Galaxy M12 supports higher data rates than an iPhone 6s (Delzanno et al., 2023)) and other attributes.

The most basic clustering algorithm is DBSCAN (Ester et al., 1996). A simplified version of DBSCAN, named DBSCAN_L, was proposed by Delzanno et al. (2023), which refrains from merging overlapping clusters. In their paper, three variants - `standardCOUNT`, `bruteForceCOUNT` and `wordDistantCount` - were considered, with the authors concluding that `bruteForceCOUNT` exhibits the best performance. OPTICS (Ankerst et al., 1999) is another clustering algorithm that builds upon the concepts of DBSCAN.

In real-world scenarios with a large number of devices and extensive data collection, applying the algorithm alone may not suffice. For instance, if the maximum number of probe requests sent by a device within a minute is 30, but there are more than 30 data points within a cluster, overlap occurs. In such cases, it becomes necessary to divide the average probe requests sent by each device within the cluster (Delzanno et al., 2023).

4.2. *Passenger and non-passenger classification using fuzzy clustering*

Separating probe requests from passenger devices and non-passenger devices can be challenging, so fuzzy logic may be helpful. Pu et al. (2020) utilized the fuzzy c-means (FCM) clustering algorithm for this purpose. FCM assigns a degree of membership to each data point, allowing it to belong to multiple clusters. Moreover, Wu, Xie, and Yu (2003) introduced kernel FCM, which uses kernel functions to map data into a higher-dimensional space, enabling the clustering of more complex datasets.

Unlike DBSCAN and OPTICS, which do not require specifying the number of clusters, fuzzy clustering is more adaptable to scenarios where the number of clusters is known. In the context of passenger and non-passenger classification, where the natural clustering involves two groups (passengers and non-passengers) as a priori, fuzzy clustering fits well. However, for clustering methods to deal with randomized MAC addresses, where the number of clusters is unknown, fuzzy clustering is not suitable.

4.3. *Prediction models*

The following prediction models were evaluated:

- Machine Learning: Two models, Random Forest (RF) Regression and XGBoost (XGB) Regression, were tested.
- Deep Learning: Deep learning has revolutionized prediction tasks. We tested two models: CRNN and CDBLSTM. CRNN, used by Pronello et al. (2024) for counting

people at bus stops via Wi-Fi probe requests, combines RNN and convolutional layers. CDBLSTM, employed in Chen et al. (2020) for occupancy estimation with environmental sensors, integrates LSTM and convolutional layers.

We acknowledge that each transit mode has unique features, and no single prediction model consistently outperforms others. This paper does not try to propose a new prediction model for AGT but instead establishes foundational insights, showing that deep learning methods consistently outperform traditional machine learning. This highlights the importance of prioritizing deep learning in future prediction model development.

4.4. Evaluation metrics

We consider the following evaluation metrics: mean absolute error (MAE), root mean square error (RMSE), R-squared score (R^2), and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE), as described in Oransirikul and Takada (2019); Pu et al. (2020):

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N |\hat{Y}_i - Y_i|}{N}, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{Y}_i - Y_i)^2}{N}}, \quad (2)$$

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - \bar{Y}_i)^2}, \quad (3)$$

$$\text{MAPE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|\hat{Y}_i - Y_i|}{Y_i} \times 100\%, \quad (4)$$

where \hat{Y}_i is the estimated occupancy, Y_i is the ground truth, and \bar{Y}_i is the average of Y_i .

Due to the opaque process of MAC address randomization and the presence of noise, the true mechanism remains unknown and is learned through prediction models. The reliability of the proposed procedure can only be tested using evaluation metrics.

5. Experiments and numerical results

5.1. An overview of Miami-Dade Metromover

Our pilot study was conducted on the Miami-Dade Metromover’s OMNI and BRICK-ELL loops. The Metromover, an AGT system in downtown Miami, uses electrically powered vehicles on fixed tracks for passenger transport. Key features include its free-ride operation without an AFC system for passenger counting, high-frequency service with cars arriving every 90 seconds in peak hours, and short travel times between adjacent stops, sometimes passing two stops in a minute. A preliminary study was conducted before the pilot study, with details provided in the following subsection.

Table 1. Data size after each filtration step

	Line	Raw Data	After Step 1	After Step 2	After Step 3	After Step 4	After Step 5
OMNI	Training Data	3,280,221	204,452	199,141	199,091	117,126	107,405
	Test Data	961,998	45,146	43,524	43,511	21,397	19,598
BRICKELL	Training Data	4,136,054	313,797	308,978	308,946	187,668	171,911
	Test Data	1,038,604	68,927	66,974	66,971	39,777	36,630

5.2. Preliminary study

The preliminary study aimed to understand Wi-Fi probing mechanism and MAC address randomization. It also explored the correlation between RSSI and device distance from sniffers, as well as probe request frequency patterns. It included two parts: one in an open space, and the other on a shuttle bus of Florida International University (FIU).

