Port Detroit

Innovation Terminal Feasibility Study

Task 4 Governance, Funding, and Implementation (FINAL)

September 18, 2026

RAMBOLL

Bright ideas.
Sustainable change.

Executive Summary

Funding and governance decisions are closely interlinked as federal and state programs require a named applicant with demonstrated site control and authority to operate. Making final governance decisions will enable the Innovation Terminal to build and execute its funding strategy.

Governance

- A draft memorandum of understanding sets out potential roles for different parties, but ultimate structure and decision have not been confirmed. No partner commitments or operating decisions are settled.
- The drafted governance framework and a non-profit operator are worth considering as viable structures based on comparable facilities elsewhere.

Actions

- Review potential lease terms and outstanding Port obligations/agreements
- Decide the operating model
- Resolve the outstanding legal questions

Funding

- No single grant can fund the entire Terminal. The concept needs to be split into packages matched to individual programs.
- A few programs are open now and others return next year, so timing differs by package.
- Every program requires a non-federal match, which makes private and philanthropic support essential.

Actions

- Confirm the Phase 1 scope
- Define the fundable packages
- Assess private and philanthropic commitments

Develop the operating economics and financial model to bridge governance and funding once both are settled.

The Port's objective is that the Terminal covers its operating cost without ongoing public subsidy, but no revenue target has been set. Further financial modeling would establish what the Terminal must earn, who would pay it, and what each governance option costs to run.

Funding and Implementation

Summary of funding options*

- Available funding will not cover the Innovation Terminal in full, but it can cover individual elements where these align with a program's stated objectives. Combining federal with state, private and philanthropic sources is therefore key, both to proving eligibility for federal grants and to funding the Terminal as a whole.
- Port Detroit can separate the Terminal into fundable packages, e,g., freight and site infrastructure, zero-emission equipment, maritime demonstration activities, and match each to the objective, applicant, partners, evidence and governance structure the relevant program requires.
- Philanthropic and industry participation is critical, both as match and as evidence of demand.
- Most federal rounds for FY2026 have closed, with the exception of FHWA PROTECT. Outside of this program, the next 12 months can be utilized for building evidence and match for applications rather than applying for funding.

Type	Program	Program objective	What it could fund	Scale	Status and timing
Federal	FHWA PROTECT	Strengthen weather resilience of transportation	Resilience planning, erosion protection, rehabilitation	$0.1M to $60M	Open now through October 9, 2026
	BUILD Program	Surface transportation projects of regional impact	Phase 1 quay, apron and site works; planning	$5M to $25M	FY26 closed. Annual.
	MARAD Port Infrastructure Development	Safety, efficiency and reliability of goods movement	Freight, dock, quay, apron and utility works	Large, no cap	FY26 closed. FY27 uncertain.
	EPA Clean Ports Program	Zero-emission port equipment and planning	Zero-emission equipment and charging	$24.9M awarded	No further round announced.
	EDA Public Works and Economic Adjustment	Infrastructure and jobs in distressed regions	Innovation lab, test bays, workforce programs	Moderate	Open now. Rolling, no deadline.
	Marine Highway Program	Waterborne freight that relieves road congestion	Cargo equipment tied to a vessel service	Small, to $3.8M	FY26 closed. Recurs annually.
State	MDOT Maritime and Port Facility Grant	Capital investment in Michigan ports	Phase 1 quay, apron and cargo equipment	Small, to $2.5M	$5.0M for FY26–27. Window not posted.
	Make it in Michigan Competitiveness Fund	Helps applicants meet federal match	Non-federal match on a federal award	To 50% of match	Fund exists. Balance to confirm.

+

Private, philanthropic and industry
Cost share
In-kind equipment
Demonstration partnership
Sponsored research
Program-related investment
Utility co-investment
Revenue-backed financing
Naming and sponsorship

Non-grant participation supplies the match federal and state programs require, and the evidence of demand that makes an application credible.

* This is an initial scan based on strategic fit, eligibility and realistic award size, not a definitive screening.

