

FY 2026 Notice of Funding Opportunity

Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP)

Amendment No. 4

Maritime Administration (MARAD)

U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)

A. BASIC INFORMATION 3

 1. CHANGES FROM THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2025 NOFO 4

B. ELIGIBILITY 4

 1. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS..... 4

 2. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS..... 5

 3. APPLICATION LIMIT 7

 4. COST SHARING..... 7

 5. PRE-AWARD AUTHORITY..... 8

 6. LOCATION DESIGNATIONS AND DEFINITIONS..... 8

 7. PROJECT COMPONENTS..... 9

 8. REDUCED AWARDS 10

C. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION..... 10

 1. PROGRAM HISTORY AND AUTHORIZATION 10

 2. PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES..... 11

 3. AWARD SIZE..... 11

 4. RESTRICTIONS ON FUNDING..... 11

 5. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS 12

 6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES..... 12

 7. PREVIOUS AWARDS..... 12

D. APPLICATION CONTENT AND FORMAT 12

 1. STANDARD FORM 424..... 13

 2. FY 2026 PIDP COVER PAGE..... 13

 3. PROJECT NARRATIVE 15

 a) NARRATIVE SECTION I: PROJECT DESCRIPTION..... 15

 b) NARRATIVE SECTION II: PROJECT LOCATION 16

 c) NARRATIVE SECTION III: GRANT FUNDS, SOURCES, AND USE OF FUNDS 17

 d) NARRATIVE SECTION IV: MERIT CRITERIA 18

e)	NARRATIVE SECTION V: ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS	18
f)	NARRATIVE SECTION VII: STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS.....	19
E.	SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND DEADLINE	22
1.	ADDRESS TO REQUEST APPLICATION PACKAGE	22
2.	UNIQUE ENTITY IDENTIFIER AND SYSTEM FOR AWARD MANAGEMENT	22
3.	SUBMISSION DATES AND TIMES.....	23
4.	INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW	23
5.	COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 508 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973	23
F.	APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION.....	23
1.	CRITERIA	24
2.	REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS.....	37
G.	AWARD NOTICES	38
1.	HOW PROJECT SELECTIONS ARE ANNOUNCED.....	38
2.	PRE-AWARD COSTS	38
3.	REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM	39
H.	POST-AWARD REQUIREMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION	39
1.	ADMINISTRATIVE AND NATIONAL POLICY REQUIREMENTS	39
2.	REPORTING	41
I.	FEDERAL AWARD AGENCY CONTACT(S).....	43
J.	OTHER INFORMATION.....	43
1.	PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION	43
2.	PUBLICATION AND SHARING OF APPLICATION INFORMATION	43

A. BASIC INFORMATION

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Pub. L. 117-58, November 15, 2021) (IIJA) appropriated \$450 million and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2026 (Pub. L. 119-75, February 3, 2026) (FY 2026 Appropriations Act) appropriated \$38,628,000 to be awarded as discretionary grants by the U.S. Department of Transportation Maritime Administration (MARAD) for the FY 2026 Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP.) The program is codified at 46 U.S.C. § 54301.

SUMMARY OVERVIEW OF KEY INFORMATION: Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP) Discretionary Grant Opportunity	
Topic	Description
Federal Agency Name	Maritime Administration (MARAD)
Funding Opportunity Title	FY 2026 Port Infrastructure Development Program
Announcement Type	Notice of Funding Opportunity
Funding Opportunity Number	MA-PID-26-001
Assistance Listing Number	20.823 Port Infrastructure Development Program
Funding Details	\$488,628,000 in FY 2026 PIDP funds
Key Dates	Applications due: June 26, 2026 at 11:59:59 p.m. E.D.T.
Executive Summary	PIDP assists in funding eligible projects for the purpose of improving the safety, efficiency, or reliability of the movement of goods through ports and intermodal connections to ports.
Eligible Applicants	<p>Eligible Applicants are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A State; • A political subdivision of a State, or a local government; • A public agency or publicly chartered authority established by one or more States; • A special purpose district with a transportation function; • An Indian Tribe, or a consortium of Indian Tribes; • A multistate or multijurisdictional group of entities described above; or • A lead entity described above jointly with a private entity or group of private entities, including the owners or operators of a facility, or collection of facilities at a port.

Eligible Projects	Projects within the boundary of a port, or outside the boundary of a port and directly related to port operations or to an intermodal connection to a port that improve the safety, efficiency, or reliability of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loading and unloading of goods at a port; • The movement of goods into, out of, around, or within a port; • Operational improvements at a port; • Resiliency in response to environmental factors; or • Infrastructure that supports seafood and seafood-related businesses. (NOTE: Section B.6. provides additional information.)
Questions	Email PIDPgrants@dot.gov
Agency Contact Information	PIDPgrants@dot.gov or call Aubrey Parsons at 202–366–8047

1. CHANGES FROM THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2025 NOFO

This amendment to the FY 2026 PIDP NOFO originally published on December 23, 2025 makes the following changes:

- Includes an additional \$38,628,000 in funding appropriated by the FY 2026 Appropriations Act,
- Updates rating rubrics for the statutory merit criteria,
- Includes a new priority for projects located in Qualified Opportunity Zones (26 U.S.C. § 1400Z-1), projects that incorporate innovative technology, and projects that support national multimodal freight goals,
- Removes Workforce Development as a selection consideration, and
- Projects to provide shore power at a port are no longer automatically treated as satisfying the determination that the project improves the safety, efficiency, or reliability of the movement of goods. Applicants must describe in the narrative how such projects satisfy that statutory determination.

B. ELIGIBILITY

To be selected for a PIDP grant, an applicant must be an Eligible Applicant and the project must be an Eligible Project.

1. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

An eligible applicant for a FY 2026 PIDP grant is:

- a State, a political subdivision of a State or a local government,
- a public agency or publicly chartered authority established by one or more States,
- a special purpose district with a transportation function,

- an Indian Tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. § 5304), without regard to capitalization,) or a consortium of Indian Tribes,
- a multistate or multijurisdictional group of entities described above, or
- a lead entity described above jointly with a private entity or group of private entities, including the owners or operators of a facility, or collection of facilities, at a port.

Federal agencies and individuals are not eligible applicants for the FY 2026 PIDP.

If submitting a joint application, applicants must identify in the application the eligible lead applicant as the primary point of contact. The lead applicant, who will be the primary recipient of the award and responsible for financial administration and monitoring of the project, must be an eligible lead entity described above (i.e., not a private entity). Joint applications should include a description of the roles and responsibilities of each applicant. If a joint applicant is providing some or all of the required non-Federal matching funds, a letter of funds commitment from that applicant must be provided as an attachment to the application.

The lead applicant submitting the application is presumed to administer and deliver the project. If the lead applicant intends to act as a pass-through entity for disbursing funds to a subrecipient (including a private-entity joint applicant, if applicable) who will deliver all or a portion of the project, the application must express such intention and a letter of support from the intended subrecipient must be included as an attachment to the application. Lead applicants intending to make subawards under their proposed FY 2026 PIDP project should refer to [2 CFR 200.331-333](#) on how to make subrecipient determinations and what requirements apply to pass-through entities, including ensuring subrecipient compliance with all PIDP requirements. Applicants should be aware that all contracts executed under the PIDP award that create procurement relationships must follow the procurement standards at [2 CFR 200.317-327](#), including requirements regarding competition.

To be eligible for award, eligible applicants must provide a written statement that they have the authority to plan, construct, own, operate, and maintain the grant-funded project. In the case of joint applications, at least one of the eligible applicants must demonstrate this authority. Refer to Section C.4 of this notice for restrictions on funding.

2. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

Eligible projects for FY 2026 PIDP grants shall be located either within the boundary of a port, or outside the boundary of a port and directly related to port operations or to an intermodal connection to a port. Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(3)(A), grants may be made for capital projects that will be used to improve the safety, efficiency, or reliability of:

- I. the loading and unloading of goods at the port, such as for marine terminal equipment;
- II. the movement of goods into, out of, around, or within a port, such as for highway or rail infrastructure, intermodal facilities, freight intelligent transportation systems, and digital infrastructure systems;
- III. operational improvements, including projects to improve port resilience;
- IV. environmental and emissions mitigation measures, including projects for—

- a. port electrification or electrification master planning;
 - b. harbor craft or equipment replacements or retrofits;
 - c. development of port or terminal microgrids;
 - d. provision of idling reduction infrastructure;
 - e. purchase of cargo handling equipment and related infrastructure;
 - f. worker training to support electrification technology;
 - g. installation of port bunkering facilities from ocean-going vessels for fuels;
 - h. electric vehicle charging or hydrogen refueling infrastructure for drayage and medium or heavy-duty trucks and locomotives that service the port and related grid upgrades; or
 - i. other related port activities, including charging infrastructure, electric rubber-tired gantry cranes, and anti-idling technologies; or
- V. port and port-related infrastructure that supports seafood and seafood-related businesses, including the loading and unloading of commercially harvested fish and fish products, seafood processing, cold storage, and other related infrastructure.

In accordance with 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(5)(A), if applying to use a PIDP grant to acquire digital infrastructure or a software component, applicants for large projects must comply with the requirements for ensuring cybersecurity, as further referenced in section D.3.a of this notice.

Activities eligible for funding under PIDP planning grants include those related to development phase activities—such as planning, feasibility analysis, revenue forecasting, environmental review, permitting, preliminary engineering and design work, development of master plans, and planning to address a port’s ability to withstand probable occurrence or recurrence of an emergency or major disaster—of eligible PIDP capital projects that will not result in construction with FY 2026 PIDP funding.

Under the FY 2026 PIDP, if an application includes right-of-way acquisition, the project will be considered a capital project.

This program will not fund construction, reconstruction, reconditioning, or purchase of a vessel eligible under 46 U.S.C. chapter 537, unless the Secretary determines such vessel is necessary for a project under 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(3)(A)(ii)(IV) and is not already receiving assistance under 46 U.S.C. chapter 537. In addition, this program will not fund any project within a small shipyard (as defined in 46 U.S.C. § 54101).

Improvements to Federally owned facilities are ineligible under the FY 2026 PIDP, unless they are projects investing in port facilities that are located on Tribal land and for which title or maintenance responsibility is vested in the Federal Government.