5.2.1. Phase 1: Open space

Phase 1 experiments took place on an empty football field at FIU. We used a Wi-Fi sniffer to detect devices at varying distances. Tests included scenarios with MAC address randomization enabled or disabled and with devices either in use or not.

Initially, we assessed background noise levels, collecting 634 Wi-Fi frames. They predominately had weak signal strength, with 97% having an RSSI below -80 dBm. The collected RSSI values fall into two groups, with the boundary at around -60 dBm.

Subsequently, test devices were positioned at varying distances from the Wi-Fi sniffer, revealing several key findings: (1) Devices within 40 ft (vehicle length) of the sniffer had RSSI stronger than -60 dBm, despite noise frames were detected. Thus, -60 dBm was set as the threshold to filter out noise. (2) Probe requests were often sent in bursts with short intervals between them. (3) Despite MAC address randomization, the MAC address remained consistent within each burst. (4) When in use, devices sent probe requests about every 3 seconds, while patterns were less clear when not in use.

5.2.2. Phase 2: FIU shuttle experiment

In the second phase, the Wi-Fi sniffer was positioned in the middle of an FIU shuttle, to collect probe data. Data from two complete trips on the same bus route were collected on February 17th, 2023, with manual passenger counts serving as ground truth. Each shuttle trip lasted 45 minutes, with an average of 11,416 Wi-Fi frames collected.


Analysis revealed that about 2.25% of probe requests had non-randomized MAC addresses and weak RSSIs around -80 dBm. These requests were transient and possibly from roadside devices. Most probe requests of our interest had randomized MAC addresses and strong signal strength with RSSIs above -55 dBm. It was again concluded that setting a threshold of -60 dBm effectively filtered out most noise.

5.3. Pilot Study on Metromover: data collection and summary statistics

Data collection occurred over a two-week period, from March 27 to April 9, 2023, including both weekdays and weekends, with a total of over 100 trips. Daily data collection took place within a four-hour window.

Table 2. Proportion of randomized and non-randomized MAC addresses

	Line	Non-random MAC	Random MAC	Total
OMNI	Train	2.5%	97.5%	100%
	Test	2.6%	97.4%	100%
BRICKELL	Train	2.4%	97.6%	100%
	Test	2.0%	98.0%	100%

**Figure 7.** Occupancy histogram of training data

5.3.1. Data filtering process

Table 1 displays the data size (the number of Wi-Fi frames) following each stage of the data filtering process in Section 3.2.1. The initial step, which selected probe requests, significantly reduced the data volume. Further filtering in Step 4, which excluded data with RSSI below -60 dBm, further halved the remaining data.

5.3.2. Proportion of randomized MAC addresses

For the filtered data, we calculated the proportion of randomized MAC addresses (see Table 2). It is evident that most devices utilized randomized MAC addresses, posing challenges for prediction. The proportion aligns with the FIU shuttle bus preliminary study (2.25% for non-randomized MAC addresses).

5.3.3. Distribution of occupancy

Figure 7 shows the occupancy histogram of the training data. Most data points fall within the moderate occupancy range of around 20 passengers. The distribution has a long tail, with some records showing occupancy levels over 50 individuals. Unlike existing research, which typically examines occupancy levels below 35 (Oransirikul and Takada, 2019; Pronello et al., 2024), our study explores higher occupancy levels (up to 64), further validating the proposed methodology in such scenarios.

Table 3. Extracted features for occupancy estimation

Features	Definition
MAC_num	The number of MAC addresses
source_random_num	The number of randomized MAC addresses
data_rate_mean	The average value of data rate
SSID_none_num	The number of probe requests with empty SSID
SSID_missing_num	The number of probe requests with missing SSID
captured_length_mean	The average value of captured length
duration_mean	The average value of duration
random_bursts	The number of bursts (with randomized MAC addresses ≥ 2 in one minute)
RSSI _{<i>i,j</i>}	The number of probe requests with RSSI between <i>i</i> and <i>j</i> . E.g, RSSI _{60,55} is the number of probe requests with RSSI between -60 ~ -55 dBm
station_id_ <i>i</i>	The indicator of whether the vehicle was at station <i>i</i> during the minute

5.4. Occupancy estimation and performance evaluation

5.4.1. Features for occupancy estimation

Features we consider are summarized in Table 3, supported by Chang et al. (2023); Pu et al. (2020). Not all features are incorporated into the predictive model: machine learning models incorporate only those features with the best 5-fold cross-validation performance on the training data, while all features are included in deep learning models.

5.4.2. Performance of machine learning algorithms

We investigated two machine learning algorithms, RF and XGB. We also explored clustering methods to deal with randomized MAC addresses and fuzzy clustering for passenger and non-passenger separation. The results are presented in Table 4.

