CASCADIA SUSTAINABLE AVIATION ACCELERATOR
PNW Feedstock Value Model & Technology Viability Roadmap
CSAA-RFI-2026-01

DATE: June 17, 2026

SUBJECT: Request for Information (RFI) – PNW Feedstock Supply, Pathway Viability, and SAF Deployment

Description

The Cascadia Sustainable Aviation Accelerator (CSAA) is issuing this Request for Information (RFI) to gather input from potential sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) feedstock growers, aggregators, conversion technology developers, infrastructure operators, investors, researchers, policy makers, and other relevant parties affected by or interested in the development of SAF supply chains in the broader Pacific Northwest (PNW).

Responses will directly inform the Washington Feedstock Value Model (FVM) and the Feedstock & Technology Viability Report and Roadmap (FTVR), two coordinated workstreams that will produce a delivered-cost model and a technology-pathway readiness assessment for SAF in the PNW.

Background

CSAA is a public/private partnership aiming to radically accelerate the transition to low-cost, high-quality SAF across the PNW prioritizing local feedstocks. CSAA is supported by Washington State, aviation end-users, research institutions, Tribal partners, and industry. CSAA operates through five pillars: *research and development, policy and advocacy, financing, feedstocks, and infrastructure.*

Under the Feedstocks pillar, CSAA is producing two linked deliverables:

- Feedstock Value Model (FVM) — a transparent, adaptable model that translates Washington feedstock supply into delivered-cost metrics and pathway-level business cases, answering whether Washington feedstocks can be aggregated and delivered to an intermediate depot or conversion gate at a price that supports SAF pathway economics, and under what conditions.
- Feedstock & Technology Viability Report and Roadmap (FTVR) — a prioritization of regional feedstocks, a Technology Readiness Level (TRL) and Commercial Readiness Index (CRI) assessment of conversion pathways, and a near-, mid-, and long-term adoption roadmap for the Pacific Northwest. Covered feedstocks include dominant feedstocks in the region.

The geographic focus for these deliverables is currently WA, OR, ID, and MT. Analysis will be expanded to BC with a separate RFI in the future. Covered feedstocks currently include *woody biomass (predicted woody residues based on harvested woody biomass data, orchard residues), agricultural waste (e.g., wheat residues, barley residues), seed oils (canola), alcohols (ethanol, methanol), municipal solid waste (rubbish/garbage), and wet wastes (e.g., food, dairy manures, sewage sludge).* Covered “pathways” include conversion pathways that are currently ASTM-approved or in the near-term pipeline, as well as paths to 100% SAF.

Purpose

The purpose of this RFI is to gather grounded, grower/aggregator/operator-level input on: (a) the real economics and logistics of feedstock supply in Washington and the PNW; (b) the viability, economics, and readiness of conversion pathways under regional conditions; (c) policy and financing mechanisms most likely to accelerate deployment; (d) data gaps and uncertainties the study should prioritize; and (e) format and cadence requirements that will make the FVM and TVR outputs actually useful in respondents' decision-making.

Responses to this RFI will be used to refine model inputs, calibrate scenarios, prioritize site visits and follow-up interviews, and inform recommendations to PNW State decision-makers and SAF project sponsors. This is solely a request for information and not a solicitation for proposals.

Disclaimer and Important Notes

This RFI is not a solicitation for proposals; CSAA is not accepting applications at this time. Responding to this RFI does not provide any advantage or disadvantage in any future CSAA or partner solicitation. CSAA will not reimburse costs incurred in responding.

Information provided by respondents to this RFI may be used by CSAA and its research partners on a non-attribution basis for analysis, modeling, strategy development and other purposes. The content of responses will be used without attribution unless you expressly authorize attribution. Aggregated and anonymized findings may be referenced in the published FVM, FTVR, and associated communications. CSAA is under no obligation to acknowledge receipt of or provide feedback on individual submissions, and a response to this RFI does not bind CSAA or the respondent to any further action.

Confidential Business Information

CSAA is subject to public disclosure laws. Respondents who wish to submit information they believe to be confidential and exempt from public disclosure should clearly mark the relevant pages with "Confidential" and clearly define the confidential content using [ ], and, where practical, provide a redacted non-confidential version alongside the full submission. CSAA will treat marked confidential information accordingly, and will limit access to research staff and contracted analysts under appropriate confidentiality obligations to the extent allowed by law.

Request for Information Categories and Questions

Respondents are not required to answer every question. Please respond to Category 1 as well as any questions on which you can offer an informed perspective. Where a question references "feedstock," "technology," or "specific pathway," please specify the feedstock(s), technology(ies), or pathway(s) you are responding about.

Category 1: Respondent Background and Sector Experience

1.1 What is your direct experience with feedstocks, SAF, or SAF pathways in the broader Pacific Northwest? Please describe your operation, role in the supply chain, geographic footprint, and approximate annual volumes handled or produced.

Category 2: Feedstock Economics and Market Position *[Current or potential feedstock growers/aggregators, please prioritize questions within this section]*

2.1 How is your "feedstock" currently treated, financially, in your operation — is it a disposal cost you are paying to remove, a free or low-value byproduct, or a revenue-generating product sold into existing markets?

2.2 If your "feedstock" is sold, at what delivered price (or range of prices) per [ton / gallon / bushel] would supplying SAF markets be economically attractive for your operation?