BUILD Grant Program

A. Program purpose

- Agency: USDOT, Office of the Secretary.
- Objective: surface transportation projects with significant local or regional impact. Port infrastructure is a named eligible category.
- Support: competitive grant, for capital or planning.
- Status: annual. FY2026 applications closed 24 February 2026; selections were expected by the end of June 2026.
- **Formerly RAISE. USDOT renamed the program for FY2026.**

B. What it can fund

- Planning and predevelopment (planning grants carry no minimum request)
- Design and engineering
- Site and horizontal infrastructure (port infrastructure is explicitly eligible, alongside road, bridge, rail and transit works)
- Buildings (only as part of an eligible surface transportation project)
- Equipment and technology, where integral to the project.

C. Potential Port Detroit eligibility

- Port Detroit applies directly: the eligible list expressly names a public authority with a transportation function, including a port authority. Could fund Phase 1 quay, apron, laydown and site works.
- **Capital requests must be at least $25M in an urban area and the maximum award is $25M. The request must read as a surface transportation project with demonstrable public benefit.**

D. How Port Detroit could pursue it

- Up to three applications are allowed, so more than one package can be advanced per round.
- A planning grant is the entry point while design is immature, no minimum applies.
- Evidence: a scored benefit-cost analysis, plus NEPA and readiness.
- Expect a wide field: the last round drew 815 bids and made 30 awards.

Fit and Competitiveness Assessment

Strategic fit	Eligibility	Funding scale	Timing
H	H	M	M

E. Fit and competitiveness — Ramboll assessment

- Fit (High): port infrastructure is a named eligible use.
- Eligibility (High): a port authority is expressly listed as eligible.
- Scale (Medium): $25M ceiling
- Timing (Medium): FY26 closed in February; reauthorization pending.

Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP)

A. Program purpose

- Agency: USDOT Maritime Administration (MARAD).
- Objective: improve the safety, efficiency or reliability of goods movement into, out of, around or within a port.
- Support: competitive, reimbursable grant.
- Status: annual. FY2026 closed 1 June 2026 with $488.6M available; awards not yet announced.
- **IIJA funded PIDP for 2022–26 only. An FY2027 round depends on new appropriations.**

B. What it can fund

- Planning and predevelopment, via planning grants.
- Design and engineering
- Site and horizontal infrastructure (quay, apron, road, rail, utilities).
- Buildings (only if port-freight related)
- Equipment and technology (terminal and cargo-handling equipment; vessels excluded)

C. Potential Port Detroit eligibility

- **The Innovation Terminal is not the fundable asset. Application must be framed as freight infrastructure with a goods-movement benefit.**
- Fits the Task 2 Phase 1 base case: new 500–525 ft quay, apron and crane zones, laydown and retrofit areas, truck access and utility corridors.
- Port Detroit applies directly and must certify authority to plan, build, own, operate and maintain. Operators join only as joint applicants.

D. How Port Detroit could pursue it

- Match: 80% federal cap.
- Evidence: USDOT benefit-cost analysis, 30% design, NEPA path, site control.
- Next: advance design and confirm MARAD’s FY2027 intentions.

Fit and Competitiveness Assessment

Strategic fit	Eligibility	Funding scale	Timing
M	H	H	L

E. Fit and competitiveness — Ramboll assessment

- Strategic Fit (Medium): Phase 1 quay, apron and utilities are exactly what PIDP funds. However, application has to include good movement benefit.
- Eligibility (High): a named applicant that would own and operate the asset.
- Scale (High): $488.6M available in FY2026, no maximum award.
- Timing (Low): FY26 closed; the IIJA authorization ends with FY2026.

EPA Clean Ports Program

A. Program purpose

- Agency: US EPA, funded by the Inflation Reduction Act.
- Objective: zero-emission port equipment and infrastructure, plus climate and air-quality planning.
- Support: grant, in two competitions — technology deployment and planning.
- Status: one-time. The $3 billion was a single tranche; both competitions closed 28 May 2024 and selections were announced in October 2024.
- Not rescinded — 51 projects worth about $2.93 billion were active at 17 August 2026. Any further round needs new budget authority.

B. What it can fund

- Planning and predevelopment (emissions inventories, workforce and resilience planning)
- Design and engineering only as support within a funded technology project.
- Site infrastructure only where it serves zero-emission equipment (charging, hydrogen fueling, shore power, supporting electrical works)
- Equipment : zero-emission cargo-handling equipment, harbor craft, railcar movers, battery storage, and solar or wind that powers them.
- Workforce as deployment support.