Projects to fund workforce training not related to electrification technology are ineligible.

This program will not fund the purchase or installation of fully automated cargo handling equipment remotely operated or monitored, with or without the exercise of human intervention or control, if the Secretary determines that such equipment would result in a net loss of jobs within the port or port terminal. Applicants that propose projects that include the acquisition of

eligible cargo handling equipment must indicate in their application whether the equipment is fully automated. If fully automated equipment is proposed to be acquired, the applicant must provide information demonstrating that the project will not directly result in a net loss of jobs.

3. APPLICATION LIMIT

Each eligible applicant may submit no more than one application. Unrelated project components should not be combined in one application to meet this limit. If an applicant submits multiple applications, only the last one received by MARAD will be considered.

4. COST SHARING

Cost sharing means the portion of the project's cost that is not paid by Federal funds. Cost share funds are typically stated as a percentage of the total project cost. Per 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(8), the Federal share of the total costs of an eligible PIDP project must not exceed 80 percent. The Secretary, however, may increase the Federal share of costs above 80 percent for:

- (1) a grant for a project that is located in a rural area; or
- (2) a grant awarded to a small project at a small port under 46 U.S.C. § 54301(b).

Applicants should use the following equation when determining the cost share for their project:

$$\frac{(PIDP \text{ Grant Request} + \text{Other Federal Funds})}{\text{Total Project Cost}} = \text{Federal Cost Share}$$

For the PIDP, Total Project Cost means the sum of future eligible Federal and non-Federal costs that have not yet been incurred.

Non-Federal sources include State funds originating from programs funded by State revenue, local funds originating from State or local revenue-funded programs, or private funds. If repaid from non-Federal sources, Federal credit assistance is considered non-Federal share. The application must demonstrate, such as through a commitment letter or other documentation included in the PIDP application, the sources of the non-Federal funds. Unless otherwise authorized by statute, funds used to satisfy the non-Federal cost-share requirement of a different Federal program may not be counted as the non-Federal cost share for both the FY 2026 PIDP grant award and another Federal grant program.

MARAD will not consider previously incurred costs or previously expended or encumbered funds towards the non-Federal cost-share requirement, except for awards made under 46 U.S.C. § 54301(b) (small projects at small ports). For awards made under 46 U.S.C. § 54301(b), MARAD may consider certain eligible pre-construction costs towards the non-Federal cost-share requirement if incurred after the date of application submittal but before announcement of project selection, if the costs are clearly indicated in the budget included in the application and comply with all applicable Federal requirements.

All non-Federal cost-share funds are subject to the same Federal requirements as awarded PIDP funds.

In addition to these cost share requirements, cost share will be evaluated according to the “Leveraging Federal Funding” criterion.

For each project that receives a PIDP grant award, the terms of the award will require the recipient to complete the project using at least the amount of non-Federal funding that was specified in the application. If the actual costs of the project are greater than the costs estimated in the application, the recipient will be responsible for addressing the funding shortfall by providing additional funds. If the actual costs of the project are less than the costs estimated in the application, MARAD will generally reduce the Federal contribution to ensure the recipient maintains the level of non-Federal funding stated in the application.

5. PRE-AWARD AUTHORITY

Consistent with the provisions in 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(10)(B) and 2 CFR 200.458, unless “pre-award costs” are authorized by MARAD in writing after MARAD’s announcement of FY 2026 PIDP awards or a Small Project at a Small Port applicant has included pre-award costs in the application budget, consistent with Section B.3 above, any costs incurred prior to MARAD’s obligation of funds for a project are ineligible for reimbursement and are ineligible to count as match for cost share requirements.¹

6. LOCATION DESIGNATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

Coastal seaport: A port on navigable waters of the United States or territories that is subject to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regulatory jurisdiction for oceanic and coastal waters under 33 CFR 329.12 or that is otherwise capable of receiving oceangoing vessels with a draft of at least 20 feet (other than a Great Lakes port).

Development phase activities: Includes planning, feasibility analysis, revenue forecasting, environmental review, permitting, and preliminary engineering and design work.

Great Lakes port: A port on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as defined under 33 CFR 83.03(o).

Large project: A project at a port other than a Small Port, regardless of the amount of PIDP funding sought in the application; or a project at a Small Port for which the amount of PIDP funding sought in the application is greater than \$11.25 million.

Port: The term “port” includes— (i) any port on the navigable waters of the United States; and (ii) any harbor, marine terminal, or other shore side facility used principally for the movement of goods on inland waters (including the Great Lakes).

Port resilience: The ability to anticipate, prepare for, adapt to, withstand, respond to, and recover from operational disruptions and sustain critical operations at ports, including disruptions caused

¹ Pre-award costs are only costs incurred directly pursuant to the negotiation and anticipation of the PIDP award where such costs are necessary for efficient and timely performance of the scope of work, as determined by MARAD.

by natural or man-made hazards, such as sea level change, flooding, earthquakes, hurricanes, tsunami inundation or other extreme weather events.

Rural area: An area located outside of a Census-designated urban area that had a population greater than 50,000 in the 2020 Census.²

Small Port: A port to and from which the average annual tonnage of cargo for the immediately preceding three calendar years from the time an application is submitted is less than 8,000,000 short tons, as determined by using U.S. Army Corps of Engineers data or data provided by an independent audit. When using U.S. Army Corps of Engineers data to determine whether the applicant qualifies as a Small Port, MARAD will use data that is specific to the eligible applicant. If an eligible applicant provides data by an independent audit, MARAD will use such data if it is a reasonable substitute for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers data.

Small Project at a Small Port: A project at a Small Port seeking less than or equal to \$11.25 million in funding under 46 U.S.C. § 54301(b).

Strategic Seaport: A military port or commercial port that is subject to a port planning order or Basic Ordering Agreement (or both) that is projected to be used for the deployment of forces and shipment of ammunition or sustainment supplies in support of military operations.

Urban area: An area located within (or on the boundary of) a Census-designated urban area that had a population greater than 50,000 in the 2020 Census.

7. PROJECT COMPONENTS

An application must describe only one project, but that project may contain more than one component and may describe components that may be carried out by parties other than the applicant. MARAD expects, and will impose requirements on, fund recipients to ensure that all components included in an application will be delivered as part of the PIDP project, regardless of whether a component includes Federal funding. The status of each component should be clearly described (for example, in the project schedule and budget). MARAD may award funds for a component, instead of the larger project, if that component: (1) independently meets minimum award amounts described in Section C and all eligibility requirements described in Section B; (2) independently aligns with the selection criteria identified in Section F; and (3) meets National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements with respect to independent utility. Independent utility means that the component will represent a transportation improvement that is usable even if no other improvement is made in the area and will be ready for intended use upon completion of that component's construction.

MARAD strongly encourages applicants to identify in their applications the project components that have independent utility and separately detail costs and requested PIDP funding for those components. If the application identifies one or more project components with independent utility, the application should clearly identify how each component addresses the selection criteria and produces benefits on its own, in addition to describing how the full proposal of which the component is a part addresses the selection criteria described in Section F.

² Please use the DOT Rural Eligibility map for PIDP at <https://www.transportation.gov/rural/eligibility> to determine rural eligibility. This map identifies the areas in the 2020 U.S. Census that have a population of less than 50,000 and, therefore, are rural areas for the purposes of PIDP.

Unrelated project components should not be combined in one application to meet the application limit. Therefore, all project components--even those with independent utility--that are presented together in a single application must demonstrate a logical relationship or connection among them or MARAD may fund only one or more of the connected components and reduce the PIDP award. MARAD strongly encourages applicants to describe the relationship between all components presented in the application, particularly if those components are not physically connected.

Applicants should be aware that, depending upon the relationship between project components and applicable Federal law, DOT funding of some project components may make other project components subject to Federal requirements.

8. REDUCED AWARDS

If selected for award, MARAD may decrease the PIDP funding amount from the applicant's request if some elements of the project are ineligible or to comply with statutory set asides such as those related to geographic preference or small projects at small ports.

9. PREVIOUS PIDP RECIPIENTS

Previous recipients of a PIDP grant may apply for funding to support additional phases of their project. The application should demonstrate the extent to which the previously funded project has met estimated project schedules and budget, as well as the ability to realize the benefits expected for the project.

10. UNSUCCESSFUL FY 2025 APPLICANTS

MARAD encourages unsuccessful FY 2025 PIDP applicants to apply for FY 2026 funding. Applicants should, however, review their application to ensure that it complies with any new program requirements and criteria outlined in this NOFO.

C. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. PROGRAM HISTORY AND AUTHORIZATION

The PIDP statute, codified at 46 U.S.C. § 54301, establishes the port and intermodal improvement program to improve the safety, efficiency, or reliability of the movement of goods through ports and intermodal connections to ports. IJA appropriated \$450 million to the PIDP for FY 2026 to make discretionary grants for eligible PIDP projects. On February 3, 2026, the FY 2026 Appropriations Act appropriated an additional \$103,330,000 for the FY 2026 PIDP grant program. Of that amount, \$38,628,000 is available to be awarded as discretionary grants. Therefore, a total of \$488,628,000 in funding is available to be awarded as discretionary grants for the FY 2026 PIDP grant program. MARAD intends to retain up to two percent of the amount appropriated for PIDP funding this fiscal year for grant administration and oversight as permitted

under 46 U.S.C. 54301(a)(11)(A). Unobligated prior year PIDP funds may also be made available and awarded under this solicitation to eligible projects.

This NOFO solicits applications for projects to be funded under the FY 2026 PIDP. It includes the funding appropriated by IJA and the FY 2026 Appropriations Act. Applicants should note that the two funding streams (IJA funding and FY 2026 Appropriations Act funding) have slightly different funding restrictions.

2. PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goal of PIDP is to assist in funding eligible projects for the purpose of improving the safety, efficiency, or reliability of the movement of goods through ports and intermodal connections to ports.

3. AWARD SIZE

For funding awarded under IJA, there is no minimum award size. For all projects funded under the FY 2026 Appropriations Act, the minimum PIDP award size is \$1 million. Therefore, funding requests below the FY 2026 Appropriations Act minimum will only be considered for funding from the IJA; they will not be eligible to compete for the full amount of funding available. Except as limited by the amount of available funding and statutory restrictions on funding identified in Section C.3, there is no maximum award size.

