# REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #2026-CCS-02-UPDATED

Carbon Sequestration Characterization Study — Northwest Oregon-

Questions and Responses

08-14-2026

1. **Is there a revised budget range for the updated proposal?**

   Bidders should develop their proposed budget based on the scope of work and responsibilities described in the revised RFP. Work assigned to IRT should not be included.

2. **Deliverables in Tasks 2, 3, and 4 are dependencies that guide uncertainties in other tasks. What is IRT's intended timing of completion for Tasks 2, 3, and 4?**

   IRT anticipates completing its subsurface scope within approximately three months.

3. **QA/QC is normally required before Task 2, 3, and 4 deliverables can be used as input in the other tasks. Should bids continue to submit QA/QC under Tasks 2, 3, and 4 as deliverables, as part of collaboration with IRT? Alternatively, should proposers submit QA/QC for Task 2, 3, and 4 deliverables as methods within the other relevant tasks, or does NW Natural anticipate a separate Task for data review?**

   IRT will be responsible for QA/QC of its work. IRT welcomes additional technical review and QA/QC input from the selected consultant as part of a collaborative working relationship. The selected consultant should review and integrate IRT's outputs, as appropriately, to support completion of the remaining scope.

4. **Task 2 included Gap Analysis which is a core dependency in Tasks 5 and 6. "Build GIS database" is now removed from the scope for IRT under Task 2, and descriptions elsewhere indicate data compilation will only include proprietary data. Does the IRT scope include non-proprietary data integration and gap analysis, or should bids propose Gap Analysis as part of Task 2, or integrate into Tasks 5 and 6?**

   IRT will address subsurface data gaps analysis within its scope of NW Natural proprietary information. Additional Gap Analysis input from the selected consultant is expected as part of the collaborative working relationship.

5. **Can a list of the deliverables and information developed by IRT be shared to inform execution plan? Also, is there a schedule duration that IRT is considering to complete the Task 2 thru 4 such that we can reference and understand when the information and associated deliverables are complete to use for the execution Task 5 thru 7**

IRT plans to present maps, cross-sections, and high level screening reports of CO2 simulation models to the consultant and NW Natural. IRT intends to take 3 months to complete the sub-surface project work.

6. **In what format will IRT present the results of Tasks 2, 3, and 4 for development of the MRV?**

   IRT will present maps, cross-sections, and high-level screening reports of CO2 simulation models to the consultant and NW Natural.

7. **How will IRT develop the geological data and present it to allow development of well designs, plume sizing, and monitoring networks for CAPEX development?**

   IRT will create a 3d static model characterizing the target reservoirs. The results will be incorporated into a regional play fairway concept to present the most favorable areas for potential CO2 injection.

8. **With the concerns around intellectual property, how will NW Natural/IRT provide the information necessary to prepare the CAPEX data and develop the regulatory framework for permitting that is highly based on geologic data and final development sizing?**

   Under NDA, IRT will provide the necessary subsurface information to support the selected consultant's development of CAPEX estimates and the regulatory framework for permitting.

9. **After completing Task 2 thru 4, Will IRT remain involved through the execution of the overall project, including during the execution of the remaining tasks that are out of their scope? If so, please explain the level involvement and availability expected in this support role (i.e. weekly meetings, workshops etc.)**

   IRT will not be responsible for the execution or oversee the completion of tasks 5 thru 13 by the consultant. However, IRT does expect to involve the consultant with bi-weekly meetings and data deliverables during IRT's project work in Tasks 1-4

10. **What additional proposer information and certifications are required for submittal? Is this bullet in reference to the minority-owned, women-owned, disadvantaged, or emerging small business?**

    Bidders should provide general company information and any certifications relevant to the scope of work. Minority-owned, women-owned, disadvantaged, or emerging small business certifications may be provided but are not required for submittal.

11. **Is the MSA that is in place sufficient for the NDA due to the confidentiality clause or is a separate NDA required for the project?**

    A separate NW Natural bilateral NDA is required for this project.

12. **Based on Question 1 response, NW Natural is conducting a separate study for capture and transport cost. However, Tasks 7 includes CO2 supply and transport analysis, and Task 8 includes a TEA. Can NW clarify how the Tasks 7 and 8 will coordinate with NW's cost analysis. For example, will NW provide transport scenarios to analyze for design basis. Will the selected contractor coordinate with the cost study contractor, who will share cost data for input to the TEA study? Alternatively, please also clarify if the TEA in Task 8 is limited to storage only, not transport.**

    NW Natural may provide relevant information from its separate capture and transport work if available within the project timeline. The selected consultant should independently evaluate applicable transport scenarios and associated costs as part of Tasks 7 and 8. The TEA is not intended to be limited to storage and should incorporate the applicable transportation costs and assumptions.

13. **Can NW Natural provide additional guidance regarding the anticipated level of coordination between IRT and the selected consultant (e.g., recurring technical workshops, review meetings, shared deliverables, participation in client presentations, contribution to final reports)?**

    IRT and the selected consultant, are expected to work collaboratively throughout the project, including technical workshops, review and feedback on relevant work products, and regular project status meetings. Each party will be responsible for its respective deliverables, with joint presentations and deliverables where the scopes are integrated.