C. Potential Port Detroit eligibility — already established

- Port Detroit is a current recipient: $21.9M for cargo-handling equipment, vessels, railcar movers, charging and solar, plus $3.0M for an emissions roadmap, workforce plan and engagement.
- **The open question is whether any awarded equipment can be sited at the Innovation Terminal within the approved description.**

D. How Port Detroit could pursue it

- The funding could be used as an implementation resource, if considered in scope of the grant.

Fit and Competitiveness Assessment

Strategic fit	Eligibility	Funding scale	Timing
M	H	M	L

E. Fit and competitiveness — Ramboll assessment

- Fit (Medium): funds equipment and charging, not the quay, lab and site works.
- Eligibility (High): two active awards already held.
- Scale (Medium): $24.9M, but committed to a defined scope.
- Timing (Low): one-time, closed, no further round announced.

EDA Public Works and Economic Adjustment Assistance

A. Program purpose

- Agency: US Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce.
- Objective: infrastructure and economic-development investment in distressed regions that attracts industry, private investment and long-term jobs.
- Support: grants and cooperative agreements.
- Status: A standing notice takes applications on a rolling basis with no deadline. No separate FY2026 notice was issued; the standing notice was amended in May 2026.

B. What it can fund

- Planning and predevelopment, including market and industry analysis.
- Design and engineering as its own application type.
- Site infrastructure (land, utilities, brownfield, broadband).
- **Buildings — yes, the key strength: incubators, commercialization centers, wet labs, multi-tenant manufacturing. EDA names port and harbor facilities as an example.**
- Equipment,, where project-related.
- Workforce and research under sector-partnership rules.

C. Potential Port Detroit eligibility

- Port Detroit would apply directly as a special-purpose unit of local government. Could fund the lab, workshops, test bays and associated programs.
- **Three threshold tests are required: regional economic distress based on third-party data, conformance with the regional strategy, and an EDA investment priority.**

D. How Port Detroit could pursue it

- Open a pre-application consultation with the EDA. Applications go through the EDGE portal.
- Size project /request a defensible element. Public Works averages about $1.4M, expected awards range from $0.6M to $5M.
- Match: 60% federal baseline, rising to 70–80% on documented distress.
- Partners: University of Michigan for the research case; an employer partnership for workforce.

Fit and Competitiveness Assessment

Strategic fit	Eligibility	Funding scale	Timing
H	M	M	H

E. Fit and competitiveness — Ramboll assessment

- Fit (High): funds commercialization centers
- Eligibility (Medium): distress, strategy, and priority thresholds must each be evidenced
- Scale (Medium): award could fund one building element, not the full lab.
- Timing (High): open now, rolling

Marine Highway Program

A. Program purpose

- Agency: USDOT Maritime Administration (MARAD).
- Objective: expand waterborne freight services that relieve landside congestion on designated Marine Highway Routes.
- Support: competitive, reimbursable grant.
- Status: annual. FY2026 posted 6 July and closed 31 August 2026, with $10.8M available nationally.
- Designation and grants are separate. Route designation is the prerequisite and can be requested at any time. Project designation is now optional and confers no money.
- FY2025 awards ran $0.4M to $3.8M, including $558,960 to the Port of Monroe.

B. What it can fund

- Planning and predevelopment (yes, but explicitly less competitive than construction)
- Design and engineering
- Site infrastructure (limited to landside works that serve the service; berth improvements and dredging have been funded)
- Equipment and vessels (cranes, spreaders, buckets, barges and conversions).

C. Potential Port Detroit eligibility

- The Terminal is not a fundable asset. A grant needs a defined service on a designated route, a vessel operator, and a freight-diversion case costed against truck and rail.
- Port Detroit is directly eligible as a US port authority. Fits containerized module handling equipment, mobile cranes and spreaders (not the quay, lab or site works).

D. How Port Detroit could pursue it

- Confirm with MARAD which designated route covers the terminal, and request designation if none does. Route requests can be filed at any time.
- Only build an application if aligned with relieving landside congestion and a barge, project-cargo or vessel-service partner is identified.

Fit and Competitiveness Assessment

Strategic fit	Eligibility	Funding scale	Timing
L	M	L	M

E. Fit and competitiveness — Ramboll assessment

- Fit (Low): near-term purpose of Innovation Terminal is primarily demonstration, not freight diversion.
- Eligibility (Medium): a service on a designated route is required.
- Scale (Low): $10.8M nationally; awards buy equipment, not infrastructure.
- Timing (Medium): FY26 closed, but the program recurs annually.