4. RESTRICTIONS ON FUNDING

MARAD must comply with the following funding restrictions:

Funding Restriction	Amount
Small Projects at Small Ports	At least 25% of available funding, which is \$122,157,000
Per State	No more than 25% of available funding, which is \$122,157,000
Planning Projects	No more than 10% of funding reserved for Small Projects at Small Ports and no more than 10% of funding available to large projects
Small Projects at Small Ports Maximum Award size	No more than \$11.25 million per award

As proscribed in 46 U.S.C. § 50309, no funds may be awarded to an entity that utilizes or provides in part or in whole: the national transportation logistics public information platform (commonly referred to as 'LOGINK') provided by the People's Republic of China, or departments, ministries, centers, agencies, or instrumentalities of the Government of the People's Republic of China; any national transportation logistics information platform provided by or

sponsored by the People’s Republic of China, or a controlled commercial entity; or a similar system provided by Chinese state-affiliated entities.³

MARAD may retain up to two percent of available funding for oversight and administration of grants.

Federal funds awarded under this program may not be used to support or oppose union organizing, whether directly or as an offset for other funds.

5. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

The table below outlines the obligation and expenditure deadlines for FY 2026 PIDP funding.

Fiscal Year	Funding Obligation Deadline	Funding Expenditure Deadline
FY 2026	September 30, 2030	5 years after funds obligation for each individual award

MARAD seeks to obligate FY 2026 PIDP grant funds by September 30, 2030.

- Obligation occurs when a selected applicant and MARAD enter into a written grant agreement after the applicant has satisfied applicable local, State, and Federal requirements, including transportation planning and environmental review requirements, such as those under NEPA.

Per 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(11)(B)(ii), MARAD also expects grant recipients to expend funds within five years of obligation of their award funds, which should be no later than September 30, 2035, depending on when each grant is executed.

- Expenditure occurs when a recipient is reimbursed for eligible project costs.

6. PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PIDP program performance measures can be found at: <https://www.maritime.dot.gov/grants-finances/federal-grant-assistance/performance-measures>.

7. PREVIOUS AWARDS

Previous program awards can be found on the [PIDP website](#).

D. APPLICATION CONTENT AND FORMAT

The Project Narrative should be formatted as a single-spaced document, using a standard 12-point font, such as Times New Roman, with 1-inch margins, with a narrative text in one column. Documents should be submitted in PDF, unless otherwise specified (e.g., Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) calculations should be submitted in an unlocked Excel spreadsheet). The Project

³ For more information on LOGINK, including information about potential vulnerabilities to maritime port equipment and networks, see the advisory on Worldwide Foreign Adversarial Technological, Physical, and Cyber Influence on the Maritime Security Communications Industry portal: <https://www.maritime.dot.gov/msci-advisorics>.

Narrative may not exceed 30 pages in length, excluding cover pages and table of contents. The only substantive portions that may exceed the 30-page limit are documents supporting assertions or conclusions made in the 30-page Project Narrative and documentation related to the required determinations. Except for the BCA, evaluators are not required to review supporting documents as part of the selection criteria review described in Section F. Supporting documentation should be dated, and MARAD recommends using appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., “Project Narrative,” “Maps,” “Memorandum of Understanding,” “Letters of Support,” “Engineering Drawings,” etc.) for all attachments. If supporting documents are submitted, applicants should clearly identify within the Project Narrative the relevant supporting document(s).

1. STANDARD FORM 424

The application must include the Standard Form (SF) 424 (Application for Federal Assistance). Applicants are encouraged to also complete the SF-424C (Budget Information – Construction Programs). These forms may be found on [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) and are also available at www.maritime.dot.gov/PIDPgrants.

2. FY 2026 PIDP COVER PAGE

Each application should include a cover page with information about the project included in the following chart:

Field Name	Guidance
Name of lead applicant	
Is the applicant applying as a lead applicant with any joint applicants?	If yes, identify by name each of the joint applicants.
Does the applicant or joint applicant own the property where the grant-funded improvements will occur?	Yes or No.
Is the applicant seeking funding under the small project at a small port set-aside?	Yes or No.
Project name	Provide a concise (five- to seven-word) name of the project. For example: “Wharf and Uplands Improvement Project”
Project description	Provide a brief (no more than 100 words) description of the project that focuses on the project’s major components. For example: “This project will fund construction of a new wharf at the X Terminal, renovate the uplands adjacent to the wharf, construct a 100,000 SF-refrigerated warehouse, and install approximately 20,000 LF of track to connect the new facilities to the port’s rail switch yard.”
Is this a planning project?	Yes or No.
Is this a project at a coastal or Great Lakes port?	Yes or No.

Is this project located in a noncontiguous State or U.S. territory?	Yes or No. If yes, name the State or U.S. territory.
Geographic Coordinates (in Latitude and Longitude format)	Provide the coordinates of the approximate geographic center of the project. The latitude and longitude of the project should be reported as decimal degrees with a minimum of 5 decimal places.
Is this project in an urban or rural area?	Use the guidance in Section B.6 of the NOFO to answer this question.
Project Zip Code	Identify the zip code that corresponds to the coordinates identified above.
Has the same project been previously submitted for PIDP funding?	If so, identify the program and year of the prior submission (such as "PIDP FY 2023").
Is the applicant applying for other Federal discretionary grant programs (managed by DOT or a separate agency) in 2026 for the same work or related scopes of work?	If so, identify the program, amount of funding requested and scope (such as DOT BUILD FY 2026, \$25 million, components 1 and 2 of this PIDP project).
Has the applicant previously received DOT funding for the same work or related scope of work?	If so, identify the program, amount of funding received and scope (such as U.S. Marine Highway Program FY 2022, \$2 million, phase 1 of this PIDP project), and status of the NEPA review for the previously funded project.
Has the applicant previously received TIGER/BUILD/RAISE, FASTLANE/INFRA, Mega, USMHP, or PIDP funding?	If so, identify the program and year of the prior award (such as "INFRA FY 2023").
PIDP Grant Amount Requested	Enter the total amount of PIDP grant funds requested. This number must be the same as the amount entered on line 18a of the SF-424.
Total Project Cost	Total Project Cost will be equal to the Total Future Eligible Project Cost, including the PIDP grant amount requested. (Only for small projects at small ports can this cost include previously incurred expenses). This number must be the same as the amount entered on line 18g of the SF-424.
Total Federal Funding	Enter the amount of Federal funding from ALL sources that will be used for this project and list each source of Federal funding.
Total Non-Federal Funding	Enter the amount of funds committed to the project from non-Federal sources.
Will the applicant be seeking approval to expend funds prior to grant agreement execution?	Yes or No.
Will RRIF or TIFIA funds be used as part of the project financing?	Indicate whether RRIF or TIFIA funding will be used for the project. If so, indicate the

	amount of funds that will be used. Note that TIFIA and RRIF generally share the PIDP program's Federal compliance requirements and are complementary programs.
Private Corporation Involvement	Does the project involve a private entity or entities that will receive a direct and predictable financial benefit if the project is selected for an award? This includes, but is not limited to, private owners or operators of infrastructure facilities being improved and private freight shippers or carriers directly benefitting from completion of the proposed project.
Private Corporation Names	If this project directly involves or benefits a private corporation, please list the corporation(s) separated by a comma.
Does the applicant use LOGINK or a similar logistics platform provided or sponsored by the People's Republic of China or Chinese state-affiliated entities?	Yes or No. See Section C.4 of this NOFO.

3. PROJECT NARRATIVE

a) NARRATIVE SECTION I: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section of the Project Narrative should include:

- A detailed statement of work and describe the proposed PIDP project that is to be planned or constructed, focusing on the technical and engineering aspects of the project as well as the current design status of the project;
- A description of the transportation challenges that the project is intended to address and how the project will address those challenges;
- The project's history, including a description of any previously completed components, to place the project into a broader context of other relevant infrastructure investments being pursued by the project sponsor (the applicant should make clear which related investments are outside the scope of the proposed PIDP project);
- A written statement that the eligible applicant has the authority to plan, construct, own, operate, and maintain the grant-funded project;
- If the lead applicant intends to act as a pass-through entity for disbursing funds to a subrecipient (including a private-entity joint applicant, if applicable) who will deliver all or a portion of the project, a description of that intention and the work the subrecipient will carry out should be included in this section and a letter of support from the intended subrecipient (as applicable) should be included as an attachment; and
- If the proposed project includes dredging incidental to the proposed improvement, the applicant should confirm that the dredging is not for

channel improvements or harbor deepening that are part of a Federally maintained navigation channel.

- Additionally, if submitting a joint application, applicants should also:
 - Identify the lead recipient of the award who will be responsible for financial administration of the project; and
 - Include a description of the roles and responsibilities of each applicant.

In addition, applicants for large projects applying to use PIDP funds to acquire digital infrastructure or a software component must do one of the following in this section of their project narrative:

- 1) Certify that the facility for which the applicant is applying for a grant has an approved facility security plan pursuant to section 46 U.S.C. § 70103(c) that addresses the cybersecurity risks of such proposed digital infrastructure or software components; or
- 2) If the approved facility security plan of a facility for which the applicant is applying for a grant does not address such cybersecurity risks, provide a brief description in this section of the project narrative of how the applicant will address the cybersecurity risks of such digital infrastructure or software component. Each applicant selected for PIDP funding will be required to ensure that such security plan is updated to address the cybersecurity risks in the next update required under section 70103(c) as a condition of funding.

Applicants for small projects at small ports are not subject to the abovementioned cybersecurity requirements.

b) NARRATIVE SECTION II: PROJECT LOCATION

This section of the application should describe the project location, provide a map or maps that clearly indicate the project's location in the local area and the State or territory, provide photographs of the project location, and (if available) renderings of the proposed project. The project's connections to existing transportation infrastructure should also be clearly described or illustrated.

