HSIP

Highway Safety Improvement Program

For State Fiscal Years 2030 and 2031

Scoring Guidance for Proactive and Reactive Projects

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Metro District Traffic Engineering
April 2026

SCORING GUIDANCE FOR PROACTIVE SAFETY PROJECTS:

Proactive Project Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Connection to 2025-29 MN Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP)	100	10%
2. Cost Per User Exposure	300	30%
3. Correctable Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History (10 years, 2016-2025)	100	10%
4. Expected System Risk Reduction in Fatal or Serious Injury Crashes - Crash Reduction Factor	200	20%
5. Connection to Existing Plan	200	20%
6. Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles	100	10%
Total	**1,000**	**100%**

1. Connection to 2025-29 Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) (100 Points) – The Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan provides insight and direction on how to reduce traffic-related crashes that involve motor vehicles on Minnesota's roads. The plan has 20 focus-area priorities and associated strategies identified for Minnesota. This measure rewards project applications that help to further strategies (shown as bullet points below) in this plan. The pertinent infrastructure-based focus areas and strategies include the following:

    1. Lane Departure
        - Install shoulder and centerline rumble strips
        - Install enhanced pavement markings and edge line rumble strips on roads with narrow or no paved shoulders
        - Provide buffer space between opposite travel directions
        - Provider wider shoulders, enhanced pavement markings and chevrons for high-risk curves
        - Eliminate shoulder drop-offs, provide safety edges and widen or pave shoulders

    2. Intersections
        - Use indirect left-turn treatments and access management to minimize conflicts at divided highway intersections
        - Provide dynamic warning signs to alert drivers of conflicts at stop-controlled intersections
        - Improve intersection visibility by providing enhanced signing, delineation, and lighting
        - Provide roundabouts/J-Turns/median U-Turns at appropriate locations
        - Optimize signal operations with phasing, timing, coordination, and clearance intervals
        - Supplement conventional red-light running enforcement with traffic signal confirmation lights and other technology enhancements that support enforcement efforts

    3. Inattentive Driving
        - Install edge and centerline rumble/mumble strips on at-risk rural roads to alert drivers of possible lane departure

- Install lighting at rural intersections to improve visibility of other vehicles and roadway users

4. Speed
   - Install dynamic speed feedback signs at rural/urban transitions, school zones, and work zones
   - Incorporate curbs, medians, lane-narrowing, sidewalks, and other design elements to influence traveled speeds.

5. Pedestrians
   - Strategies aimed specifically at improving safety for pedestrians

6. Bicyclists
   - Strategies aimed specifically at improving safety for bicyclists

7. Trains
   - Strategies aimed specifically at improving safety at train crossings

SCORING GUIDANCE

Projects will be awarded between 0 and 5 points based on the ability of the project to implement one or more of the strategies identified in the Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). Applicants could be awarded full points for either proposing a project that strongly advances one of the strategies found in the plan or for a project that implements multiple strategies. These strategies can be identified in related safety plans and studies such as a County/Local Safety Action Plan, SS4A plan, etc. but they need to align with those identified in the SHSP and be HSIP eligible.

Scorers will respond to the following statement:
The project implements one or more of the strategies listed in the Minnesota Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Strongly disagree: 0 points
Disagree: 1 point
Neutral: 2 points
Slightly Agree: 3 points
Agree: 4 points
Strongly agree: 5 points

2. Cost Per User Exposure (300 Points) – This criterion will assess cost effectiveness of the infrastructure being proposed. Each application for a linear project will be scored on its total million vehicle miles (MVM) while each application at an intersection will be scored on its total million entering vehicles (MEV).

LINEAR PROJECTS

- Total project cost:_____
- Project MVM: _____
- Cost effectiveness (project MVM/project cost): _____

INTERSECTION PROJECTS

- Total project cost:_____
- MEV: _____
- Cost effectiveness (project MEV/project cost): _____

SCORING GUIDANCE

The linear project application with the highest cost effectiveness will be awarded full points. Other applications will receive a proportionate share of the full points. Similarly, the intersection project with the highest cost effectiveness will be awarded full points with other applicants receiving a proportionate share. For example, if the linear application being scored was 0.089 MVM per cost and the highest-rated project was 0.110 MVM per cost, the application would receive (0.089/0.110)*300 points or 243 points.

Note: Because of the two different scales for linear and intersections, two projects will be awarded the full 300 points.