14. **Can we assume that the storage complex scenarios for saline and basalt storage will be developed by IRT, since they have access to data and models.**

    IRT will provide the subsurface reservoir characterization and modeling based on the data supplied by NW Natural, working collaboratively with the selected consultant to incorporate their technical expertise in developing the saline and basalt storage scenarios.

15. **Since Tasks 2, 3, and 4 will be performed by IRT, please clarify whether the GIS database deliverable (see Task 11 scope) will be developed by IRT, jointly developed, or is expected to be produced by the RFP awardee.**

    A GIS database will not be required as part of Task 11. The consultant should develop maps and other geospatial outputs necessary to support the applicable tasks.

16. **Should the selected consultant independently develop the site ranking and decision framework under Task 11, or is IRT expected to provide technical input that will serve as the basis for the decision matrix and development roadmap?**

    IRT will provide the subsurface characterization and high level injection screening parameters required for the consultant to complete the site ranking and decision framework under Task 11

17. **Will IRT provide technical documentation regarding identified data gaps, storage uncertainty, injectivity limitations, and characterization needs to support development of the permitting roadmap and Class VI decision gates?**

    Yes, IRT will document and provide data gaps and uncertainties associated with the subsurface portion of the study. The selected consultant will identify additional data gaps related to surface and permitting requirements, coordinating with IRT as needed

18. **Can it be assumed that IRT will provide data on CO2 storage subsurface parameters: injection reservoirs, caprocks, depths, pressure and CO2 saturation, wellhead/bottomhole injection pressures, number of injection wells, well specifications, and area of review.**

    IRT will develop screening-level injectivity and storage performance analyses, including estimates of storage capacity, injectivity constraints, containment risks, and other relevant subsurface data requirements. Modeling conditions and assumptions will be developed in collaboration with the selected consultant.

19. **Options Task 12 and 13 - Will IRT also provide geologic data for the larger areas for this or is this to be collected by the consultants?**

    IRT's Tasks 2–4 will focus on the Oregon study area. For the Washington optional scope, the consultant should leverage IRT's Oregon mode for all the tasks under their scope, assess its applicability to Washington geology, and identify additional data or analysis needed to validate assumptions.

20. **Please clarify roles and responsibilities for GIS data management and delivery. Specifically, is IRT responsible for the final GIS data package (Task 11)? How will geospatial data generated under Tasks 7 and 8 be incorporated into IRT-led efforts, and which entity is responsible for reconciliation, QA/QC, and final delivery of the GIS dataset?**

    A GIS database will not be required. The consultant should develop maps and other geospatial outputs necessary to support the applicable tasks 7 and 8.

21. **Will an estimate of schedule be provided for Tasks 2,3,4 by IRT, or should one be assumed for the purposes of this proposal?**

    IRT intends to take 3 months to complete the sub-surface project work. Coordination at the beginning of the work is required to develop an integrated implementation plan

22. **Is the contractor expected to provide oversight and quality control management of Tasks 2, 3, and 4, or assume that IRT will manage this work and associated deliverables**

**(Including interim memos)? What level of peer review and QAQC is expected from the contractor for these Tasks?**

The selected consultant is not expected to provide oversight or formal QA/QC of IRT's subsurface work. However, technical coordination, review, and feedback from the selected consultant is expected as part of the collaborative development of Tasks 1–4.

23. **We understand that IRT's involvement is in part due to comply with NW Natural's proprietary data protection requirements. Should we assume that Optional scopes 12 and 13 will be considered in the IRT delivery of Tasks 2,3, and 4? (E.g. will public data from historical wells drilled in Washington be considered in IRT's investigation?)**

    IRT's Tasks 2–4 will focus on the Oregon study area. For the Washington optional scope, the consultant should leverage IRT's Oregon mode for all tasks under their scope, assess its applicability to Washington geology, and identify additional data or analysis needed to validate assumptions. Proposers should quote each optional task separately and include the applicable work needed to complete the optional scope.

24. **Have the potential CCS project locations been pre-determined?**

    No specific CCS project locations have been predetermined. IRT will evaluate the available subsurface data and develop a 3D static model to identify the most favorable areas for potential CO2 injection.

25. **Q&A #1 notes transport and capture costs are being developed through a separate NW Natural pilot. Will that pilot's transport cost basis and $CO_2$ stream specifications be available so Task 7 concept and Task 8 storage economics integrate cleanly?**

    Relevant information from NW Natural's separate work may be provided if available within the project timeline. The selected consultant should evaluate the applicable transport scenarios, costs, and CO2 stream assumptions needed for the analysis.

26. **Are there existing Mist-area corridors, rights-of-way, or surface facilities from existing gas-storage operations that a $CO_2$ gathering and injection system could co-locate with to reduce cost and permitting footprint?**

    Yes. Depending on the location, NW Natural can provide maps of existing easements for consideration.

27. **Q&A #23 frames the TEA as a comparison against other decarbonization pathways (RNG, hydrogen, synthetic methane). Will NW Natural share the cost metrics and assumptions it uses for those alternatives (e.g., $/tonne $CO_2$e or $/MMBtu) so our levelized cost of storage is presented on a comparable basis?**

    NW Natural will provide relevant cost metrics and assumptions for other decarbonization pathways where available**.**