This section should also clearly identify whether the project is:

- located in a rural or urban area (as defined in Section B.6);
- a project at a coastal seaport or Great Lakes port (as defined in Section B.6);
- a small project at a small port (as defined in Section B.6) seeking funding under 46 U.S.C. § 54301(b); and
- located in a Qualified Opportunity Zone. The Department provides more information and an interactive map to show [Qualified Opportunity Zones](#). The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) designates Qualified Opportunity Zones and maintains [a list on the IRS website](#). MARAD may consider prioritizing the selection of projects located in designated Qualified Opportunity Zones.

c) NARRATIVE SECTION III: GRANT FUNDS, SOURCES, AND USE OF FUNDS

This section should present the budget for the PIDP project (i.e., the project scope that includes PIDP funding and matching funding), including information about the degree of design completion (e.g., 30 percent design) upon which the budget is based. Except for a project seeking funding under 46 U.S.C. § 54301(b), the budget should not include any previously incurred expenses that are incurred prior to MARAD's announcement of project selection.

Project budgets should show how different funding sources will share in each activity and present that data in dollars and percentages. The budget should identify other Federal funds, if any, that the applicant is applying for, has been awarded, or intends to use. Funding sources should be grouped into three categories: non-Federal, current FY 2026 PIDP funding request, and other Federal, with specific amounts from each funding source. The budget details should sufficiently demonstrate that the project satisfies the statutory non-Federal cost-sharing requirements described in Section B.3.

At a minimum, the project budget must include:

- Total Project Costs for the FY 2026 PIDP project (see Section B.3 for definition of Total Project Cost);
- FY 2026 PIDP grant funding request;
- Specific source, amount, type (grant, loan, etc.), and match requirements of other Federal funds to be used for eligible project costs;
- Specific sources and amounts of non-Federal funds, if included, to be used for eligible project costs; and
- If the project is located in two or more census tracts or is located only partially within an urbanized area, the budget needs to separate the costs between the various census tracts or areas designated as urban and rural.

In addition to the information enumerated above, this section should provide complete information on how all project funds may be used. For example, if a particular source of funds is available only after a condition is satisfied, the application should identify that condition and describe the applicant's control over whether it is satisfied. Similarly, if a particular source of funds is available for expenditure only during a fixed time period, the application should describe that restriction. Complete information about project funds will ensure that MARAD's expectations for award execution align with any funding restrictions unrelated to MARAD, even if an award differs from the applicant's request. If a funding source is uncertain, the applicant should state that it is uncertain and describe the source of the uncertainty.

Applicants are encouraged to include the budget table below, filled out with project details:

	[Component 1]	[Component 2]	Total
PIDP Funds:	[\$XXX]	[\$XXX]	[\$XXX]
Other Federal Funds:	[\$XXX]	[\$XXX]	[\$XXX]
Non-Federal Funds:	[\$XXX]	[\$XXX]	[\$XXX]
Total:	[\$XXX]	[\$XXX]	[\$XXX]

If there is only a single component, remove “Component 2” column. If there are more than 2 components, add columns.

The budget should clearly identify any project expenses anticipated between the time of MARAD’s announcement of project selections and obligation that the applicant intends to request approval from MARAD to expend pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(10)(B) to count toward the non-Federal cost share or 2 CFR 200.458 if its application is selected for award. These pre-obligation costs must still comply with all Federal requirements, including NEPA. The discussion should also reference (and summarize) supporting documentation of funding commitments for non-Federal funds to be used for eligible project costs. This supporting documentation must be submitted as an appendix and clearly marked. In preparing this section, applicants should also refer to the “Leveraging Federal Funding” merit criterion.

d) NARRATIVE SECTION IV: MERIT CRITERIA

This section of the application should demonstrate how the project aligns with the statutory merit criteria described in Section F.1 of this notice. PIDP statutory merit criteria are: Achieving Safety, Efficiency, or Reliability Improvements; Supporting Economic Vitality at the Regional or National Level; Leveraging Federal Funding; and Port Resilience. To assist project evaluators, MARAD encourages applicants to describe the project merit criteria in the order in which they are described in Section F.1, address each criterion separately, identify the elements of the proposed project that align with items listed under each criterion under the merit rating rubric, and support estimated benefit claims with data, details, and/or qualitative descriptions. Insufficient information to assess any criterion will negatively impact the project rating. Guidance describing how MARAD will evaluate projects against the Merit Criteria is listed in Section F of this notice. Applicants should review that section before preparing their application.

e) NARRATIVE SECTION V: ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

This section of the application should demonstrate how the project aligns with the additional considerations of Supporting National Multimodal Freight Goals, Project Readiness, and Innovative Technology.

Supporting National Multimodal Freight Goals describes how the project generates benefits and produces outcomes that support and align with national multimodal freight policy goals. This portion of the narrative should provide information on the categories of goods and commodities that will be impacted by the project, the customers or industries who ship through the Port, and any other

information that shows how the project supports the national goals for the multimodal freight system. The approach MARAD will take in evaluating projects for alignment with this Additional Consideration is described in detail in Section F.1.

Project Readiness describes an applicant's preparedness to move a proposed project forward once it receives a PIDP grant. This portion of the narrative should include a detailed project schedule and information that, when considered with the project budget information, is sufficient for MARAD to evaluate whether the project is reasonably expected to begin the capital or planning project in a timely manner after satisfying applicable administrative requirements, including transportation planning and environmental review requirements, such as those under NEPA, and meet both the preferred obligation and expenditure deadlines. Project readiness consists of two factors: Technical Capacity and NEPA Process & Permitting Risk. Technical Capacity and NEPA Process & Permitting Risk are described in detail in Section F.1.

Innovative Technology considers whether and how the applicant takes advantage of the many developments in science that are transforming the way we address the practical challenges of infrastructure development and maritime operations. A well-written application will demonstrate how the project incorporates novel approaches to the development and improvement of maritime infrastructure and operations. For PIDP, innovation may include the deployment of advanced technologies to enhance safety or operational efficiency; the application of innovative methods in design, construction, or maintenance that reduce costs or accelerate project delivery; and the integration of solutions that strengthen port resilience. Examples of innovative technologies include: smart cargo handling systems, intelligent berth and yard management, advanced asset inspection and management technologies, or resilient infrastructure designs. Applicants are expected to clearly describe and substantiate how their project goes beyond traditional maritime practices and delivers measurable benefits, supported by evidence or concrete examples. The approach MARAD will take in evaluating projects for alignment with this Additional Consideration is described in detail in Section F.1.

f) NARRATIVE SECTION VII: STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS

To select a project for award, MARAD must determine that the project—as a whole, as well as each independent component of the project—satisfies several statutory requirements enumerated in 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(6)(A) and restated in the table below. The application must include sufficient information for MARAD to make these determinations for both the project as a whole and for each independent component of the project. Applicants should use this section of the application to summarize how their project and, if present, each independent project component, meets each of the following requirements. Applicants are not required to reproduce the table below in their application but following this format will help evaluators identify the relevant information that supports each project determination. Supporting information provided in appendices may be referenced.

Statutory Determination	Guidance
<p>1. The project improves the safety, efficiency, or reliability of the movement of goods through a port or intermodal connection to the port.</p>	<p>Please summarize how the project will improve the safety, efficiency, or reliability of the movement of goods through a port or intermodal connection to a port.</p> <p>Detail specific elements of the project and their forecasted impact on port performance indicators (such as improvements in vessel dwell times, truck turn times, capacity, throughput, accident reductions, etc.).</p> <p>If the project has multiple independent components, please provide sufficient information to describe the impact of each component on the overall project.</p>
<p>2. The project is cost effective.</p>	<p>Please highlight the results of the BCA, as well as the analyses of independent project components, if applicable.</p> <p>The Department will base its determination on the ratio of project benefits to project costs as assessed according to the Economic Vitality criterion.</p> <p>Note: This determination is not applicable to small projects at small ports or large projects located in noncontiguous States or U.S. territories.</p>

<p>3. The eligible applicant has the authority to carry out the project.</p>	<p>Please provide citations of authority or other supporting documentation necessary to establish an applicant's authority to carry out the project. The citations should be of sufficient detail to demonstrate that the applicant is an eligible applicant and to show how the applicant is related to the work on the property where the grant funds will be spent.</p> <p>Examples of information that could assist with making this determination include: the citation of specific sections or chapters of state or local statutory language that demonstrate relevant authority; the inclusion of a narrative outlining the authority of the eligible entity applying for grant funding; information about who owns the property where the improvements will take place or who operates the facilities that will be improved by the project; or a description of the relationship between the applicant and the owner of the property that links the project to the authority to carry out the project (e.g., through a lease agreement).</p>
<p>4. The eligible applicant has sufficient funding available to meet the matching requirements.</p>	<p>Please indicate funding source(s) and amounts that will account for all project costs, broken down by independent project component, if applicable. Demonstrate that the funding is stable, dependable, and dedicated to this specific project by referencing a letter of commitment, a local government resolution, memorandum of understanding, or similar documentation. Include documentation that the matching funds will be available and/or committed prior to obligation of funds, regardless of the source of funding.</p>

<p>5. The project will be completed without unreasonable delay.</p>	<p>Please provide expected obligation date and construction start date, referencing project budget and schedule as needed. If the project has multiple independent components, or will be obligated and constructed in multiple phases, please provide sufficient information to show that each component meets this requirement. MARAD will base its determination on the project risk rating assessed as part of the evaluation of the Project Readiness criterion.</p>
<p>6. The project cannot be easily and efficiently completed without Federal funding or financial assistance available to the project sponsor.</p>	<p>Describe the potential negative impacts on the proposed project if the PIDP grant (or other Federal funding) is not awarded. The applicant must address at least one of the following in the narrative, although a well-written narrative will address each of the potential impacts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How would the project scope be affected if PIDP (or other Federal) funds were not received? 2. How would the project schedule be affected if PIDP (or other Federal) funds were not received? 3. How would the project cost be affected if PIDP (or other Federal) funds were not received? <p>Impacts to a portfolio of projects will not satisfy this requirement; please describe only impacts to this project. Re-stating the project's importance for national or regional economy, mobility, or safety will not satisfy this requirement.</p>

E. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND DEADLINE

1. ADDRESS TO REQUEST APPLICATION PACKAGE

All application materials may be found on [Grants.gov](https://www.Grants.gov) and the [PIDP website](#).

2. UNIQUE ENTITY IDENTIFIER AND SYSTEM FOR AWARD MANAGEMENT

Each applicant must: (1) be registered in [SAM.Gov](https://www.SAM.gov) before submitting its application; (2) provide a valid unique entity identifier (UEI) in its application; and (3) continue to maintain an active

SAM registration with current information at all times during which it has an active Federal award or an application or plan under consideration by a Federal awarding agency.