3. Correctable Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History (100 Points) – This criterion measures the history of correctable fatal and serious injury crashes from 2016 to 2025 that have occurred within the limits of the proposed project. Total correctable fatal and serious injury crashes for 2016-2025 will be tallied with each fatal crash being worth two times the number of each serious injury crash.

- Total correctable crashes = 2* Fatal crashes + Serious Injury crashes

SCORING GUIDANCE

Correctable crashes are those that the treatment being proposed is anticipated to mitigate. The applicant with the highest number of fatal and serious injury crashes will receive the full points for the measure. Other projects will receive a proportionate share of the points. For example, if the application being scored had 10 total crashes and the top application had 30 crashes, this application would receive (10/30)*100 points, or 33 points.

4. Expected System Risk Reduction in Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes – Crash Modification Factor (200 Points) – This criterion awards points based on the crash modification factor (CMF). Applicants must provide a reasonable CMF via printout from the Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse.

The score will be based on the aggregate of up to the maximum of two CMFs (see Multiple

Improvement Crash Modification Formula found on Pg 12 of the Program Criteria).

SCORING GUIDANCE

The applicant with the greatest crash reduction for the proposed improvement will be awarded full points. Other applications will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored has a CMF of 64 (36% reduction) and the highest-rated project has a CMF of 52 (48% reduction), the application would receive (36/48)*200 points or 150 points.

5. Connection to Existing Plan (200 Points) – The project or the transportation safety problem/need that the project addresses should be in a planning or programming document. Reference the name the appropriate District/County/Local Safety Action Plan, Road Safety Audit, Safe Routes to School plan, corridor study document, or other official plan or program of the applicant agency that the project is included in and/or a transportation safety problem/need that the project addresses. Studies on a trunk highway must be supported by the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Metropolitan Council. Applicants should include the applicable plan or pages or provide a link to the plan or plan excerpt.

SCORING GUIDANCE
Projects will be awarded points as follows:
200 pts – If the safety strategy being employed in the project is specifically listed or addressed in a standalone SAFETY plan such as a District/County/Local Safety Action Plan, Road Safety Audit, Road Safety Analysis, etc. For example, the plan recommends a converting a specific two-way stop intersection to a roundabout.
150 pts – If the project is generally listed or addresses a general transportation need that is included in a standalone SAFETY plan such as a District/County/Local Safety Action Plan, Road Safety Audit, Road Safety Analysis, etc. For example, the plan lists an intersection but lists a variety of countermeasures to address needs.
100 pts – If the project addresses a transportation need that is part of a safety discussion in a larger general plan such as a City Comprehensive Plan, etc. or addresses safety risk factors identified in a plan or identifies strategies that align with the Safe Systems Approach. For example, the plan lists converting two-way stops to roundabouts as a safety strategy but does not specifically call out the project location.
0 pts – the project is not included in a plan or project does not address a safety need identified in a plan.

6. Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles (100 Points) – Discuss how the project will improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. Include any information available about the location including it being identified in State/District/County/Local pedestrian or bicycle plans or being on an identified route. Any information about pedestrian or bicycle volumes should be provided, if available. Discuss potential pedestrian and bicycle generators that would impact the project area and how the project elements are addressing pedestrian and bicycle issues.

   Safety countermeasures for pedestrians can include those identified by the Safe Systems Approach or those identified by FHWA as part of the Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian program or Proven Safety Countermeasures (e.g., pedestrian refuge islands, raised crosswalks, pedestrian hybrid beacons, leading pedestrian intervals, etc.). Eligible strategies for bicycles can include those identified by the FHWA Bikeway Selection Guide. Additional information about safety countermeasures can be found in MnDOT's Best

Practices for Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety.

SCORING GUIDANCE
The project that will provide the most improvement to pedestrian safety will receive full points. Other projects will receive a portion of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

100 pts – If the project addresses significant pedestrian or bicycle needs, or is located on a pedestrian or bicycle route, or the specific location is found in a pedestrian or bicycle planning document where it is identified as a need.

50 pts – If the project addresses a pedestrian or bicycle need but the anticipated use is low, or it is not located on/near a pedestrian or bicycle route/generator.

0 pts – If the project is not included in any pedestrian or bicycle plan and does not address pedestrian or bicycle needs. Additionally, if the project addresses a vehicle traffic safety need while potentially making pedestrian or bike safety worse, or will create a barrier to pedestrian or bicycle use, it will receive no points in this category.

