

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

**Cascadia Region Sustainable Aviation Fuel
Infrastructure Breakpoint Analysis & Solution Packages**

Issued by	Cascadia Sustainable Aviation Accelerator (Cascadia)
RFP number	IN004
Issue date	4/3/2026
Proposals due	EOD 4/24/2026
Submit proposals to	liz@cascadiaaccelerator.org

Primary contact: Liz Gill, PM, Cascadia Sustainable Aviation Accelerator | liz@cascadiaaccelerator.org

Note: Cascadia may request clarifications, conduct interviews, or negotiate scope with one or more finalists prior to award.
Cascadia reserves the right to reject any or all proposals.

Contents

1. Purpose and Overview 3

2. Inputs Provided 3

3. Questions to Answer 4

4. Deliverables 4

5. Schedule, Budget, and Payments 5

6. Proposer Qualifications 5

7. Proposal Submission Requirements 6

1. Purpose and Overview

The Cascadia Sustainable Aviation Accelerator (CSAA) is soliciting proposals from **qualified engineering and infrastructure advisory organizations or research institutions** to perform the Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF) Infrastructure Breakpoint Analysis & Solution Packages project in support of a regional SAF infrastructure study for the Cascadia region. This engagement will use current-state infrastructure and SAF scale-up scenarios (provided by Cascadia) to identify location-specific infrastructure breakpoints. After the breakpoints have been identified, the project team will develop and evaluate a set of costed solution options to address each breakpoint. Following the completion of the scope of work defined in this RFP, the project output will be validated and refined by expert infrastructure stakeholders in the region. Ultimately the findings from this project will provide the basis for a roadmap of recommended regional infrastructure interventions to enable and accelerate SAF production and adoption in Cascadia, including informing investment prioritization.

Item	Details
Scope solicited	Infrastructure breakpoint analysis & solution options development/evaluation
Estimated duration	2–3 months
Budget	\$150,000
Geography	Cascadia region (WA, OR, ID, MT) with Washington State as a primary focus, with infrastructure focus on getting SAF to major state airports
Roles	CSAA (program lead and decision authority, reviews progress and); selected contractor (execution and delivery)

2. Inputs Provided

CSAA will provide input materials to the selected contractor to enable the project based on analysis that is currently taking place, and we are committed to supporting targeted additions or formatting changes to improve usability of these inputs based on feedback from the selected contractor, subject to schedule. The two input materials that will be provided are:

- **XLSX file: A current-state infrastructure inventory** spanning the Cascadia region that covers the primary infrastructure nodes for transporting and storing SAF (and its feedstocks) along the value chain to help it get to major airports where it can be used. Note, the inventory may include infrastructure nodes that may not currently be used to transport/store SAF today but could be in the future (e.g., a petroleum products pipeline). All sources and assumptions used to populate the inventory will be clearly cited. This inventory will include data on both stationary and mobile infrastructure:
 - a. Stationary infrastructure types covered in the current-state inventory are expected to include (non-exhaustive): maritime ports, airports, fuel production/refinery sites, fuel blending terminals, fuel storage sites, feedstock pre-processing sites, feedstock storage sites, and freight rail stations. As applicable, data on stationary infrastructure nodes will

include: the owning company, location data, volume/capacity, and how/how much fuel or feedstocks are transported to/from the node.

- b. Mobile infrastructure types covered in the current-state inventory are expected to include (non-exhaustive): petroleum products pipelines, road network, freight rail network, and maritime import routes. As applicable, data on mobile infrastructure nodes will include: location/network data (GIS file) transport mode characteristics, and available capacity or throughput metrics (e.g., gallons per day for a pipeline, railcar capacity, or vessel/barge capacity for a pipeline).

2. **XLSX file: A set of three SAF scale-up scenarios (low, moderate, and high SAF production growth)** that define potential pathways for increasing SAF production in the region from 2025-2035. Each scale-up scenario will start with the same initial SAF production estimate for the Cascadia region in 2025 but will diverge in the subsequent years based on different production trajectories. All scenarios will be refined based on input from regional SAF infrastructure experts, and the assumptions/rationale for each will be included. The file provided will include annual figures for total SAF production in gallons for all years across each scenario in this 10-year timespan.