Please note that the SAM registration process takes several weeks to complete, if not longer. MARAD may not make a FY 2026 PIDP grant award to an applicant until the applicant has complied with all applicable UEI and SAM requirements. If an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time MARAD is ready to make a PIDP grant award, MARAD may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a PIDP grant award and use that determination as a basis for making a PIDP grant award to another applicant.

3. SUBMISSION DATES AND TIMES

Applications must be submitted to [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) by 11:59:59 p.m. E.D.T. on June 26, 2026. [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) attaches a time stamp to each application at the time that submission is complete. Applications with a time stamp after the deadline will not be considered. MARAD does not accept applications via mailed paper, fax machine, email, or other means.

i. Submission Issues

MARAD is not able to assist with technical issues related to Grants.gov registration or application submission. For information and instructions, please see Grants.gov. If applicants experience difficulties at any point during the registration or application submission process, please call the Customer Service Support Hotline at 1-800-518-4726 or email support@grants.gov.

ii. Consideration of Applications

Only applicants who comply with all submission deadlines described in this notice and electronically submit valid, on-time applications through Grants.gov will be eligible for evaluation and possible selection for award.

iii. Late Applications

Any applications that Grants.gov time stamps after 11:59:59 PM E.D.T. on the deadline will not be accepted. Applicants are strongly encouraged to make submissions days, if not weeks, in advance of the deadline. Applicants facing technical issues are advised to contact the Grants.gov helpdesk well in advance of the deadline.

4. INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW

This program is not subject to EO 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.

5. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 508 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

MARAD encourages applicants to submit documents that are compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (see [Section 508 guidelines](#)).

F. APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

1. CRITERIA

Responsiveness Review

There are several statutory criteria that must be met for an application to be eligible for application review and selection for an award. MARAD reserves the right to submit follow-up inquiries to applicants to resolve questions regarding any of the criteria described below. MARAD will assess these criteria at two stages in the application review process: intake and application review. The intake review process verifies basic applicant and project eligibility, and the application review process will assess the remainder of the criteria.

A determination of non-responsiveness related to any of the following factors will be a basis for elimination from further consideration for award of a grant:

- Applicant eligibility (46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(2));
- Project eligibility (46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(3) and (4));
- Certification or description of cybersecurity risks for large projects proposing digital infrastructure or a software component (46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(5)(A)(ii));
- The project improves the safety, efficiency, or reliability of the movement of goods through a port or intermodal connection to a port (46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(6)(A)(i));
- The project is cost effective (46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(6)(A)(ii));
- The applicant has the authority to carry out the project (46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(6)(A)(iii));
- Sufficiency of funding to meet the matching requirements (46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(6)(A)(iv));
- The project will be completed without unreasonable delay (46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(6)(A)(v)); and
- The project cannot be completed easily and efficiently without Federal funding (46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(6)(A)(vi)).

If any of the factors listed above are in question, MARAD will continue the application review process until the concern is resolved. If non-responsiveness is confirmed, the application review will conclude, and the responsiveness issue will be memorialized in the review documentation. If a responsiveness question is successfully resolved, the application will continue to be considered during the review process described below and in Section F.2 of this notice.

Merit Criteria

MARAD will review merit criteria for all applications. Reviewers will assess a project's alignment with the program's statutory merit criteria: Achieving Safety, Efficiency, or Reliability Improvements; Supporting Economic Vitality; Leveraging Federal Funding; and Port Resilience. For each criterion, reviewers will evaluate whether the benefits of the project are clear, direct, data-driven, and reasonable. Based on that assessment, reviewers will assign a rating for each criterion, as explained in greater detail in criterion-specific sections below. See Section F.2 for more information on the Review and Selection Process.

Planning grant applications will be evaluated against the same merit criteria as capital grants. The information provided in planning grant applications, however, need not include the same level of data-driven material submitted for capital grants. MARAD will also consider how the plan, once implemented, will ultimately further the merit criteria.

(1) Achieving Safety, Efficiency, or Reliability Improvements

MARAD will evaluate the extent to which the project will improve the safety, efficiency, or reliability of the movement of goods through a port using the rubric below. Applications should detail current safety, efficiency, or reliability issues and describe how specific elements of the project will improve applicable port performance measures (such as reduced vessel dwell times, improved truck turn times, increased capacity or throughput, reduced vehicle crashes, lives saved, reduced workplace injuries, fuel efficiency, energy efficiency, etc.). If the project has multiple independent components, the applicant should include sufficient information to describe the impact of each component on the overall project.

Using the rubrics below, reviewers will assign a rating of “high,” “medium,” “low,” or “non-responsive” for each element (that is, safety, efficiency, and reliability). Reviewers will then combine those ratings to arrive at a single overall project rating. Projects with higher ratings will be more competitive.

	Non-Responsive	Low	Medium	High
Safety	Application did not address the Safety criterion OR project negatively affects safety	Application contains safety information that does not satisfactorily address this criterion or relates to safety benefits that are external to the port	Project has one or more of the following safety benefits, but safety may not be a primary project purpose or the project’s safety benefits do not meet the description of a “High” rating: - Protects individuals inside the port from safety risks - Incorporates safety improvements that are part of a documented risk reduction plan	Safety is a primary project purpose (not an ancillary or incidental consideration) AND the project has clear, direct, data-driven (for capital projects) and significant benefits that target a documented safety problem by doing one or more of the following: - Incorporates specific safety improvements that a part of a documented risk

			- Reduces fatalities and/or serious injuries related to port operations	reduction plan and that have port-wide impact - Protects individuals inside the port from safety risks - Reduces fatalities and/or serious injuries related to port operations
Efficiency	Application did not address the Efficiency criterion OR project negatively affects efficiency	Application contains efficiency information that does not satisfactorily address this criterion or relates to efficiency benefits that are external to the port	Project has one or more of the following efficiency benefits even though efficiency may not be a primary project purpose or the project's efficiency benefits do not meet the standard of a "High" rating: - Results in an improvement likely to increase cargo throughput - Makes improvements that enhance the speed of cargo operations	Efficiency is a primary project purpose (not an ancillary or incidental consideration) AND the project has clear, direct, data-driven (for capital projects) efficiency benefits by accomplishing one or more of the following: - Results in a documented increase in cargo throughput by meeting an existing, well-defined need for additional throughput capacity - Generates changes in port operations that increase the types of cargo that can be moved through the port with documentation

				of likely increases in new cargo volumes - Makes improvements that enhance the speed of cargo operations
Reliability	Application did not address the Reliability criterion OR project negatively affects reliability	Application contains reliability information that does not satisfactorily address this criterion or relates to reliability improvements that are external to the port	Project has one or more of the following reliability benefits even though reliability may not be a primary purpose or the project's reliability benefits do not meet the standard of a "High" rating: - Results in enhancements that are likely to improve the dependability of cargo operations - Remedies port infrastructure deficiencies that have an adverse impact on port operations	Reliability is a primary project purpose (not an ancillary or incidental consideration) AND the project has clear, direct, data-driven (for capital projects) reliability benefits by accomplishing one or more of the following: - Results in enhancements that generate well-documented improvements in the dependability of cargo operations - Remedies port infrastructure deficiencies that are identified in a capital investment plan and that have a demonstrated impact on cargo operations

To determine a single overall project rating, reviewers will combine the ratings for each element using the following process:

(1) Convert each element rating to a numerical value according to the following table.

Descriptive Element Rating	Numerical Value
Non-responsive	0
Low	1
Medium	3
High	5

(2) Calculate a single overall project rating using the following formula.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \text{Rating}_{\text{Safety}} + \text{Rating}_{\text{Efficiency}} + \text{Rating}_{\text{Reliability}}$$

(3) Convert the overall project numerical rating to a descriptive rating according to the following table.

Project Numerical Rating	Descriptive Rating
0 or 1	Non-responsive
2 – 5	Low
6 – 11	Medium
12 – 15	High

(2) Supporting Economic Vitality at the Regional or National Level

(a) Large Projects

MARAD will consider the net benefits of large projects (as defined in Section B.6) seeking PIDP funding, except for those projects located in noncontiguous States and U.S. territories. To the extent possible, MARAD will rely on quantitative, data-supported analyses to assess how well a project addresses this criterion, including an assessment of the project's estimated Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) and net benefits based on the applicant supplied Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA) described below.

For large projects, this criterion measures the benefits generated by the project against the costs of the project. Among otherwise comparable applications, MARAD will prioritize projects that maximize net benefits.

This section describes the recommended approach for the completion and submission of a BCA narrative and calculation file. Applicants should also review DOT's detailed guidance on how to conduct a BCA, which is available on the DOT website at <https://www.transportation.gov/mission/office-secretary/office-policy/transportation-policy/benefit-cost-analysis-guidance>.

In this section, the applicant should summarize the conclusions of the BCA, including estimates of the project's Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) and net benefits.

The purpose of the BCA is to enable DOT to evaluate the project's cost-effectiveness by comparing its expected benefits to its expected costs, relative to a no-build scenario. Applicants should provide a BCA narrative description of their analysis as well as the calculation or analysis files used for their BCA (such as unlocked spreadsheet files). The BCA narrative should carefully document the assumptions and methodology used to produce the analysis, including a description of the baseline, the sources of data used to project the outcomes of the project, and the values of key input parameters. The spreadsheets and technical memos should present the calculations in sufficient detail and transparency to allow the analysis to be reproduced by DOT evaluators. Any benefits claimed for the project, both quantified and unquantified, should be clearly tied to the expected outcomes of the project. While benefits should be quantified wherever possible, applicants may also describe other categories of benefits in the application narrative.

To address this criterion in the project narrative, applicants should summarize the conclusions of the BCA, including estimates of the project's BCR and net benefits.

Based on MARAD's assessment, MARAD will assign an economic analysis rating of high, medium-high, medium, medium-low, or low according to the following table:

Rating	Description
High	The project's benefits will exceed its costs, with a BCR of at least 2.0
Medium-High	The project's benefits will exceed its costs
Medium	The project's benefits are likely to exceed its costs
Medium-Low	The project's costs are likely to exceed its benefits
Low	The project's costs will exceed its benefits

Projects with a higher rating as described above will be more competitive than ones with lower ratings.