Additional potential federal funding sources

Additional funding sources can be utilized to support specific aspects of the Innovation Terminal as additional priorities are defined in the future

Program	Best-fit Terminal use	Key condition	Status at 1 Sep 2026
INFRA	Freight road and rail access	Needs a defined freight project	FY26 closed 1 July. Annual
Small Shipyard	Only via a shipyard partner	The Port cannot apply; the partner must	FY26 closed. None available
MARAD META	Demonstration and vessel trials	Not a standing grant; cost share expected	No open FY26 solicitation
CRISI	Phase 2 rail spur and transload	Needs a defined rail project	FY25–26 closed 22 June
Port Security	A discrete security project only — surveillance, access control, cyber	Must be primarily maritime security under the Area Maritime Security Plan	FY26 $95M, closed 24 July. Recurs annually
EPA DERA	Cargo-handling and marine engines	Fueling infrastructure excluded	Dormant since FY22–23
TIFIA and RRIF	Quay and freight-transfer works	Needs a dedicated repayment source	Rolling. Open now
Private activity bonds	Dock and wharf bonds for a privately used berth	Needs a private user or operator. The USDOT freight allocation is exhausted	Tax-code authority, not an annual round

State of Michigan funding opportunities

MDOT’s port grant is the state’s primary maritime funding source, and Port Detroit has already won it in the past. Other funding sources could support specific future needs, such as a sediment and contamination examination or a potential rail spur.

Program and what it funds	Status	Fit with the Terminal
MDOT Maritime and Port Facility Assistance Grant Capital grants to Michigan ports: quay, apron, roads, equipment, design. Up to $2.5M.	Active. $5.0M appropriated for FY2026–27; window not yet posted. Port Detroit won $1.5M in 2024.	Strongest state fit. Funds quay and site works and can match a federal port grant.
Michigan Maritime Innovation Grant Public-private maritime innovation projects. Up to $500,000, match required.	Closed. One round only ($1.5M to five projects), July 2026. No further round announced.	Closest in purpose, but unavailable. Port Detroit was a named partner.
Make it in Michigan Competitiveness Fund State money to help pay the applicant’s share of a federal grant, up to half the match.	Fund exists, but the balance and whether it is still open could not be confirmed.	Federal grants need Port Detroit to fund 20–40% itself. Could be a state route to close that gap.
EGLE Brownfield Grants and Loans Environmental assessment and cleanup. Up to $1M grant plus $1M loan per project.	Active. Applications accepted year-round.	Supports the sediment and contamination investigation Task 2 flags as a Phase 1 gap.
MDOT freight and rail programs Rail customer infrastructure such as spurs, and wider rail capacity works.	Freight program open at any time. Rail enhancement call planned for fall 2026.	Only for the Phase 2 rail spur, which Task 2 ties to confirmed intermodal demand.
Workforce and business development Employer training grants, and business attraction and redevelopment financing.	Going PRO active and recurring. MEDC capacity reduced for FY27.	Reaches the Terminal through others: employers and tenants apply, not the Port.

Private, philanthropic and industry participation

Industry and nonprofit participation is critical for demonstrating demand and utilization and matching funds for federal and other grants.

Funding mechanism	Who could provide it
Cost share	Operators, users, equipment makers, logistics firms
In-kind equipment	Component makers, suppliers, automation firms
Demonstration partnership	Shipyards, vessel builders, automation and digital firms
Sponsored research	University of Michigan, corporate research groups
Program-related investment	Great Lakes, freshwater and regional foundations
Utility co-investment	Utilities and energy providers
Revenue-backed financing	Infrastructure and green banks, federal credit, bond issuers
Naming and sponsorship	Corporate sponsors, utilities, industry bodies

Funding roadmap

Once Phase 1 of the Innovation terminal is defined and confirmed, the following steps can be taken to structure the funding approach.

