



26-RRRC-RFP-01

**Identifying Opportunities to Improve
Contaminated Site Closure Outcomes in
Alberta** - Evidence-Based Review of Tools,
Pathways, and Decision Processes and Practical
Implementation Opportunities

BUDGET: \$80,000¹

RFP PUBLICATION DATE: MAY 1, 2026

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE: JUNE 17, 2026 (5:00 PM MT)

¹ Budget is an upper cap.
Proponents are encouraged to submit competitive pricing.

1. Background and Rationale

Alberta's policy for contaminated sites provides the framework for assessment, remediation, closure, and long-term management of contaminated sites associated with upstream oil and gas development. While the underlying policy framework is well established, in practice there can be uncertainty and inefficiency in navigating closure pathways, with some sites having unnecessarily low regulatory confidence in achieving contamination closure. Additionally, regular users of the framework have identified limited regulatory flexibility to allow more site-specific considerations and pragmatic consideration of probable risk to receptors.

Alberta's remediation framework is primarily focused on achieving prescribed guideline criteria, which can limit recognition of sites where risks to human health and the environment have been appropriately assessed and managed through risk-based approaches. However, sites managed through Risk Management or Exposure Control are not eligible for regulatory closure. Additionally, there are sites where source removal has been completed but residual contamination remains (e.g., in bedrock), and conventional remediation is no longer practicable. Clear and consistent pathways to closure for these sites remain uncertain. Therefore, regulatory flexibility could support appropriate case closure where site-specific risks have been demonstrably addressed.

These challenges include varying professional interpretation of evidence requirements, uncertainty around assessment and closure decision points, rework required for closure submissions, over conservatism in selecting remedial endpoints, delays in progressing sites through closure pathways, and monitoring expectations for sites not eligible for closure. Collectively, these issues can increase costs, extend timelines, and limit the ability to return sites to productive use.

2. Benefits to Albertans

The outcomes of this project are expected to provide direct value to Albertans by improving predictability, consistency, and efficiency in closure-related decision-making. By clarifying expectations and standardizing key elements of closure pathways, the project will support more timely and defensible progression toward site closure and productive reuse.

- Reduce over-remediation
- Improved ability to plan and progress toward closure through clearer decision points and reduced rework, which may support more efficient timelines
- Greater predictability in long-term liability management
- Improved alignment between technical evidence and regulatory decision-making
- The project may identify opportunities that could trigger future policy or regulatory changes, without prescribing specific amendments

3. Research Objectives

The objective of this project is to identify practical, evidence-based opportunities to improve efficiency and consistency of contaminated site closure approaches. This includes level-setting what is currently defined as closure in Alberta, with a focus on improving implementation efficiency, decision clarity, and enabling proportionate, risk-based closure where appropriate.

The project shall focus on identifying:

- Where the current system creates delays, rework, or uncertainty and why
- What practical improvements can be implemented within or alongside existing frameworks
- Which proven approaches from other jurisdictions could enhance Alberta's system

The work shall remain focused on implementation and outcomes, not policy redesign.

The proponent shall deliver an evaluation that identifies how Alberta can improve closure outcomes, structured around the following objectives:

A. Characterize Alberta's Current Closure System

Conduct a high-level, practitioner-focused review of contaminated site closure in Alberta, including:

- Current closure tools, pathways, and regulatory mechanisms
- Typical closure workflows and decision points
- Common barriers, inefficiencies, and sources of rework or delay
- Challenges associated with progressing sites toward closure, including technically constrained sites (e.g., bedrock, peatlands, residual contamination)

This review should be high-level and focused on practical application, not a detailed regulatory analysis.

B. Identify Relevant and Transferable Approaches from Other Jurisdictions

Identify select examples of proven closure tools, pathways, or mechanisms from comparable jurisdictions that may be applicable and add value to Alberta.

- Focus only on beneficial, transferable approaches that improve closure efficiency, clarity, or outcomes
- Do **not** conduct exhaustive jurisdictional comparisons or detailed regulatory mapping
- Consider up to **five relevant jurisdictions**, to be confirmed with the Technical Champion during project initiation
- Highlight specific mechanisms, practices, or frameworks that enable closure in situations where Alberta currently experiences delays or limitations and identify regulatory, technical, and policy approaches that support improved closure and productive reuse outcomes

The intent is to identify **what works elsewhere that could realistically improve Alberta's system**, not to document all differences.