- Clustering methods to deal with randomized MAC addresses surprisingly performed worse than no-clustering. Several factors contribute to this outcome. First, the performance of density-based clustering methods heavily depends on the classification capability of features. However, when dealing with large datasets with significant overlaps, clustering MAC addresses solely by these features becomes exceedingly challenging, particularly considering the inherent variability in RSSI values for the same device. Second, the no-clustering approach may benefit from the *burst* concept, where devices send multiple probe requests with consistent MAC address in short intervals, providing valuable information through the feature *random_bursts* (see Kumar and Cunche (2024)). Moreover, when employing any clustering method, two key considerations arise. On the one hand, determining the average number of probe requests sent by smartphones is crucial, particularly for large datasets where clusters may contain probe requests exceeding the maximum possible probe requests sent by a device within one minute. Partitioning each cluster based on the average number of probe requests leads to improved results, as illustrated by the superior performance of ‘MULT’ compared to ‘SNGL’. On the other hand, no single method consistently outperforms the others, underscoring the challenges these clustering methods face when dealing with large datasets.
- Fuzzy clustering for passenger and non-passenger separation unexpectedly showed that the “no fuzzy” option often performs better. Although kernel FCM generally outperforms FCM, both fuzzy methods are worse than “no fuzzy”. This is likely due to data overlap. The complex nature of MAC address randomization also compounds the difficulty of passenger and non-passenger separation.
- Machine learning algorithms: In our experiments with no-clustering, RF generally