Funding workstream	What it involves
1. Deep dive into the funding landscape and set a preliminary strategy	At a high level, decide with funding sources to pursue and confirm eligibility with. Sketch out which grants might work in parallel to fund different aspects of the Innovation Terminal.
2. Confirm eligibility	Test specific qualification elements different programs require (e.g., economic distress status; small-port tonnage threshold; whether a designated marine highway route covers the site, etc.)
3. Define fundable packages	Split the Terminal into discrete, defensible packages and assign each to the source that best fits it.
4. Determine the applicant, ownership, and match	Establish who applies and on what authority, then identify where the non-federal share comes from for each package.
5. Build the funding evidence base	Assemble the analysis needed to win, e.g., benefit-cost, cost estimates, and freight and emissions baselines.
6. Engage agencies and prepare applications	Open pre-application conversations, track notices, and file where a package and a source are both ready.

Governance and Operating Structure

Documented draft position: Where governance discussions stand today

A draft Memorandum of Understanding among the three principal parties sets out potential roles each would take. The draft has not been executed, and it states that questions of legal form, governance, liability and statutory authority remain open.

Party	Role set out in the draft Memorandum of Understanding
Great Lakes Water Authority	Would transfer operational control of the site, or of specific portions of it, to the Port under a long-term agreement with a minimum term of fifty years, subject to further extensions. Would continue to co-occupy the site and would receive a newly constructed warehouse for its own exclusive use.
Detroit-Wayne Port Authority	Would act as the primary operator of the site, with responsibility for daily operations, compliance and budgeting. Would also develop the site and make physical improvements, create programming, generate business opportunities, apply for grant funding and report to the other parties.
University of Michigan, Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering	Would construct a laboratory on a portion of the site set aside for its use and co-occupy other portions as needed. Would provide financial support for the initial cost of build-out, assist in attracting revenue-generating projects, and provide support for budgetary shortfalls.

The draft records that the parties will work in good faith toward a final agreement and that legislative action by all three may be required as part of the formal approval process. It also notes that the parties chose to identify roles and shared goals first, precisely because the questions of legal form, governance, liability and statutory authority are more complicated and remain unresolved. The document is a statement of intent rather than as a settled structure.

Currently confirmed constraints: four key factors shape available governance options

Four conditions limit the structures realistically available to the Port. They should be settled before a preferred model is selected, because each one rules certain options in or out.

Constraint	What it means	Effect on the choice of structure
The Port would lease the site rather than own it	The Great Lakes Water Authority holds site control of the approximately 21-acre site. The draft Memorandum of Understanding contemplates a transfer of operational control for a minimum of fifty years, and terms of up to ninety-nine years have been discussed.	Lease duration and the conditions attached to it will determine whether the Port can offer sub-leases, grant site control to an operator, or satisfy the site control requirements that federal funding programs apply.
The Master Concession agreement*	An agreement dating from the 2005 bankruptcy of the Detroit Marine Terminal is understood to limit the Port's ability to operate a conventional cargo terminal.	This constraint is one reason the innovation concept was developed. It may restrict the range of commercial activity the Port can undertake directly, which in turn affects whether an operator is required.
All three parties are public bodies	The draft Memorandum of Understanding notes that a "subject to appropriation" qualifier would ordinarily apply to each party's financial obligations. Public disclosure law, open meetings requirements and public procurement rules apply to all three.	Financial commitments between the parties may not be firm in the way a commercial counterparty would expect. Arrangements involving proprietary technology, and any development the Port undertakes on behalf of another party, will need to be structured with these requirements in mind.
The Port operates on a limited budget and seeks to avoid subsidy	The Port's annual budget is approximately $1.2 million, or approximately $1.7 million including wedding and cruise revenue. Funding has historically been shared between the State, the City and the County.	The structure selected must cover its own operating cost. This favors models that bring in an operator or anchor tenant with independent revenue, and it makes any structure that adds materially to the Port's overheads difficult to sustain.

* The agreement has not been obtained or reviewed, so the extent of the limitation cannot be confirmed.

Ramboll view: Governance and operating model options

Four potential structures are available. The draft Memorandum of Understanding already points toward the second structure, and comparable facilities elsewhere suggest the third is worth examining alongside it.

1. Port operates the terminal directly

How it would work:
The Port leases the site from the Water Authority and runs the terminal itself, with the University as a tenant.

Considerations:
Simplest to establish. It places the full operating cost and liability on an organization with an annual budget of approximately $1.2 million.

2. Three-party partnership as drafted

How it would work:
The Water Authority transfers operational control to the Port, the Port operates and develops the site, and the University builds and funds the laboratory.