C. Evaluate Closure Outcomes, Pathways, and Barriers in Alberta Using Available Data

Undertake a targeted, evidence-based analysis to:

- Analyze publicly available AER data and/or relevant industry-supplied data to quantify high level closure and productive reuse outcomes
- Evaluate closure pathways across low-, medium-, and high complexity sites, including sites impacted in mineral soils, peatlands, and bedrock.
- Identify common technical, regulatory, and process barriers that prevent sites from progressing efficiently toward closure
- Identify practical, actionable improvements, focused on enabling closure and reducing inefficiencies

Analysis should be fit-for-purpose and insight-driven, not exhaustive.

D. Identify Key Decision and Process Points in Alberta Driving Delay, Rework, Uncertainty, or Limited Practicality of Closure

Map and assess closure processes in Alberta to identify:

- Decision points and process steps along the closure process that contribute to delays, inefficiencies, rework, or regulatory uncertainty
- Limitations to achieving closure for sites where further remediation is not technically feasible or environmentally beneficial. This may include Technically Constrained Sites, such as bedrock-impacted sites, peatlands, or other complex sites, and incorporate considerations related to sustainability objectives and net environmental benefit
- Areas where conservative assumptions or unclear expectations affect outcomes
- Constraints in progressing sites where remediation is no longer practical

Focus on identifying specific, actionable points in the process where improvements would have the greatest impact.

E. Develop Practical, Implementable Recommendations and Decision Support Frameworks

Develop practical, prioritized, and implementable recommendations to improve closure outcomes, including:

- Opportunities to improve efficiency, clarity, and consistency
- Conceptual decision-support frameworks, guidance, or tools to improve consistency and clarity in closure decision-making
- Recommendations that support proportionate, risk-based approaches and reduce unnecessary rework or over-remediation

Outputs must be practical, implementable, and directly usable by industry and regulators.

All outputs of this work must clearly support **actionable improvement opportunities for Alberta**.

4. In Scope

The scope of work includes a structured review of Alberta contaminated site closure options and pathways with an operational focus on efficiency, effectiveness, and decision clarity. The proponent shall prioritize outputs that are implementable and directly usable by industry and regulators.

Data set should seek to capture a range of site types and complexities across Alberta, this includes contaminated sites with impacts in mineral soils, peatlands, and bedrock. The primary target is upstream oil and gas contaminated sites but noting that observations may be transferable to other contaminated sites in Alberta. Additionally, consideration should be given to sites where remediation has reached technical or practical limits, but closure has not been achieved.

The work should focus on those aspects of the closure process that most strongly influence timelines, rework, uncertainty, and long-term liability administration.

The proposal must demonstrate how the work will:

- Identify **specific decision points** where delays or rework occur
- Support proportionate, evidence-based decision-making so the default is not automatically the most conservative approach, reducing the risk of over-remediation

- Provide **practical, implementable improvements** to those decision points
- Translate findings into **clear guidance or tools** usable by industry and regulators

5. Out of Scope

This project is not intended to provide site-specific remediation solutions or to advocate for specific amendments to Alberta’s contaminated sites policy framework. However, the project may identify opportunities that could trigger future policy or regulatory changes. The focus is on identifying and bringing forward practical opportunities to improve closure outcomes, regardless of whether an idea is administrative, technical, or would require future consideration of policy or regulatory implications.

Work that does not directly contribute to practical, implementable guidance and decision-support is considered out of scope.

- Site-specific remediation design or engineering
- Detailed contaminant transport or numerical modelling
- Standalone academic literature reviews
- Drafting specific legislative, regulatory, or formal policy amendments (ideas may identify potential policy/regulatory considerations, but the project is not to propose changes)

6. Specific Deliverables

Deliverables must directly support the objectives above and focus on clear, decision-ready outputs rather than academic analysis.

Deliverable A: Characterization of Alberta’s Current Closure System (Supports Objective A)

Provide a high-level, practitioner-focused summary of contaminated site closure in Alberta.