Table 4. Evaluation of occupancy estimation using machine learning

			No Fuzzy		OMNI FCM		Kernel FCM		No Fuzzy		BRICKELL FCM		Kernel FCM	
			RF	XGB	RF	XGB	RF	XGB	RF	XGB	RF	XGB	RF	XGB
No-clustering	Training	MAE	5.05	5.09	5.69	5.51	5.71	5.54	3.91	4.21	3.94	4.27	3.98	4.19
		RMSE	6.82	7.45	7.62	7.82	7.65	7.86	5.02	5.66	5.00	5.73	5.06	5.58
		MAPE	0.38	0.37	0.44	0.40	0.44	0.41	^a ∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
		R ²	0.51	0.42	0.39	0.36	0.39	0.35	0.71	0.63	0.71	0.62	0.71	0.64
	Test	MAE	4.42	4.54	4.53	4.65	4.46	4.67	4.43	4.45	4.45	4.44	4.52	4.36
		RMSE	5.43	5.44	5.66	5.73	5.60	5.82	5.83	5.81	5.82	5.83	5.88	5.69
		MAPE	0.74	0.76	0.79	0.78	0.78	0.79	0.29	0.29	0.30	0.29	0.30	0.29
		R ²	0.19	0.18	0.12	0.09	0.13	0.06	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.55	0.58
DBSCAN	Training	MAE	5.63	5.32	5.73	5.41	5.73	5.43	4.09	4.35	4.18	4.34	4.22	4.32
		RMSE	7.59	7.63	7.72	7.75	7.72	7.74	5.31	5.90	5.40	5.88	5.49	5.85
		MAPE	0.43	0.39	0.44	0.39	0.44	0.39	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
		R ²	0.40	0.39	0.38	0.37	0.38	0.37	0.68	0.60	0.67	0.60	0.66	0.61
	Test	MAE	4.78	4.59	4.87	4.74	4.85	4.65	4.92	4.80	5.02	4.77	5.04	4.79
		RMSE	5.78	5.52	5.94	5.81	5.92	5.73	6.36	6.23	6.50	6.23	6.50	6.24
		MAPE	0.82	0.78	0.85	0.79	0.85	0.77	0.33	0.32	0.33	0.31	0.33	0.31
		R ²	0.08	0.16	0.02	0.07	0.03	0.09	0.47	0.49	0.45	0.49	0.45	0.49
DBSCANL	Training	MAE	4.95	5.44	5.12	5.56	5.10	5.64	4.76	4.80	4.81	4.84	4.82	4.90
		RMSE	6.76	7.76	6.90	7.87	6.93	7.94	6.18	6.42	6.24	6.46	6.23	6.53
		MAPE	0.37	0.40	0.39	0.41	0.39	0.41	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
		R ²	0.52	0.37	0.50	0.35	0.50	0.34	0.56	0.53	0.55	0.52	0.56	0.51
	Test	MAE	5.40	4.94	5.67	5.11	5.60	5.03	5.32	5.19	5.34	5.21	5.31	5.24
		RMSE	6.45	5.99	6.79	6.26	6.74	6.21	6.87	6.65	6.90	6.68	6.88	6.67
		MAPE	0.91	0.82	0.96	0.85	0.96	0.86	0.38	0.34	0.38	0.34	0.38	0.34
		R ²	-0.15	0.01	-0.27	-0.08	-0.25	-0.07	0.38	0.42	0.38	0.42	0.38	0.42
DBSCANL	Training	MAE	5.68	5.16	5.19	5.60	5.31	5.54	4.15	4.49	4.28	4.49	4.19	4.42
		RMSE	7.67	7.46	6.98	7.98	7.10	7.88	5.41	6.11	5.59	6.10	5.40	5.99
		MAPE	0.44	0.38	0.40	0.41	0.40	0.41	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
		R ²	0.38	0.42	0.49	0.33	0.47	0.35	0.66	0.57	0.64	0.57	0.67	0.59
	Test	MAE	4.88	4.81	4.98	5.02	4.91	4.89	4.98	4.92	5.04	5.01	4.96	4.93
		RMSE	5.89	5.80	6.04	6.13	5.95	5.99	6.40	6.28	6.45	6.33	6.38	6.26
		MAPE	0.83	0.77	0.81	0.89	0.81	0.84	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.32	0.33	0.32
		R ²	0.04	0.07	-0.01	-0.04	0.02	0.01	0.46	0.49	0.46	0.48	0.47	0.49
OPTICS	Training	MAE	4.99	5.37	4.84	5.35	4.86	5.43	4.70	4.92	4.71	4.93	4.67	4.95
		RMSE	6.73	7.66	6.47	7.61	6.49	7.63	6.10	6.55	6.11	6.57	6.06	6.57
		MAPE	0.37	0.39	0.37	0.39	0.37	0.40	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
		R ²	0.52	0.38	0.56	0.39	0.56	0.39	0.57	0.51	0.57	0.51	0.58	0.51
	Test	MAE	5.21	5.03	5.31	5.06	5.51	5.20	5.20	5.25	5.18	5.27	5.28	5.20
		RMSE	6.33	6.14	6.42	6.15	6.59	6.36	6.78	6.73	6.69	6.73	6.82	6.62
		MAPE	0.87	0.82	0.88	0.81	0.91	0.84	0.37	0.34	0.36	0.35	0.37	0.36
		R ²	-0.11	-0.04	-0.14	-0.04	-0.20	-0.12	0.40	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.39	0.43
OPTICS	Training	MAE	5.67	5.10	5.66	5.63	5.13	5.46	4.08	4.40	4.34	4.46	4.22	4.42
		RMSE	7.69	7.47	7.63	7.96	6.89	7.79	5.25	5.93	5.58	6.00	5.40	5.97
		MAPE	0.44	0.37	0.44	0.41	0.40	0.40	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
		R ²	0.38	0.42	0.39	0.34	0.50	0.36	0.68	0.60	0.64	0.59	0.67	0.59
	Test	MAE	4.73	4.67	5.01	4.79	4.84	4.77	4.61	4.68	4.77	4.54	4.59	4.58
		RMSE	5.71	5.64	6.10	5.83	5.85	5.81	5.99	6.05	6.25	5.91	6.02	5.94
		MAPE	0.82	0.77	0.87	0.82	0.81	0.79	0.30	0.30	0.31	0.28	0.30	0.29
		R ²	0.10	0.12	-0.03	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.53	0.52	0.49	0.54	0.53	0.54
OPTICS	Training	MAE	4.83	5.60	4.80	5.56	5.44	5.57	4.59	4.68	4.61	4.58	4.58	4.72
		RMSE	6.52	7.90	6.45	7.84	7.33	7.85	5.98	6.27	6.01	6.14	5.93	6.33
		MAPE	0.36	0.42	0.36	0.40	0.41	0.41	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
		R ²	0.55	0.35	0.56	0.35	0.44	0.35	0.59	0.55	0.59	0.57	0.60	0.54
	Test	MAE	4.86	4.97	5.01	4.79	5.01	4.81	4.99	5.00	5.01	4.94	4.98	5.07
		RMSE	6.06	6.00	6.25	5.94	6.21	5.95	6.53	6.44	6.55	6.39	6.50	6.61
		MAPE	0.80	0.85	0.83	0.79	0.84	0.79	0.34	0.32	0.34	0.32	0.34	0.32
		R ²	-0.02	0.01	-0.08	0.03	-0.07	0.02	0.44	0.46	0.44	0.47	0.45	0.43

^aFor the BRICKELL line, a MAPE value of ' ∞ ' indicates that the data contain zero occupancy, as shown by Eq. 4, where MAPE tends to infinity when $Y_i = 0$. ^b'MULT' indicates that each cluster shares multiple devices, with the number equaling the size of the cluster divided by the average number of probe requests sent by a smartphone, whereas 'SNGL' signifies that each cluster is unique to one device.




Figure 8. Input data of deep learning models

outperforms XGB. However, on the BRICKELL line with kernel FCM, XGB is better. Overall, RF is more effective for its robustness across varying conditions.