Considerations:
Reflects the position the parties have already reached and gives each a defined role. The draft leaves liability, procurement and disclosure questions unresolved, and the Port carries the operating responsibility

Comparator evidence: Port of Gulfport, where the University of Southern Mississippi is anchor tenant and primary operator

Documented draft position

3. Independent non-profit operator

How it would work:
A separate non-profit entity is established to operate the terminal, hold tenant relationships and run programming, under agreement with the Port.

Considerations:
Separates operating risk from the Port and allows dedicated staffing, membership income and philanthropic funding. It requires time to establish, and the entity would need its own revenue from the outset.

Comparator evidence: AltaSea and Maritime Blue, both operating as non-profits alongside their ports

4. Concession or operating agreement with a private operator

How it would work:
The Port contracts a commercial operator to run all or part of the terminal under a concession or operating agreement.

Considerations:
Transfers operating risk and can generate rental income without Port staffing. It depends on a commercial operator being available and interested, and it would reduce the Port's control over programming.

Unresolved questions: issues for parties to resolve

These questions are drawn from the draft Memorandum of Understanding itself. Each needs an answer before a definitive agreement can be prepared, and several will influence which operating model is workable.

Question	Why it matters	Who needs to resolve it
Liability for site operation	The draft asks whether the Port can take on liability for overall operation and what coverage would look like, noting that the site sits close to the largest wastewater treatment plant in North America.	All three parties, with legal and insurance advice
Exclusive-use space and lease-back	Each party is expected to hold its own exclusive-use areas. The draft asks whether a long-term lease with lease-backs to the other parties would be used.	All three parties
Security, badging and compliance	The Water Authority is a homeland security facility and the Port is expected to be one as well. The University may have its own requirements tied to the laboratory. The draft asks who controls visitor badging, and whether that changes during construction.	All three parties, with the U.S. Coast Guard
Protection of proprietary information	Public disclosure and open meetings requirements apply to all three parties. The draft asks how proprietary information relating to new technology would be protected, particularly given the reporting expected between the parties.	All three parties, with legal advice
Procurement and construction risk	The draft asks how public procurement rules apply if the Port develops projects for the other parties, and notes the added risk of taking the developer role while operations continue.	The Port
Withdrawal and financial commitment	The draft asks how a partner would withdraw. It also notes that, as public bodies, each party's financial obligations would ordinarily be subject to appropriation.	All three parties
Position under the Master Concession Agreement	The draft notes that the more the Port appears to be in the driver seat, the less insulated it becomes under the Master Concession Agreement. This affects how far the Port can take the lead.	The Port, with legal advice

Reaching a governance decision

The steps below run in order because each depends on the one before it. The funding strategy cannot progress far without the first three, since federal and state programs require a named applicant with demonstrated site control.

Step	What it involves	What it produces	Owner
1. Review the Master Concession agreement	Obtain the 2005 agreement and the related bankruptcy documents and take legal advice on what they permit.	A clear statement of what commercial activity the Port may undertake at the site, which determines whether an operator is necessary	Port Detroit, with legal counsel
2. Confirm the lease terms available from the Water Authority	Establish the term, the conditions attached, and whether the Port may sub-lease or grant site control to an operator or tenant.	The site control evidence that funding applications require, and the boundaries within which an operating model can be designed	Port Detroit and the Water Authority
3. Select the operating model	Decide between direct Port operation, the three-party partnership as drafted, an independent non-profit operator, or a concession. The decision should follow steps 1 and 2.	A named applicant of record for funding applications, and a defined operating structure	Port Detroit Board, with the Water Authority and the University
4. Resolve the outstanding legal questions	Work through liability, exclusive-use space, security and badging, protection of proprietary information, procurement, and withdrawal, with legal advice for each party.	The basis for a definitive agreement to replace the draft Memorandum of Understanding	All three parties, with legal counsel
5. Establish the financial model	Set the annual revenue the terminal needs to cover operating cost and reserves, and identify where that revenue would come from. No target has yet been set.	Evidence that the structure is sustainable without ongoing public subsidy	Port Detroit, with the prospective operator
6. Negotiate and approve the definitive agreement	Prepare the final agreement and take it through the approval process for each party. The draft notes that legislative action by all three parties may be required.	An executed agreement, and the authority the Port needs to commit to funded projects	All three parties and their governing boards

Bright
ideas.
Sustainable
change.

RAMBOLL