SCORING GUIDANCE FOR REACTIVE SAFETY PROJECTS:

Reactive Project Scoring:

Criteria and Measures	Points	% of Total Points
1. Benefit/Cost (B/C) Ratio	600	60%
2. Meets Intent of the HSIP Program	200	20%
3. Correctable Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History (10 years, 2016-2025)	100	10%
4. Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles	100	10%
Total	**1,000**	**100%**

1. Benefit/Cost Ratio (600 Points) – Only projects with a B/C ratio of 1.0 or greater can be funded. Projects with a higher B/C ratio will receive more points.

SCORING GUIDANCE:
The applicant with highest B/C ratio will receive the full points for the measure. Other projects will receive a proportionate share of the full points. For example, if the application being scored had a B/C ratio of 7.5 and the top project had a B/C ratio of 11.0, this applicant would receive (7.5/11.0)*600 points or 409 points. The scoring committee may reduce the points awarded if the methodology or data provided by the applicant is not reasonable.

2. Meets Intent of the HSIP Program (200 Points) – Projects will be scored based on their ability to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.

SCORING GUIDANCE

Projects will be awarded between 0 and 5 points based on the ability of the project to reduce fatal and serious injuries crashes. Scorers will assess the types of crashes that have occurred in the project area and the potential for the proposed solution to reduce the fatal and serious injury crash risk that has been documented.

Scorers will respond to the following statement:

The proposed project meets the intent of the HSIP program.

Strongly disagree: 0 points
Disagree: 1 point
Neutral: 2 points
Slightly Agree: 3 points
Agree: 4 points
Strongly agree: 5 points

Multiple projects can receive 5 points in this scoring measure. Points awarded (0-5) will be multiplied by 40 to get a final score out of 200 points possible.

3. Correctable Fatal and Serious Injury Crash History (100 Points) – This criterion measures the history of correctable fatal and serious injury crashes from 2016 to 2025 that have occurred within the limits of the proposed project. Total correctable fatal and serious crashes for 2016-2025 will be tallied with each fatal crash being worth two times the number of each serious injury crash.

   - Total correctable crashes = 2* "Fatal" Crashes + "Serious Injury" Crashes

SCORING GUIDANCE

Correctable crashes are those that the treatment being proposed is anticipated to mitigate. The applicant with the highest number of fatal and serious injury crashes will receive the full points for the measure. Other projects will receive a proportionate share of the points. For example, if the application being scored had 10 total fatal and serious injury crashes and the top application had 30 crashes, this application would receive (10/30)*100 points, or 33 points.

4. Improvements for People Outside of Vehicles (100 Points) – Discuss how the project will improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. Include any information available about the location including it being identified in State/District/County/Local pedestrian or bicycle plans or being on an identified route. Any information about pedestrian or bicycle volumes should be provided, if available. Discuss potential pedestrian and bicycle generators that would impact the project area and how the project elements are addressing pedestrian and

bicycle issues.

Safety countermeasures for pedestrians can include those identified by the Safe Systems Approach or those identified by FHWA as part of the Safe Transportation for Every Pedestrian program or Proven Safety Countermeasures (e.g., pedestrian refuge islands, raised crosswalks, pedestrian hybrid beacons, leading pedestrian intervals, etc.). Eligible strategies for bicycles can include those identified by the FHWA Bikeway Selection Guide. Additional information about safety countermeasures can be found in MnDOT's Best Practices for Pedestrian/Bicycle Safety.

SCORING GUIDANCE

The project that will provide the most improvement to pedestrian safety will receive full points. Other projects will receive a portion of the full points at the scorer's discretion.

100 pts – If the project addresses significant pedestrian or bicycle needs, or is located on a pedestrian or bicycle route, or the specific location is found in a pedestrian or bicycle planning document where it is identified as a need.

50 pts – If the project addresses a pedestrian or bicycle need but the anticipated use is low, or it is not located on/near a pedestrian or bicycle pedestrian or bicycle route/generator.

0 pts – If the project is not included in any pedestrian or bicycle plan and does not address pedestrian or bicycle needs. Additionally, if the project addresses a vehicle traffic safety need while potentially making pedestrian or bike safety worse, or will create a barrier to pedestrian or bicycle use, it will receive no points in this category.