



Team D7: Forever Akpabio, Emmanuel Obu, Akintayo Salu 18-500 Capstone Design, Spring 2025 **Electrical and Computer Engineering Department** Carnegie Mellon University



Product Pitch

Rid3 makes navigating while riding a bicycle easier for people. Most riders often have to ride with one hand while looking at their phone or smart watch in order to navigate their surroundings when they are riding. These methods can be dangerous and many smart watches are quite costly. Currently, audio guided GPS systems exist that can help with navigation but there is lack of support for increased awareness while riding to avoid obstacles that may appear in a riders' blindspot. We believe a device like Rid3 which provides haptic feedback through vibrations coupled with audio feedback will be beneficial for providing a safer riding experience for bicycle owners. Rid3 guides users where to go based on audio and haptic feedback and detects when obstacles are in the user's blind spots. Vibrations tell users when objects are in their blind spots. So come along and join us for the Rid3!

System Architecture

The system in broken up into two main pieces. The primary device hub holds our RPi 4, which acts as a centralized system for most of our hardware and software. The radar sensor, fan, GPS module, and battery are all attached to the RPi. We host our speech recognition, audio response, gps tracking, object detection, and navigation algorithm on our RPi. Our wristband holds the Blues Swan device which acts as a centralized system for our wristband battery, HC-05 bluetooth module, and vibration motor. Through the Vibration algorithm hosted on the swan, we use the HC--05 to receive bluetooth signals from the RPi allowing for vibration triggers.

System Description



Device attaches under bike seat with GoPro mount. User uses bluetooth headset to initiate journey by saying destination. Routes get generated using Google maps API. GPS data is being collected through GPS module, and converted to longitude and latitude for direction algorithm. Algorithm uses longitude and latitude to estimate nearest turn for direction instructions. Simultaneously the radar sensor is checking blind spots for any incoming objects. If object is detected, sends bluetooth ping to HC-05, initiating vibrating motor to trigger on the Blues swan.





System Evaluation

Destination Speech-to-Text Testing



Time to receive a vibration from when object is detected

Time to Receive Vibration

Average GPS Error Distance Testing



Sensor detection accuracy rate for different objects



35.0

Use - Case Requirements

Metric	Target	Actual
Wristband Battery Life Main Device Battery Life	≥ 5 hours ≥ 10 hours	≥ 50 hours ≤ 8 hours
Detection to Haptic Feedback Latency	≤ 1 seconds	.979 secondes
Blind Spot Detection Rate/Range	≥ 95%/ ≤ 10 ft	≥ 66%/ ≤ 34.9 ft
Distance to Receive Instructions	200-300 ft	200-350 ft
Destination Speech Recognition Accuracy	≥90%	≥73%

Conclusions & Additional Information

What Worked:

Our device offers voice-activated audio navigation for an entire journey and uses vibration alerts to notify riders of objects entering a 20-degree blind spot detection zone.

What Didn't Work:

Field of view not as large as we wanted it to be. Accuracy of blind spot detection, speech recognition, and audio feedback not as high as we wanted.

Our Blog QR

Future Improvements:

• Slack time is important

• Larger FOV for BSDS





Blind Spot Detection System:

- 50 time trials revealed average vibration response time of .979 seconds
- 50+ trials testing sensor against different objects (stationary and moving), from multiple distances, angles and speeds.
- Bikes averaged 22.2 ft detection distance with ~69% accuracy.
- Cars averaged 34.9 ft detection distance with ~84% accuracy.
- People averaged ~14.8 ft detection distance with ~89% accuracy.
- No false positives
- OPS-243 has limited FOV(20 degrees) but greater accuracy for detecting incoming objects compared to ultrasonic sensor originally used.

Navigation Algorithm:

- Tested **10 distinct journeys** (with different start and end points) with the navigation algorithm
- Manually inputted GPS coordinates that simulated a user's bike journey and checked the outputted navigation instruction as well as the distance threshold where the algorithm produces the instruction
- Used Google Maps and the coordinates to visually check whether the appropriate direction was outputted by the algorithm
- Distance threshold within where the instruction is produced: 200-350 ft from the actual turn
- Distance threshold where a new route is generated: ≥ 1200 ft from current coordinates

GPS:







• Software might work

Lessons Learned:



standalone, but is a lot



harder to integrate with

different hardware.

Testing for average GPS Error distance across 4 routes.

- Took 10 points across each route, and compared Google Maps coordinates at these points to

longitude and latitude coordinates outputted by GPS script.

- Used Haversine Formula as a means to calculate Error distance between the two coordinates.

Average GPS Error Distance across all four routes was an average of ~7.81 meters. <10

meters good for most standard GPS modules.