(b) Small Projects at Small Ports

Applications for funding for small projects at small ports are not required to include a BCA. Instead, the economic vitality analysis for small projects at small ports will apply to applications seeking funding under 46 U.S.C. § 54301(b). Under this criterion, MARAD will evaluate applications for small projects at small ports for how well they address the project's impact on: (1) the economic advantage of the port, (2) the contribution to freight transportation at, around, and through the port, and (3) overcoming the competitive disadvantage of the port.

The economic advantage of a port relates to existing logistical, geographic, transportation, or business advantages at a port that will be enhanced or improved because of the project. It includes factors such as superior logistics, the availability of large space or capacity, proximity to railroads and highways, proximity to key centers of production and consumption, abundant truck parking, light traffic congestion, and economic incentives. Information related to a project's impact on economic advantage should include evidence of improvements the project will generate as reflected in commitments, plans, or other documentation. It should also include

analysis and documentation related to how the project will enhance the elements of economic advantage, such as by creating economies of scale, overcoming barriers to entry, or creating more efficient physical access for labor, resources, and customers to and around the port. Regarding economies of scale, examples of projects, or project components, contributing to economies of scale include, but are not limited to: land expansion, construction of new or expanded warehouses, and construction of longer or wider berths or channels. Barriers to entry consist of geographic barriers, such as the applicant’s port having natural constraints to its capacity, or economic barriers such as an incumbent or adjacent port having an absolute cost advantage due to its location, size, or capabilities.

The narrative’s discussion of the project’s contribution to freight transportation should address how the project will improve the physical process of transporting goods and commodities. A project improves the physical transportation of goods if, for example, it includes the construction of a new or renovated terminal, a new or renovated rail spur or a highway connection, additional gates, or the consolidation of shipments and the optimization of cargo loading and unloading. It should also address how the project will reduce or eliminate potential points of failure related to the transportation of goods and commodities. The applicant should also discuss how the project will improve the physical process of transporting commodities by overcoming or reducing negative externalities, such as pollution, noise, odor, or congestion.

Applicants should also include information that will help reviewers understand the competitive disadvantage of the port and, as appropriate, and how the project will improve the port’s competitive position. Competitive disadvantage refers to existing geographic, institutional, or operational conditions that impede, disrupt, or minimize the relative competitive position of a port, in logistics or business, and how the proposed project will address those issues. Elements of competitive disadvantage typically include unfavorable geography, such as extreme weather, port remoteness, shallow harbors, rigid adjacent or surrounding terrain, or poor soil. Institutional limitations, such as specific local laws and regulations pertaining to zoning or land usage could impose a competitive disadvantage on a port by limiting land expansion. Another competitive disadvantage of a port is inherent deficiencies in the port’s operational capabilities, due to, for example, insufficient docking space, or inadequate storage space due to the port’s restrictive geographic characteristics. Applicants should explain how PIDP funding will help reduce, remove, or correct those elements.

Overall, applicants should include data and/or well-reasoned analyses when providing inputs on the economic vitality of a proposed project. Economic vitality supports the development of transportation systems that stimulate, support, and enhance the movement of goods to ensure a prosperous community and economy. When preparing the Project Narrative, applicants should consider that the concept of economic vitality includes recognizing a full range of multimodal and intermodal freight needs, public-private partnerships, and other institutional linkages within local, regional, and national economies.

Reviewers will assign a rating of “high,” “medium,” “low,” or “non-responsive” as described in the rubric below. Projects with higher ratings will be more competitive.

Non-Responsive	Low	Medium	High
-----------------------	------------	---------------	-------------

Application did not address economic advantage, contribution to freight transportation, or competitive disadvantage OR Reviewers determined that the project will not improve any of the factors	Reviewers determined that the project will address one of the following: improve economic advantage; contribute positively to freight transportation; or improve the competitive advantage of the port	Reviewers determined that the project will address two of the following factors: improve economic advantage; contribute positively to freight transportation; or improve the competitive advantage of the port	Reviewers determined that the project will address all of the following factors: improve economic advantage; contribute positively to freight transportation; and improve the competitive advantage of the port
--	--	--	---

(3) Leveraging Federal Funding to Attract Non-Federal Sources of Infrastructure Investment

To maximize the impact of PIDP awards, MARAD seeks to leverage PIDP funding with non-Federal contributions. To evaluate this criterion, MARAD will assign a leverage rating to each project. See Section D.3.c. The rating will be based on the calculated non-Federal share of the project's future eligible project costs. Refer to Section B.4 of this notice for how MARAD will make this calculation. MARAD will sort project applications based on their calculated non-Federal leverage percentage into one of five groups or quintiles. Applications requesting a waiver of the non-Federal cost share requirement will be placed in the lowest quintile. A project in a higher quintile will be more competitive than a comparable project in a lower quintile.

(4) Port Resilience

As provided in 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(6)(B)(iii), the Secretary shall give substantial weight to changes to a port's resilience as a result of the project. Resilience, as defined in 46 U.S.C. § 54301, means the ability of the port to anticipate, prepare for, adapt to, withstand, respond to, and recover from operational disruptions and sustain critical operations, including disruptions caused by natural or manmade hazards. Therefore, MARAD will assess whether a project improves a port's resilience and to what extent that improvement strengthens the port's role in sustaining vital local, regional, and/or national supply chain systems.

Examples of natural hazards include: sea level rise, flooding, earthquakes, hurricanes, tsunami inundation, or other extreme weather events. Examples of manmade hazards include: human-made disruptions such as dredging and sediment management, terrorism, cyberattacks, disruptions to Position, Navigation, and Timing (PNT) data via the Global Positioning System (GPS), whether intentional or unintentional, public health emergencies, or shortages/bottlenecks at key elements of the supply chain.

In considering a project's role in improving a port's resilience to natural or manmade hazards, reviewers will consider how well the project incorporates resilience measures or features to withstand natural or manmade hazards.

Reviewers will assign a rating of “high,” “medium,” “low,” or “non-responsive” as described in the rubric below. Projects with higher ratings will be more competitive.

Non-responsive	Low	Medium	High
Application did not address how the project will advance the port’s resilience to natural and manmade hazards OR Reviewers determined that the project will not improve either of those factors.	Reviewers determined that the project is likely to advance the port’s resilience to either natural or manmade hazards.	Reviewers determined that the project satisfies either of the following: (1) the project advances the port’s resilience to both natural AND manmade hazards but the impacts aren’t quantified; or, (2) the project advances resilience to either natural OR manmade hazards and the narrative quantifies how resilience is improved.	Reviewers determined that the project will advance the port’s resilience to both natural AND manmade hazards and the narrative quantifies the project’s impact on resilience for each.

(5) Supporting National Multimodal Freight Goals

The Department of Transportation seeks to support port projects that align with the national multimodal freight policy goal of ensuring the freight system serves as a foundation for the United States to compete in the global economy. DOT seeks to invest in port infrastructure that: (1) enhances the export competitiveness of the United States, with an emphasis on agriculture exports; (2) supports the supply chains of key industries of national interest, including critical minerals, steel, the defense industrial base, or pharmaceutical manufacturing; (3) advances America’s domestic energy industry; (4) supports the reshoring of advanced manufacturing; and (5) revitalizes the maritime industrial base including shipbuilding, component supply chains, ship repair, and marine transportation services. Applicants should provide information on the export/import mix of cargo that will benefit from their project, and describe the commodities/goods that will be impacted by the project and the industries that rely on them.

Reviewers will assign a rating of “high,” “medium,” “low,” or “non-responsive” as described in the rubric below.

Non-responsive	Low	Medium	High
Application does not address this criterion	The project provides only <i>non-significant</i> or	The project has material contributions	The project contributes

<p>or project will negatively impact this criterion.</p>	<p><i>indirect</i> contributions to one or more of the goals above.</p>	<p>to one or more of the goals above, but the contributions are minimal.</p>	<p><i>significantly</i> to one of the goals above, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrably results in the growth and expansion of American exports • Directly and clearly benefits the supply chain of an industry of national interest • Advances domestic energy production and distribution • Directly and clearly reduces costs for a reshoring manufacturer • Contributes to the revitalization of the maritime industrial base
--	---	--	--

(6) Project Readiness

Each application will receive a Project Readiness rating based on the ratings it receives for Technical Capacity and NEPA Process and Permitting Risk. The Project Readiness rating will be based on the poorest risk rating earned in either Technical Capacity or NEPA Process and Permitting Risk. For example, if an application is evaluated as high risk for Technical Capacity and medium risk for NEPA Process and Permitting Risk, its Project Readiness rating will be high risk since a rating of high risk is less desirable than a rating of medium risk. The following

paragraphs describe how MARAD will evaluate Technical Capacity and NEPA Process and Permitting Risk.

(a) Technical Capacity

The applicant should provide information demonstrating its technical capacity to implement the project based on experience and understanding of Federal requirements. The application may include a description of the applicant's history of delivering similar projects. The application should also demonstrate a project's feasibility or constructability and schedule, and how the project will comply with applicable Federal requirements. The narrative should also include information about how and when cost data in the budget was compiled, including information on how it was sourced (such as a cost database, market survey, or fixed-price bid). The discussion should also include information about the recency and degree of design completion used to compile the cost information. An applicant's failure to include this information could adversely affect its technical capacity rating.

The applicant should indicate whether the project is part of an ongoing planning effort, such as at the local, regional, or State level. Information on whether the project is included in a local or State freight plan, part of a facility or organization strategic plan, or included in other planning efforts should be included. Applicants should provide links or other documentation supporting the project's inclusion in these planning efforts.

The applicant should include a detailed project schedule that identifies all major project milestones. For capital project applications, examples of such milestones include State and local planning approvals; start and completion of NEPA, and other Federal environmental reviews and approvals including permitting; design completion; real property and right of way acquisition; approval of plans, specifications, and estimates; procurement; project partnership and implementation agreements, including agreements with non-governmental entities involved in or impacted by the project; and construction. For planning projects, examples of milestones may include start dates, schedule for public engagement, and completion dates. The project schedule should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that:

- all necessary pre-award activities will be complete at least six months in advance of the obligation deadline to allow sufficient time for unexpected delays and to meet the expected obligation deadline;
- the capital project can begin construction upon obligation of grant funds and that those funds will be spent expeditiously once construction starts, in order for MARAD to make the determination described in Section D.3.f, with all funds expended five years after obligation; and,
- all real property and right-of-way acquisition will be completed in a timely manner in accordance with 49 CFR part 24 and other applicable legal requirements, even if acquired outside the scope of the PIDP project, or a statement that no right-of-way acquisition is necessary.