2.3 If your "feedstock" is sold, what factors shape whom you sell to?

2.4 What environmental or sustainability concerns (e.g., soil health, forest health, water use, land-use change, community impacts) affect the availability or viability of your "feedstock," and how is your operation addressing those concerns today?

2.5 If you currently have a market outlet for this "feedstock," is that market growing or shrinking? What is driving the trajectory and variability?

2.6 What would incentivize you to become part of the SAF value chain and what share of your potentially available "feedstock" could realistically be redirected to SAF over the next 3, 5, and 10 years, assuming favorable economics?

2.7 In order to grow your supply of this "feedstock" for SAF, how would that affect your business from a capital and operating standpoint (e.g., equipment, land, labor, contracts, working capital, permitting)?

Category 3: Supply Chain — Logistics, Quality, and Preprocessing

3.1 What haul distances and modes (truck, rail, barge) are realistic for this "specific feedstock" supply, and where do current logistics constraints (driver shortages, rail access and pricing, seasonal road restrictions, port capacity) pose challenges for deliveries?

3.2 What aggregation, handling, and storage steps does this "specific feedstock" require between source and an intermediate depot or conversion-facility gate, and roughly what does each of those steps cost today?

3.3 What quality variability do you see in this "specific feedstock" across seasons, sites, or batches — including moisture, ash, contamination, oil content, or other relevant specifications?

3.4 What preprocessing would your "feedstock" need to meet conversion-pathway specifications, and who currently performs that step in the supply chain (producer, aggregator, third party, conversion operator)?

Category 4: Pathway Viability, Technology Readiness, and Carbon Intensity

4.1 How do you assess the viability and readiness of "specific pathways" in the PNW context — including feedstock fit, "technology" maturity, expected capital and operating cost profile, and permitting and siting realities?

4.2 What feedstock-supply or pathway risks would you need to see priced or mitigated before considering a PNW SAF facility investable (e.g., feedstock contract structure and duration, offtake, policy duration, "technology" performance guarantees)?

4.3 What references, methodologies, or frameworks do you use to estimate or report carbon intensity (CI) for this "feedstock" or "specific pathway" (e.g., GREET, CORSIA defaults, CARB LCFS pathways, ISCC, proprietary LCA)? Where do you see the most material uncertainty in those estimates?

4.4 Which carbon-intensity framework would you recommend policymakers adopt for this "feedstock" or "specific pathway"? (GREET, CORSIA defaults, CARB LCFS pathways, ISCC, proprietary LCA, or others.)

4.5 What are the biggest constraints or competing uses currently affecting the mobilization of this "feedstock" for SAF in Washington and the PNW?

Category 5: Policy, Financing, and Public Investment

5.1 What policy or financing mechanisms (e.g., state SAF tax credit, low-carbon fuel standard design, feedstock incentives, loan guarantees, offtake support, infrastructure cost-share) would most accelerate deployment in the PNW?

5.2 Of the constraints you named in Category 4, which are most policy-actionable at the state level, and where would you expect the highest impact per dollar of public investment?

Category 6: Study Design, Data Gaps, and Output Usability

6.1 What data gaps or uncertainties should this study prioritize closing — and which would most change your own decisions if resolved?

6.2 This work will produce a delivered-cost model (FVM) and a feedstock/technology viability roadmap (FTVR). What would make those outputs useful to you: format (e.g., interactive model, static report, dashboard), level of detail (e.g., county-level, basin-level, facility-level), and update cadence?

6.3 Who else in this space should we be talking to — and is there anyone we should not approach, or should approach carefully (e.g., for relationship, confidentiality, or political reasons)?

6.4 Have you or your organization been a part of similar feedstock viability studies, supply chain assessments, or SAF pathway analyses in the past for the PNW region? If so, can you share relevant findings, data or lessons learned to inform this work?

Category 7: Other

7.1 CSAA invites any additional feedback not captured above related to PNW feedstock supply, SAF pathway viability, infrastructure, policy, financing, or community engagement.

Response Guidelines

Responses to this RFI should be submitted electronically to info@cascadia.com no later than 5:00 PM (Pacific Time) on July 8, 2026. Responses should be provided as a Microsoft Word (.docx) or PDF attachment, no more than 5 pages in length, 11- or 12-point font, with one-inch margins. Supporting data, spreadsheets, or supplemental references may be attached separately and are not counted against the page limit.

Please identify your answers by responding to specific questions or topics. Respondents may answer as many or as few questions as they wish. CSAA will not respond to individual submissions or publish a compendium of responses.

Respondents are requested to provide the following information at the start of their response:

- Organization name and brief description
- Primary contact name, title, address, phone number, and e-mail address
- Relevant geography of operations (counties, states, provinces)
- Whether any portion of the response is marked confidential, and if so, which sections
- Whether CSAA may follow up with the respondent for clarification or a structured interview

Contact and Questions

Questions about this RFI may be directed to:

Cascadia Sustainable Aviation Accelerator — Feedstocks Workstream RFI

Email: info@cascadia.com

This is a Request for Information (RFI) only. Cascadia Sustainable Aviation Accelerator (CSAA) will not pay for information provided under this RFI, and no project will be supported as a result of this RFI. This RFI is not a solicitation for proposals and is not accepting applications for financial assistance or financial incentives.