In summary, machine learning algorithms demonstrate commendable performance. Despite testing various methods, the “no clustering” and “no fuzzy” scenario consistently outperforms others. Therefore, we focus on this approach in the next section. Since vehicle occupancy data is a time series, incorporating historical data might improve performance. We then test deep learning models using data from the previous t minutes (see Figure 8). For real-time occupancy estimation, probe requests collected over a minute are aggregated into features. These features, along with those from the previous t minutes, are used to estimate occupancy for that minute.

5.4.3. Performance of deep learning algorithms

We tested two deep learning frameworks, CRNN and CDBLSTM. The results are presented in Table 5.

In contrast to machine learning methods, deep learning models show significant performance improvements. The CDBLSTM model performs best on the OMNI line with a time lag of $t = 10$, and on the BRICKELL line with $t = 8$. Similarly, the CRNN model performs best with $t = 6$ on the OMNI line and $t = 9$ on the BRICKELL line. While CRNN outperforms CDBLSTM on the OMNI line, the reverse is true for the BRICKELL line. This discrepancy may stem from various factors, including line-specific attributes, and challenges in model training such as overfitting or underfitting. Overall, deep learning models outperform machine learning approaches, primarily due to their ability to leverage historical data and advanced neural network capabilities.


Table 5. Evaluation of occupancy estimation using deep learning

		OMNI		BRICKELL		
		CDBLSTM	CRNN	CDBLSTM	CRNN	
$t = 5$	Training	MAE	4.12	3.19	4.23	3.72
		RMSE	6.19	4.95	5.81	5.08
		MAPE	0.30	0.21	^a ∞	∞
		R ²	0.60	0.74	0.61	0.71
	Test	MAE	4.57	3.81	3.93	4.16
		RMSE	5.82	4.82	5.21	5.33
		MAPE	0.67	0.54	0.28	0.29
		R ²	0.07	0.36	0.65	0.63
$t = 6$	Training	MAE	4.41	3.60	4.18	2.62
		RMSE	6.57	5.57	5.60	3.67
		MAPE	0.30	0.26	∞	∞
		R ²	0.55	0.67	0.64	0.85
	Test	MAE	3.98	3.55	3.97	4.54
		RMSE	5.17	4.48	5.19	5.78
		MAPE	0.57	0.54	0.28	0.30
		R ²	0.27	0.45	0.65	0.57
$t = 7$	Training	MAE	2.93	2.73	4.40	3.10
		RMSE	3.93	4.17	5.90	4.15
		MAPE	0.19	0.19	∞	∞
		R ²	0.84	0.82	0.60	0.80
	Test	MAE	4.44	3.86	4.00	4.62
		RMSE	5.50	4.96	5.15	6.12
		MAPE	0.61	0.52	0.30	0.32
		R ²	0.17	0.33	0.66	0.52
$t = 8$	Training	MAE	3.94	2.93	4.54	2.76
		RMSE	5.87	4.59	6.00	3.77
		MAPE	0.31	0.22	∞	∞
		R ²	0.64	0.78	0.59	0.84
	Test	MAE	4.88	3.83	3.90	4.24
		RMSE	5.91	4.94	5.19	5.81
		MAPE	0.72	0.57	0.30	0.28
		R ²	0.05	0.33	0.65	0.56
$t = 9$	Training	MAE	3.35	2.19	3.88	2.60
		RMSE	5.02	3.32	5.24	3.53
		MAPE	0.25	0.16	∞	∞
		R ²	0.74	0.88	0.69	0.86
	Test	MAE	4.02	3.98	3.98	4.05
		RMSE	4.83	5.03	5.33	5.60
		MAPE	0.62	0.52	0.28	0.27
		R ²	0.36	0.31	0.63	0.59
$t = 10$	Training	MAE	3.55	2.69	4.50	2.42
		RMSE	5.27	4.38	5.91	3.29
		MAPE	0.25	0.19	∞	∞
		R ²	0.71	0.80	0.60	0.88
	Test	MAE	3.77	3.93	3.94	4.24
		RMSE	4.58	4.90	5.12	5.70
		MAPE	0.56	0.56	0.30	0.30
		R ²	0.43	0.35	0.66	0.58
$t = 11$	Training	MAE	3.84	2.67	4.25	2.00
		RMSE	5.74	3.95	5.86	2.70
		MAPE	0.26	0.18	∞	∞
		R ²	0.66	0.84	0.61	0.92
	Test	MAE	4.33	3.71	4.07	4.50
		RMSE	5.17	4.62	5.35	5.93
		MAPE	0.63	0.51	0.27	0.29
		R ²	0.28	0.42	0.63	0.55

^aFor the BRICKELL line, a MAPE value of ' ∞ ' indicates that the data contain zero occupancy, as shown by Eq. 4, where MAPE tends to infinity when $Y_i = 0$.