Applicants should include a discussion of project risks and related mitigation strategies. The discussion should focus on, but need not be exclusively related to, risks related to project readiness. For example, the applicant should identify project risks, procurement delays, technical

challenges in design or construction, or potential increases in project costs. The narrative should include a discussion that identifies how the project parties will mitigate or otherwise be able to handle the identified risks. For example, if an applicant anticipates pursuing a waiver of relevant domestic preference laws, the applicant should describe steps that have been or will be taken to maximize the use of domestic goods, products, and materials in constructing its project.

The Technical Capacity Assessment will evaluate the applicant's capacity to successfully deliver the project in compliance with applicable Federal requirements. MARAD will consider significant risks to successful completion of a project, including risks associated with the complexity of the project, the proposed project schedule, and the applicant's overall capacity to manage project delivery. If applicable, reviewers will also consider the applicant's previous experience working with Federal agencies on grant-funded projects. Risks do not disqualify projects from award, but competitive applications clearly and directly describe achievable risk mitigation strategies. A project with mitigated risks is more competitive than a comparable project with unaddressed risks.

Technical Capacity ratings will be one of the following: "low risk," "moderate risk," or "high risk." An applicant's lack of previous experience with Federally funded grants will not disqualify a project from consideration.

(b) NEPA Process and Permitting Risk

The application should include sufficient information for MARAD to evaluate whether a project is reasonably expected to begin construction in a timely manner, consistent with all applicable local, State, and Federal requirements. To minimize redundant information in the application, MARAD encourages applicants to cross-reference from the Project Readiness section of the narrative to relevant information in other sections of the application.

The applicant should indicate the anticipated NEPA class of action for the project and describe any environmental analysis in progress or completed. This includes Categorical Exclusion, Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Impact, or Environmental Impact Statement/Record of Decision. The final determination of NEPA class of action will be made by MARAD after announcement of project selections. The application should also include a discussion on the status of any required environmental approvals or permits in addition to the status of the NEPA process. The applicant should review the Department of Transportation's Order 5610.1D, *Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts* (available at [DOT's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts | US Department of Transportation](#)), to include Subpart C which contains additional procedures for MARAD, prior to submission.

The successful applicant will be responsible for the completion of MARAD's NEPA documentation, in collaboration with MARAD's NEPA Coordinator, prior to execution of the grant agreement. Applicants are encouraged to engage with MARAD as part of the application development process to ensure they fully understand MARAD's NEPA process.

The applicant should indicate any previously completed or ongoing consultations involving the project under Section 106 of the NHPA, 54 U.S.C. § 306108. This includes any communication

with State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs), and other interested parties. Successful applicants will be responsible for completion of MARAD’s Section 106 documentation prior to NEPA completion and execution of the grant agreement. The application should also include any known or anticipated stakeholder or public contentious issues related to the project.

The schedule provided in the application should include a timeline for completion of the NEPA process and the acquisition of the required environmental approvals and permits (such as U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permits and consultations under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1531).

Reviewers will evaluate whether the applicant has demonstrated receipt (or reasonably anticipated receipt) of necessary environmental approvals or permits. They will also assess the applicant’s understanding of the NEPA process as well as the applicant’s ability to comply with environmental consultations, approvals, and permits. As with risks related to technical capacity, risks do not disqualify projects from an award, but competitive applications include achievable risk mitigation strategies.

NEPA Process and Permitting Risk ratings will be one of the following: “low risk,” “moderate risk,” or “high risk.”

(7) Innovative Technology

MARAD encourages applicants to use innovative technology in project design and to improve the movement of goods through its port. As reflected in the rubric below, reviewers will assign applications a “high,” “medium,” “low,” or “non-responsive” rating based on how well the project aligns with this consideration.

Rating	Rating Standard
High	The project involves the use of one or more innovative technologies that are directly related to maritime infrastructure challenges or maritime operations. The innovative technologies are well described in the narrative. In addition, the technologies will result in significant, measurable increases in the movement of goods.
Medium	Application demonstrates that the project involves the use of one or more innovative technologies that are directly related to maritime infrastructure challenges or maritime operations and will likely result in increases in the movement of goods.
Low	Application contains insufficient information to assess innovation benefits or describes innovations that are minimal in scope, unrelated to maritime infrastructure challenges or maritime operations, or unlikely to produce gains in the movement of goods.
Non-responsive	Application did not address the criterion.

2. REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS

a. Review Process

The FY 2026 PIDP grant application evaluation process consists of an Intake Review Phase, an Application Review Phase, and a Senior Review Phase.

During the Intake Review Phase, the Intake Team will sort applications into groupings for assignment to evaluators and conduct a threshold eligibility screening based on criteria outlined in this NOFO.

During the Application Review Phase, MARAD staff will analyze applications and provide ratings, consistent with the descriptions in this notice. Initially, all applications will be reviewed for their alignment with the following merit criteria: Achieving Safety, Efficiency, or Reliability Improvements; and Leveraging Federal Funding.

Projects that receive a “High” rating in Safety, Efficiency, or Reliability Improvements and whose calculated non-Federal share of the project’s future eligible costs exceeds 20 percent will be designated “Highly Recommended” and automatically advance for second-tier analysis.

After the initial review, projects that did not receive a “Highly Recommended” designation will be presented to the Senior Review Team (SRT). The SRT will decide which of the projects not designated as “Highly Recommended” will move forward for second-tier analysis. The SRT will primarily base its decision on how well a project meets the statutory merit criteria of Achieving Safety, Efficiency, or Reliability Improvements; and Leverage.

During the second-tier analysis, projects will be reviewed for their alignment with the following criteria: Supporting Economic Vitality; Project Readiness; Innovative Technology, Port Resilience; Supporting National Multimodal Freight Goals; and Statutory Determinations.

Based on the results of the second-tier review, the SRT will assemble a List of Projects for Consideration for selection by the Secretary. A project will be advanced to the List of Projects for Consideration based on its alignment with the statutory merit criteria. In addition, a project must meet all applicable determinations to be advanced on the List of Projects for Consideration. Only those projects that meet all applicable determinations will be advanced to the Secretary.

Using the discretionary authority provided in statute, the Secretary selects projects from the List of Projects for Consideration for award consistent with the merit criteria and additional considerations described in Section F.1. In making PIDP grants, the Secretary may give priority to providing funding to:

- strategic seaports in support of national security requirements pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(6)(C); or
- projects located in a designated Qualified Opportunity Zone (26 U.S.C. § 1400Z-1); or,
- projects that align with [Executive Order 14269 \(Restoring America’s Maritime Dominance\)](#) and [America’s Maritime Action Plan](#).

The PIDP statute also requires the Secretary to consider geographic diversity in making selections. Per statute, “not more than 25 percent of the amounts made available for grants under this subsection for a fiscal year may be used to make grants for projects in any 1 State.”

Compliance with DOT Order 2100.7, Ensuring Reliance Upon Sound Economic Analysis in DOT’s Policies, Programs and Activities

The Department intends to apply principles from DOT Order 2100.7, [Ensuring Reliance Upon Sound Economic Analysis in DOT’s Policies, Programs and Activities](#) when evaluating applications and making award selections. To the maximum extent permitted by law, MARAD will prioritize projects that are in alignment with the principles outlined in DOT Order 2100.7.

b. Follow-up with Applicants

MARAD may ask any applicant to supplement data in its application but is not required to do so. Lack of supporting information provided with the application negatively affects competitiveness of the application. Throughout the review and selection process, MARAD may seek additional information from an applicant related to project eligibility, whether the project can be completed with a reduced award, or other information needed to complete project analysis. MARAD will use email when seeking additional information from an applicant. MARAD will send the email to the point(s) of contact listed by the applicant on the SF-424.

3. Risk Review

Prior to obligation of funds, each selected applicant will be subject to a risk assessment as required by 2 CFR 200.206. Before making a Federal award with a total amount of Federal share greater than the simplified acquisition threshold, MARAD must review and consider any information about the applicant that is in the responsibility/qualification records available in SAM.gov (see 41 U.S.C. § 2313). An applicant may review information in SAM.gov and comment on any information about itself. MARAD will consider comments by the applicant, in addition to the other information in SAM.gov, when completing the review of risk posed by applicants.

G. AWARD NOTICES

1. HOW PROJECT SELECTIONS ARE ANNOUNCED

MARAD will publicly announce selections and notify each successful applicant by email. MARAD will also post all selections on the [PIDP website](#). Notice of selection is not authorization to begin work or to incur costs for the proposed project. Following the announcement of selections, PIDP Program Office staff will contact the point of contact listed on each successful applicant’s SF-424 to initiate the process of developing a grant agreement, which is the official document that obligates PIDP funds.

2. PRE-AWARD COSTS

Unless “pre-award costs” are authorized by MARAD in writing after MARAD’s announcement

of FY 2026 PIDP award selections pursuant to 46 U.S.C. § 54301(a)(10)(B) or 2 CFR 200.458 or a Small Project at a Small Port applicant has included pre-award costs in the application budget, consistent with Section B.3, any costs incurred prior to MARAD's obligation of funds for a project are ineligible for reimbursement and are ineligible to count as match for cost share requirements.⁴

- Project costs incurred before project selections are announced cannot be paid for with funds from this competition.
- Funds must be used only for the specific purposes as outlined in the award letter and/or authorized by MARAD.

3. REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM

Recipients of a PIDP award will not receive a lump-sum cash disbursement at the time of announcement of project selection or obligation of funds. In general, PIDP grant funds are administered on a reimbursement basis. Grant recipients will generally be required to pay project costs upfront using their own funds, and then request reimbursement from MARAD for those costs. PIDP funds will reimburse recipients only after a grant agreement has been executed, allowable expenses are incurred, and valid requests for reimbursement are submitted and approved by MARAD.

H. POST-AWARD REQUIREMENTS AND ADMINISTRATION

1. ADMINISTRATIVE AND NATIONAL POLICY REQUIREMENTS

i. Administrative Requirements

Please visit [Federal Grant Assistance | MARAD](#) for the General Terms and Conditions for the FY 2025 PIDP awards. The FY 2026 Terms and Conditions will be similar but will include relevant updates consistent with this notice.

