

# QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

FOR

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS  
FEASIBILITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
STUDY CONSULTANT  
FOR MARITIME INNOVATION TERMINAL  
October 28, 2025

1. What is the timeframe for the feasibility study?

**Answer: 6 months or less**

2. What is the desired completion date and presentation date?

**Answer: Draft Completion: May 15, 2026; Presentation: June 15, 2026**

3. **Standard Terms and Negotiation Process**

Does the Port Authority have a standard professional services agreement, including terms and conditions, that can be shared with proposers? If so, will negotiation of those terms be permitted with the selected consultant prior to final execution?

**Answer: Proposers should submit a proposed agreement. The Port Authority will negotiate final terms with the selected consultant.**

4. **Funding Source and Status**

What is the anticipated funding source for this feasibility study and subsequent implementation phases? If federal or state funds are involved, have grant agreements been executed and funds obligated?

**Answer: Funding for the consultant services will come from a State of Michigan grant that has been executed and obligated.**

5. **Artificial Intelligence**

Does the Port Authority have any restrictions or policies regarding the use of Artificial Intelligence or related digital tools by its service providers?

**Answer: No. However, future policies could affect the use of Artificial Intelligence.**

6. **Existing Studies, Plans, and Initiatives**

Are there existing or concurrent Port Authority initiatives, studies, policies, or planning efforts—such as infrastructure assessments, master plans, or innovation partnerships—that should be reviewed to inform this study?

**Answer: Yes, but not required prior to selection. The Port Authority's Decarbonization and Air Quality Improvement Plan (see: [www.portdetroit.com/decarbonization-plan](http://www.portdetroit.com/decarbonization-plan)), and the Port**

**Authority's Clean Ports Planning Grant – Hydrogen and PowerBarge research projects (see attached) will be relevant related initiatives.**

**7. Stakeholder and Governance Engagement**

Can the Port Authority elaborate on the key stakeholder groups expected to participate in the study—such as City or County officials, its Board, state agencies, research institutions, community organizations, or industry partners? Will the Port facilitate introductions or convene an advisory committee?

**Answer: The Port Authority will look to the Consultant to recommend relevant stakeholders for the study. That said, the Port Authority regularly engages with City, County and State transportation, economic development and environmental entities regarding its initiatives. It also has existing EPA Clean Ports grant relationships with the University of Michigan, the American Bureau of Shipping, Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision, and Michigan Clean Cities regarding initiatives relevant to the scope of the consulting project.**

**8. Integration with Academic and Innovation Partners**

Since the RFQ references collaboration among industry, academia, and government, does the Port Authority already have established partnerships with regional universities or research institutions that should be engaged in this process?

**Answer: In addition to the grant/contract with the University of Michigan, the Port Authority participates regularly in regional planning works with the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments, and port electrification and decarbonization research with the national laboratories and multiple maritime groups.**

**9. Site Scope and Parameters**

Can the Port Authority clarify whether there are pre-identified candidate sites within the Port of Detroit for evaluation, or should the consultant propose a range of potential sites based on suitability criteria (e.g., water depth, access, infrastructure readiness)? Are there existing terminal facilities or parcels—publicly or privately owned—that should be included in the assessment?

**Answer: A proposed site is under review. However, alternative sites have been identified and will be evaluated as part of the assessment. The selected consultant should also plan to recommend other sites that may be more advantageous.**

**10. Infrastructure and Access Constraints**

Will the Port Authority provide existing geotechnical, environmental, utilities, or infrastructure data (e.g., water, power, rail, and road access) for potential sites? Are there known navigation, dredging, or shoreline permitting constraints that could affect potential terminal site locations or future water-access improvements?

**Answer: Yes, the Port Authority has preliminary environmental data and is working to perform additional investigations on the proposed site. Permitting constraints will be discussed after selection and during contract negotiations.**

**11. Coordination with Other Agencies**

Should the consultant assume coordination with other local, state, or federal agencies (e.g., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, City of Detroit, MDOT) as part of the site evaluation process, or will the Port Authority serve as the primary liaison?

**Answer: Yes. The Port Authority will facilitate introductions with other agencies.**

**12. Cruise and Passenger Vessel Activity**

Given the Port of Detroit's growing role in the Great Lakes cruise network, is the Port Authority seeking to integrate passenger vessel or tourism-related opportunities into this project, or should the scope remain focused on research, technology, and logistics functions?

**Answer: The Port Authority does not anticipate cruise or tourism-related opportunities with this project. However, it would be open to discussing any advisable opportunities.**

**13. Labor and Workforce Considerations**

Should the consultant account for union participation, prevailing wage requirements, or other workforce considerations as part of the feasibility analysis or future implementation planning?

**Answer: With respect to the implementation of capital improvements, the Port Authority anticipates union and prevailing wage requirements. The Port Authority does not anticipate any trade union work for the research and operations at the site.**

**14. Future Use and Implementation Considerations**

Is the Port Authority seeking conceptual layouts focused solely on maritime innovation activities, or should site concepts also accommodate potential co-located uses such as logistics, workforce training, or research partnerships?

**Answer: The scope of the innovation terminal is at an early stage of development. Other potential activities are open for evaluation, though maritime, logistics, alternative fuels are the leading initiatives. After selection, the Port Authority will negotiate the specific layouts and site amenities to be considered.**

**15. Level of Analytical Depth and Deliverables**

Given the breadth of the listed sub-scopes (market analysis, site evaluation, economic impact, and governance strategy), can the Port Authority clarify the expected level of detail for each? Specifically, should the consultant assume a high-level feasibility and screening study, or a more comprehensive, data-driven analysis involving stakeholder engagement, market modeling, and concept development?

**Answer: These details will be negotiated after selection.**

**Respectfully,**  
**Mark Schrupp**  
Executive Director  
Detroit/Wayne County Port Authority

130 E. Atwater St., Detroit, MI 48226  
**mschrupp@portdetroit.com**