Table 6. Summary of performance on test data using different models

	OMNI				BRICKELL			
	RF	XGB	CDBLSTM	CRNN	RF	XGB	CDBLSTM	CRNN
MAE	4.42	4.54	3.77	3.55	4.43	4.45	3.90	4.05
RMSE	5.43	5.44	4.58	4.48	5.83	5.81	5.19	5.60
MAPE	0.74	0.76	0.56	0.54	0.29	0.29	0.30	0.27
R ²	0.19	0.18	0.43	0.45	0.56	0.56	0.65	0.59

**Figure 9.** Figure depicting the best model performance (CRNN, $t = 6$) on a subset of the OMNI line data

5.5. Discussion

Table 6 summarizes the performance of different prediction models on the test data, reaffirming that deep learning models consistently outperform machine learning models.

For additional validation of deep learning models, we plot a subset of the estimation performance of the best model, CRNN with $t = 6$ for the OMNI line, as depicted in Figure 9. The figure showcases the model’s ability to accurately predict occupancy trends, validating the use of deep learning for occupancy estimation.

Figure 10 outlines the key procedures that lead to superior performance. “No clustering” and “no fuzzy” yield the best results compared to various approaches. Additionally, deep learning outperforms machine learning in the task.

While our performance metrics, such as MAE and RMSE, may not match those reported in other studies (Oransirikul and Takada, 2019; Pronello et al., 2024; Pu et al., 2020), it is due to our data having a larger maximum occupancy. Drawing inspiration from Fabre et al. (2024a), we normalize these metrics as follows:

$$\text{NMAE} = \frac{\text{MAE}}{\max_i Y_i} \times 100\%, \quad (5)$$

$$\text{NRMSE} = \frac{\text{RMSE}}{\max_i Y_i} \times 100\%. \quad (6)$$




Figure 10. Flowchart depicting experimental results

Table 7. Comparison of performance with other studies

	Max Occupancy	Randomized MAC	Reported Value		Normed Value	
			MAE	RMSE	NMAE	NRMSE
Oransirikul and Takada (2019)	30	✗	4.16	5.89	13.87%	19.63%
Pu et al. (2020)	40	✗	2.08	3.82	5.20%	9.56%
Our results	64	✓	3.55	4.48	5.55%	7.00%

Table 7 shows that our normed metrics match those of other studies. It is also important to note that we are addressing unique challenges and sources of error, including:

- Inaccurate ground truth data: The data collection accuracy becomes unreliable with increasing passenger volumes, and vehicles passing two stations within a minute cause errors and data loss during the data aggregation process.
- MAC address randomization: Currently, there is no reliable, up-to-date method to physically de-randomize MAC addresses. Therefore, we utilize alternative features for occupancy prediction, such as the number of bursts.
- Difficulty in distinguishing passenger data: Lab-controlled experiments may separate non-passenger data, but real-world complex systems like AGT introduce more data and noise, complicating the task. Fuzzy clustering is not effective here.

5.6. Application for other regions

Wi-Fi-based vehicle occupancy estimation can be easily extended to other regions. First, the Wi-Fi sniffer must be installed in the vehicle. Then, the transit agency should collect enough Wi-Fi data and corresponding ground truth occupancy data to train the deep learning model. Once trained, the system can estimate real-time occupancy.

6. Conclusion

This study represents an innovative endeavor in leveraging Wi-Fi probe requests to estimate vehicle occupancy in AGT systems. We developed a comprehensive framework, from data collection to prediction models. We tested different approaches in a pilot study on the Miami-Dade Metromover system. Two key findings emerged: first, there are no reliable methods to deal with randomized MAC addresses or to separate passenger data from non-passengers; second, deep learning models significantly outperform machine learning models. Our results match existing literature in normed metrics like NMAE and NRMSE despite being based on a significantly larger sample dataset. Our results prove the validity of occupancy estimation using Wi-Fi in complex settings even with MAC address randomization. This study offers valuable insights for transit agencies, supporting decision-making and improving service quality.

Despite the promising results, the complexities of real-world scenarios necessitate further research into new feature extraction methods. Additionally, refining and exploring deep learning models could further enhance model accuracy. Incorporating real-time GPS data might further improve estimation performance (Pu et al., 2020). This aspect was not covered in the current study but will be considered in future research.