All awards will be administered pursuant to the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards found in 2 CFR part 200, as adopted by DOT at 2 CFR part 1201. Federal wage rate requirements included in subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, U.S.C., apply to all projects receiving funds under this program, and apply to all parts of the project, whether funded with PIDP grant funds, other Federal funds, or non-Federal funds.

In connection with any program or activity conducted with or benefiting from funds awarded under this notice, recipients of funds must comply with all applicable requirements of Federal law, including, without limitation, the Constitution of the United States; the conditions of performance, nondiscrimination requirements, and other assurances made applicable to the award of funds in accordance with regulations of DOT; and applicable Federal financial assistance and contracting principles promulgated by the Office of Management and Budget. In

⁴ Pre-award costs are only costs incurred directly pursuant to the negotiation and anticipation of the PIDP award where such costs are necessary for efficient and timely performance of the scope of work, as determined by MARAD.

complying with these requirements, recipients must ensure that no concession agreements are denied, or other contracting decisions made on the basis of speech or other activities protected by the First Amendment. If MARAD determines that a recipient has failed to comply with applicable Federal requirements, MARAD may terminate the award of funds and disallow previously incurred costs, requiring the recipient to reimburse any expended award funds.

For projects that are eligible under the PIDP but are not eligible under DOT's other programs or projects that are eligible under multiple DOT programs, MARAD will determine the appropriate requirements to ensure the project is delivered consistent with program and Department goals. In particular, Executive Order 14005 directs the Executive Branch Departments and agencies to maximize the use of goods, products, and materials produced in, and services offered in, the United States through the terms and conditions of Federal financial assistance awards. If selected for an award, grant recipients must be prepared to demonstrate how they will maximize the use of domestic goods, products, and materials in constructing their project.

Amounts awarded as a grant under this notice from IIJA funding that are not expended by the grant recipient shall remain available to MARAD until September 30, 2036, for use for grants under this program. Funds awarded under the FY 2026 Appropriations Act remain available until expended for grants under this program.

ii. Program Requirements

Civil Rights and Title VI

As a condition of a grant award, grant recipients should demonstrate that the recipient has a plan for compliance with civil rights obligations and nondiscrimination laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and implementing regulations (49 CFR part 21), including any amendments thereto, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and all other civil rights requirements and accompanying regulations. This should include a current Title VI plan, a plan to address any legacy infrastructure or facilities that are not compliant with ADA standards, and a completed Community Participation Plan (alternatively called a Public Participation Plan). MARAD's Office of Civil Rights may work with awarded grant recipients to ensure full compliance with Federal civil rights requirements.

Critical Infrastructure Security, Cybersecurity, and Resilience

It is the policy of the United States to strengthen the security and resilience of its critical infrastructure against all hazards, including physical and cyber risks, consistent with National Security Memorandum (NSM-22) on Critical Infrastructure Security and Resilience, and the National Security Memorandum on Improving Cybersecurity for Critical Infrastructure Control Systems. Each applicant selected for Federal funding must demonstrate, prior to the signing of the grant agreement, efforts to consider and address physical and cyber security risks relevant to the transportation mode and type and scale of the project. Projects that have not appropriately considered and addressed physical and cyber security and resilience in their planning, design, and project oversight, as determined by the Department and the Department of Homeland Security, will be required to do so before receiving funds.

Domestic Preference

As expressed in Executive Order 14005, [Ensuring the Future Is Made in All of America by All of America's Workers](#) (86 FR 7475), the executive branch should maximize, consistent with law, the use of goods, products, and materials produced in, and services offered in, the United States. Funds made available under this notice are subject to the domestic preference requirements of section 70914(a) of the Build America, Buy America Act, Pub. L. 117-58, div. G, tit. IX, subtitle A, 135 Stat. 429, 1298 (2021). The Department expects all applicants to comply with this requirement.

Compliance with Federal Law and Policies

Except where prohibited by court order, the applicant assures and certifies, with respect to any application and awarded Project under this NOFO, that it will comply with all applicable Federal laws, regulations, executive orders, policies, guidelines, and requirements as they relate to the application, acceptance, and use of Federal funds.

Federal Anti-Discrimination

- Except where prohibited by court order, pursuant to Section 3(b)(iv)(a) of Executive Order 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, as a condition of grant award, each Recipient must agree that its compliance in all respects with all applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws is material to the government's payment decisions for purposes of section 3729(b)(4) of title 31, United States Code.
- Except where prohibited by court order, pursuant to Section 3(b)(iv)(B) of Executive Order 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, as a condition of grant award, each Recipient must certify that it does not operate any programs promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives that violate any applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws.

To the extent a court order bars the implementation or enforcement of one or more of these conditions with respect to a particular applicant or recipient, the Department will not implement or enforce the relevant condition(s) against that applicant or recipient for as long as the order remains in place.

2. REPORTING

i. Progress Reporting on Grant Activities

Each applicant selected for PIDP grant funding must submit quarterly progress reports and Federal Financial Reports (SF-425) to monitor project progress and ensure accountability and financial transparency in the PIDP.

ii. Performance Reporting

Each applicant selected for PIDP grant funding must collect and report to MARAD information on the project's performance based on performance indicators MARAD identifies related to program goals and other information as requested by MARAD. Performance indicators should include measurable goals or targets that MARAD will use internally to determine whether the project meets program goals, and grant funds achieve the intended long-term outcomes of the PIDP. To the extent possible, performance indicators used in the reporting should align with the measures included in the application and should relate to at least one of the selection criteria defined in the Criteria section. Performance reporting continues for several years after project construction is completed, and MARAD does not provide PIDP grant funding specifically for performance reporting. PIDP grant performance measures are posted on the program website.

iii. Program Evaluation

As a condition of grant award, PIDP grant recipients may be required to participate in an evaluation undertaken by DOT or another agency or partner. The evaluation may take different forms such as an implementation assessment across grant recipients, an impact and/or outcomes analysis of all or selected sites within or across grant recipients, or a benefit/cost analysis or assessment of return on investment. DOT may require applicants to collect data elements to aid the evaluation. As a part of the evaluation, as a condition of award, grant recipients must agree to: (1) make records available to the evaluation contractor; (2) provide access to program records, and any other relevant documents to calculate costs and benefits; (3) in the case of an impact analysis, facilitate the access to relevant information as requested; and (4) follow evaluation procedures as specified by the evaluation contractor or DOT staff.

Recipients and subrecipients are also encouraged to incorporate program evaluation including associated data collection activities from the outset of their program design and implementation to meaningfully document and measure the effectiveness of their projects and strategies. Title I of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 (Evidence Act), Pub. L. No. 115-435 (2019) urges Federal awarding agencies and Federal assistance recipients and subrecipients to use program evaluation as a critical tool to learn and to elevate program service and delivery across the program lifecycle. Evaluation means "an assessment using systematic data collection and analysis of one or more programs, policies, and organizations intended to assess their effectiveness and efficiency" (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 311). For grant recipients, evaluation expenses are allowable costs (either as direct or indirect), unless prohibited by statute or regulation, and such expenses may include the personnel and equipment needed for data infrastructure and expertise in data analysis, performance, and evaluation (2 CFR part 200). Credible program evaluation activities are implemented with relevance and utility, rigor, independence and objectivity, transparency, and ethics. (OMB Circular A-11, Part 6 Section 290).

iv. Reporting of Matters Related to Recipient Integrity and Performance

If the total value of a selected applicant's currently active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts from all Federal awarding agencies exceeds \$10,000,000 for any period of time during the period of performance of this Federal award, then the applicant during that period of time must maintain the currency of information reported to the SAM that is made available in FAPIIS about civil, criminal, or administrative proceedings described in paragraph 2

of Appendix XII of 2 CFR part 200. This is a statutory requirement under Section 872 of Public Law 110–417, as amended (41 U.S.C. § 2313). As required by Section 3010 of Public Law 111–212, all information posted in the designated integrity and performance system on or after April 15, 2011, except past performance reviews required for Federal procurement contracts, will be publicly available.

I. FEDERAL AWARD AGENCY CONTACT(S)

For further information concerning this notice please contact the PIDP staff via email at: PIDPgrants@dot.gov, or call Aubrey Parsons at 202–366–8047. A TDD is available for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing at 202–366–3993. In addition, DOT will post answers to questions and requests for clarifications at <https://www.maritime.dot.gov/PIDPgrants>. To ensure applicants receive accurate information about eligibility or the program, the applicant is encouraged to contact MARAD with questions directly, rather than through intermediaries or third parties. MARAD may also conduct debriefs on the PIDP grants selection and award process upon request by unsuccessful applicants.

J. OTHER INFORMATION

1. PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION

All information submitted as part of or in support of any application shall use publicly available data or data that can be made public and methodologies that are accepted by industry practice and standards, to the extent possible. If the applicant submits information that the applicant considers to be a trade secret or confidential commercial or financial information, the applicant must provide that information in a separate document, which the applicant may cross-reference from the application narrative or other portions of the application. For the separate document containing confidential information, the applicant must do the following: (1) state on the cover of that document that it “Contains Confidential Business Information (CBI)”; (2) mark each page that contains confidential information with “CBI”; (3) highlight or otherwise denote the confidential content on each page; and (4) at the end of the document, explain why the information you are submitting is CBI. DOT will protect confidential information complying with these requirements to the extent required under applicable law. If DOT receives a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for the information that the applicant has marked in accordance with this section, DOT will follow the procedures described in its FOIA regulations at 49 CFR 7.29. Only information that is in the separate document, marked in accordance with this section, and ultimately determined to be confidential under Section 7.29 will be exempt from disclosure under FOIA.

2. PUBLICATION AND SHARING OF APPLICATION INFORMATION

Following the completion of the selection process and announcement of awards, MARAD intends to publish a list of all applications received along with the names of the applicant organizations and funding amounts requested. Except for the information properly marked as described in Section J.1, MARAD may make application narratives publicly available or share application information within the Department or with other Federal agencies if the Department determines that sharing is relevant to the respective program’s objectives.

+++++

Issued in Washington D.C. on March 25, 2026

By Order of the Maritime Administrator