3. Questions to Answer

This project is intended to answer the following question, clearly and defensibly:

What stationary and mobile infrastructure node gaps and breakpoints must be addressed (where, by when, owned/operated by whom, and at what estimated cost) to enable the low, moderate, and high SAF scale-up scenarios in the Cascadia region?

More specifically, the project should answer:

1. Where do the scale-up scenarios break the current SAF value chain/infrastructure system and in what way (e.g., capacity shortfalls, operational constraints, commercial limitations, etc.)?
2. What infrastructure solution options exist to address each major breakpoint, and what are their estimated cost ranges, timelines, dependencies, risks, and expected impacts?
3. What overall portfolio of infrastructure solution options (“packages”) is required/best to enable each scenario (low/base/high), and what is the total estimated cost range for each package?

4. Deliverables

This project is limited to the SAF Infrastructure Breakpoint Analysis & Solution Packages project. The selected contractor is not expected to recreate the current-state infrastructure inventory or scale-up scenarios. The project requires analysis of gaps and solutions built on top of those inputs.

We welcome additional detail in responses to this RFP, but we expect the deliverables to be roughly as follows:

Deliverable	Description
D1. Breakpoint and solution options database (XLSX)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location-aligned Cascadia SAF infrastructure breakpoints/gaps, including detail on how the magnitude of the breakpoint/gap changes across scale-up scenarios. • Detailed solution options mapped to address each breakpoint, including (as applicable) location, dependencies, estimated cost range, time to implement, likely owners/operators/partners, risk and feasibility profile (regulatory/permitting/social), and expected impact (e.g., throughput enabled, capacity/reliability improvements). Where feasible, provide a cost-per-unit-impact metric to support comparisons.
D2. Scenario-aligned solution packages (XLSX + short memo)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three proposed packages of infrastructure solutions: one each to meet the low, medium, and high scale-up scenarios. Packages to include total cost ranges and clear justifications for selection of the solutions in each.
D3. Summary deck (PPTX)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concise summary of major breakpoints, top infrastructure solution options (including no-regrets candidates), solution packages, comments on risk/feasibility, and observations/implications/conclusions from the project

5. Schedule, Budget, and Payments

The estimated timeframe for this project is 2–3 months, with a likely start in mid-May 2026. Proposers should include a detailed timeline for project execution, and clear justification for any adjustments to this timeframe. If a longer overall timeframe is proposed, make clear what portion of the work can be achieved within 2-3 months. The budget for this project is approximately \$150,000. Proposers may put forward an alternate price with rationale included. An indicative payment schedule is as follows:

- 30% upon acceptance of D1 (Breakpoint and solution options database)
- 40% upon acceptance of D2 (Scenario-aligned solution packages)
- 30% upon acceptance of D3 (Summary deck)

6. Proposer Qualifications

Strong proposals will demonstrate technical credibility in fuels infrastructure in the Cascadia region and the ability to produce decision-grade cost estimates. Additional relevant experience includes:

- Fuel logistics and infrastructure experience (ports, refineries, terminals/tanks, rail/barge/truck, pipelines, etc.)
- Schedule development/high-level project scoping for comparable infrastructure projects, and ability to document assumptions transparently.
- Understanding of permitting/regulatory risks and typical constraints in the Pacific Northwest
- Experience translating technical options into decision-ready comparisons (impact vs feasibility, cost-per-impact, cost-benefit analysis).

- Ability to work with data involving assumptions and uncertainties to provide confidence ranges and sensitivities.

7. Proposal Submission Requirements

Please submit one PDF proposal of no more than 10 pages of content (excluding title page and team member bios/resumes) to liz@cascadiaaccelerator.org by EOD on April 24th.

All proposals should cover:

1. Executive summary
2. Project needs and objectives
3. Method/approach, including path to each deliverable and data organization/transparency practices
4. Detailed project timeline with key dates and milestones
5. Project management approach
6. Team composition and roles
7. Pricing broken down by deliverable (or otherwise if work is divided up differently)
8. Project delivery risks and mitigation actions
9. Relevant project experience (and references, as appropriate)
10. Conflict disclosure: proposers must disclose any relationships that could bias findings (e.g., formal business links to fuel infrastructure owners/operators, developers, or suppliers).
11. **Appendix:** Full team bios or resumes

Proposals will be evaluated using a best-value approach, considering (non-exhaustive) technical approach and credibility, relevant experience, team strength, and cost reasonableness/value.