Disclosure of interest

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

References

- Ankerst, Mihael, Markus M Breunig, Hans-Peter Kriegel, and Jörg Sander. 1999. “OPTICS: Ordering points to identify the clustering structure.” *ACM Sigmod record* 28 (2): 49–60.
- Bravenec, Tomáš, Joaquín Torres-Sospedra, Michael Gould, and Tomas Fryza. 2023. “UJI probes: Dataset of Wi-Fi probe requests.” In *2023 13th International Conference on Indoor Positioning and Indoor Navigation (IPIN)*, 1–6. IEEE.
- Brik, Vladimir, Suman Banerjee, Marco Gruteser, and Sangho Oh. 2008. “Wireless device identification with radiometric signatures.” In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on Mobile computing and networking*, 116–127.
- Chang, Wenbo, Baoqi Huang, Bing Jia, Wuyungerile Li, and Gang Xu. 2023. “Online public transit ridership monitoring through passive WiFi sensing.” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*.
- Chen, Zhenghua, Chaoyang Jiang, Mustafa K Masood, Yeng Chai Soh, Min Wu, and Xiaoli Li. 2020. “Deep learning for building occupancy estimation using environmental sensors.” *Deep Learning: Algorithms and Applications* 335–357.
- Chon, Yohan, Suyeon Kim, Seungwoo Lee, Dongwon Kim, Yungeun Kim, and Hojung Cha. 2014. “Sensing WiFi packets in the air: Practicality and implications in urban mobility monitoring.” In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing*, 189–200.
- Dave, Rajesh N. 1993. “Robust fuzzy clustering algorithms.” In *[Proceedings 1993] Second IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems*, 1281–1286. IEEE.
- Delzanno, Giorgio, Luca Caputo, Daniele D’Agostino, Daniele Grosso, Abdul Hannan Mustajab, Luca Bixio, and Matteo Rulli. 2023. “Automatic passenger counting on the edge via unsupervised clustering.” *Sensors* 23 (11): 5210.
- Dunlap, Matthew, Zhibin Li, Kristian Henrickson, and Yin Hai Wang. 2016. “Estimation of origin and destination information from Bluetooth and Wi-Fi sensing for transit.” *Transportation Research Record* 2595 (1): 11–17.
- Ester, Martin, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, and Xiaowei Xu. 1996. “A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise.” In *kdd*, Vol. 96, 226–231.
- Fabre, Léa, Caroline Bayart, Patrick Bonnel, and Nicolas Mony. 2023. “The potential of Wi-Fi data to estimate bus passenger mobility.” *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 192: 122509.
- Fabre, Léa, Caroline Bayart, Patrick Bonnel, and Nicolas Mony. 2024a. “Estimating bus passenger mobility with Wi-Fi data and clustering.” *Transportation Research Procedia* 76: 445–457.
- Fabre, Léa, Caroline Bayart, Yacouba Kone, Ouassim Manout, and Patrick Bonnel. 2024b. “A Machine Learning Approach to Estimate Public Transport Ridership Using Wi-Fi Data.” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*.
- Fenske, Ellis, Dane Brown, Jeremy Martin, Travis Mayberry, Peter Ryan, and Erik C Rye.

2021. “Three Years Later: A study of MAC address randomization in mobile devices and when it succeeds.” *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies* 2021 (3): 164–181.
- Franklin, Jason, Damon McCoy, Parisa Tabriz, Vicentiu Neagoie, J Van Randwyk, and Douglas Sicker. 2006. “Passive data link layer 802.11 wireless device driver fingerprinting.” In *USENIX Security Symposium*, Vol. 3, 16–89.
- Freudiger, Julien. 2015. “How talkative is your mobile device? An experimental study of Wi-Fi probe requests.” In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM Conference on Security & Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks*, 1–6.
- Gao, Yuhan, and Jan-Dirk Schmöcker. 2024. “Inferring travel patterns and the attractiveness of touristic areas based on fusing Wi-Fi sensing data and GPS traces with a Kyoto Case study.” *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 160: 104531.
- IEEE Computer Society LAN/MAN Standards Committee. 2007. “IEEE Standard for Information technology-Telecommunications and information exchange between systems-Local and metropolitan area networks-Specific requirements Part 11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications.” *IEEE Std 802.11* .
- Kostakos, Vassilis, Tiago Camacho, and Claudio Mantero. 2010. “Wireless detection of end-to-end passenger trips on public transport buses.” In *13th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 1795–1800. IEEE.
- Kumar, Abhishek, and Mathieu Cunche. 2024. “Characterizing probe request bursts to efficiently count Wi-Fi devices with randomized MACs.” In *2024 European Conference on Networks and Communications & 6G Summit-Special Sessions*, .
- Lesani, Asad, and Luis Miranda-Moreno. 2018. “Development and testing of a real-time Wi-Fi/bluetooth system for pedestrian network monitoring, classification, and data extrapolation.” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 20 (4): 1484–1496.
- Longo, Edoardo, Alessandro EC Redondi, and Matteo Cesana. 2019. “Accurate occupancy estimation with Wi-Fi and bluetooth/BLE packet capture.” *Computer Networks* 163: 106876.
- Martin, Jeremy, Travis Mayberry, Collin Donahue, Lucas Foppe, Lamont Brown, Chadwick Riggins, Erik C Rye, and Dane Brown. 2017. “A study of MAC address randomization in mobile devices and when it fails.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.02874* .
- Matte, Célestin, Mathieu Cunche, Franck Rousseau, and Mathy Vanhoef. 2016. “Defeating MAC address randomization through timing attacks.” In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Conference on Security & Privacy in Wireless and Mobile Networks*, 15–20.
- Mehmood, Ubaid, Irene Moser, Prem Prakash Jayaraman, and Abhik Banerjee. 2019. “Occupancy estimation using Wi-Fi: A case study for counting passengers on busses.” In *2019 IEEE 5th World Forum on Internet of Things (WF-IoT)*, 165–170. IEEE.
- Mikkelsen, Lars, Radoslav Buchakchiev, Tatiana Madsen, and Hans Peter Schwefel. 2016. “Public transport occupancy estimation using WLAN probing.” In *2016 8th International Workshop on Resilient Networks Design and Modeling (RNDM)*, 302–308. IEEE.
- Mishalani, Rabi G, Mark R McCord, and Ted Reinhold. 2016. “Use of mobile device wireless signals to determine transit route-level passenger origin–destination flows: Methodology and empirical evaluation.” *Transportation Research Record* 2544 (1): 123–130.
- Newell, Darren Franklin. 2023. “A review of methods for estimating population density in public spaces using Wi-Fi probe requests despite MAC randomization.” PhD diss., San Francisco State University.
- Nitti, Michele, Francesca Pinna, Lucia Pintor, Virginia Pilloni, and Benedetto Barabino. 2020. “iABACUS: A Wi-Fi-based automatic bus passenger counting system.” *Energies* 13 (6): 1446.
- Oransirikul, Thongtat, Ian Piumarta, and Hideyuki Takada. 2019. “Classifying passenger and non-passenger signals in public transportation by analysing mobile device Wi-Fi activity.” *Journal of Information Processing* 27: 25–32.
- Oransirikul, Thongtat, and Hideyuki Takada. 2019. “The practicability of predicting the number of bus passengers by monitoring wi-fi signal from mobile devices with the polynomial regression.” In *Adjunct Proceedings of the 2019 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing and Proceedings of the 2019 ACM International Sym-*

- posium on Wearable Computers*, 781–787.
- Ozbay, Kaan, Neveen Shlayan, and Hani Nassif. 2017. “Real-time estimation of transit OD patterns and delays using low cost-ubiquitous advanced technologies.” <https://rosap.ntl.bts.gov/view/dot/32343>.
- Pastor, George J. 1988. “The case for automated-guideway transit.” *Light Rail Transit* 79.
- Pew Research Center. 2024. “Mobile Fact Sheet.” <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/fact-sheet/mobile/>.
- Pronello, Cristina, Deepan Anbarasan, Felipe Spoturno, and Giulia Terzolo. 2024. “A low-cost automatic people-counting system at bus stops using Wi-Fi probe requests and deep learning.” *Public Transport* 1–30.
- Pu, Ziyuan, Meixin Zhu, Wenxiang Li, Zhiyong Cui, Xiaoyu Guo, and Yin Hai Wang. 2020. “Monitoring public transit ridership flow by passively sensing Wi-Fi and Bluetooth mobile devices.” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 8 (1): 474–486.
- Rakebrandt, Andreas. 2007. “Transit tracking: automatic passenger counting systems and tracking ridership.” *Mass Transit* 33 (1).
- Ryu, Seunghan, Byungkyu Brian Park, and Samy El-Tawab. 2020. “WiFi sensing system for monitoring public transportation ridership: A case study.” *KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering* 24 (10): 3092–3104.
- Schauer, Lorenz, Martin Werner, and Philipp Marcus. 2014. “Estimating crowd densities and pedestrian flows using Wi-Fi and Bluetooth.” In *11th International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Systems: Computing, Networking and Services*, November, 171–177. ICST.
- Sun, Yanshuo, and Paul M Schonfeld. 2016. “Schedule-based rail transit path-choice estimation using automatic fare collection data.” *Journal of Transportation Engineering* 142 (1): 04015037.
- Tan, Jiajie, and S-H Gary Chan. 2021. “Efficient association of Wi-Fi probe requests under MAC address randomization.” In *IEEE INFOCOM 2021-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, 1–10. IEEE.
- Uras, Marco, Raimondo Cossu, Enrico Ferrara, Ovidiu Bagdasar, Antonio Liotta, and Luigi Atzori. 2020. “WiFi probes sniffing: an artificial intelligence based approach for mac addresses de-randomization.” In *2020 IEEE 25th International Workshop on Computer Aided Modeling and Design of Communication Links and Networks (CAMAD)*, 1–6. IEEE.
- Wu, Zhongdong, Weixin Xie, and Jianping Yu. 2003. “Fuzzy c-means clustering algorithm based on kernel method.” In *Proceedings Fifth International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Multimedia Applications. ICCIMA 2003*, 49–54. IEEE.
- Zhang, Jinlei, Feng Chen, Zhiyong Cui, Yin Hai Guo, and Yadi Zhu. 2020. “Deep learning architecture for short-term passenger flow forecasting in urban rail transit.” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 22 (11): 7004–7014.