This shall include:

- Overview of current closure tools, pathways, and regulatory mechanisms in Alberta
- Description of typical closure workflows and key decision points
- Identification of:
 - Common barriers
 - Inefficiencies
 - Sources of rework and delay
- Discussion of challenges associated with technically constrained sites (e.g., bedrock, peatlands, residual contamination)

This deliverable should:

- Focus on how the system works in practice
- Avoid detailed regulatory interpretation
- Clearly identify where the system is not working optimally

Deliverable B: Relevant and Transferable Approaches from Other Jurisdictions (Supports Objective B)

Provide a focused summary of selected comparative jurisdictions and transferable closure approaches.

This shall include:

- Selected examples (up to **five relevant jurisdictions**, confirmed with the Technical Champion) of closure tools, pathways, and mechanisms from:
 - Canada and the United States (primary focus)
 - Other relevant jurisdictions (e.g., Europe, Australia), where applicable
- High-level description of how “closure” is characterized in each jurisdiction, including:
 - Any tiered or graduated closure outcomes
 - Key differences relevant to Alberta
- Identification and benchmarking of:
 - Transferable regulatory, technical, and policy approaches
 - Mechanisms that improve closure efficiency, consistency, or outcomes
 - Approaches aligned with:
 - Net environmental benefit
 - Sustainability objectives
 - Long-term risk management

This deliverable must:

- Be selective and practical, not exhaustive
- Focus only on approaches that could realistically improve Alberta’s system

Deliverable C: Evidence-Based Evaluation of Closure Outcomes, Pathways, and Barriers in Alberta Using Available Data (Supports Objective C)

An evidence-based analysis, supported by clearly documented methodology, of closure outcomes and trends using publicly available AER data and/or industry-supplied data, delivering:

- High-level quantification of closure and productive reuse outcomes, including sites impacted in mineral soils, peatlands, and bedrock; Types of guidelines applied in

closure submissions; Trends related to site type, conceptual site model, guideline application, and closure option selection

- Identification of factors influencing closure success or delay
- Key barriers supported by data insights

Analysis should:

- Be fit-for-purpose and decision-focused
- Provide clear insights, not large datasets or exhaustive analysis

Deliverable D: Key Decision and Process Points in Alberta Driving Delay, Rework, Uncertainty, or Limited Practicality of Closure (Supports Objective D)

Provide a clear and structured assessment of Alberta’s closure process, including:

- Mapping of key decision and process steps
- Identification of:
 - Where delays, rework, and inefficiencies occur
 - Root causes of uncertainty or inconsistency
- Identification of:
 - Constraints for sites where remediation is no longer practical
 - High-impact intervention points for improvement

This deliverable should clearly show:

- **Where improvements should be targeted for maximum impact**

Deliverable E: Practical, Implementable Recommendations and Decision-Support Frameworks (Supports Objective E)

Provide a set of prioritized, practical, and implementable recommendations, including:

i. Low-Risk Closure Clarity

- Provide recommendations on how standardized guidance or screening-based approaches could improve clarity and consistency for sites progressing through lower risk closure pathways, aligned with existing risk-based policy tools
- Where appropriate, consider defining standardized approaches for low severity or low risk sites to improve efficiency while maintaining environmental protection

ii. Medium- and High-Risk Site Progression

- Identify practical options to improve progression of sites requiring more complex assessment or management toward closure

- Consider alternative or adaptive approaches for medium and high risk sites that do not readily meet numeric guideline criteria
- Strategies for technically constrained sites

iii. Decision-Support Tools and Best Practices

- Benchmark and re-capture transferable approaches from other jurisdictions
- Develop conceptual frameworks for:
 - Decision-support tools
 - Guidance documents
 - Best-practice resources that could improve consistency, transparency, and certainty in closure decision-making

These should:

- Improve consistency and transparency
- Reduce rework and uncertainty
- Support risk-based decision-making

Targeted Engagement (If warranted)

- Conduct targeted engagement with other consultants, where necessary, to validate findings and recommendations
- Engagement is intended to inform analysis and recommendations, not to develop or approve policy

7. Success Criteria

Success will be measured by the extent to which the project delivers usable, decision-ready outputs that improve the understanding of the current state and can provide clarity, consistency, and timeliness of closure-related decisions while maintaining a neutral, evidence-based posture. A successful project will result in guidance and tools that reduce rework, improve predictability, and support more efficient progression toward closure and productive reuse. Criteria include:

- Full set of publicly available data as collected for analysis (i.e., appendices for all the data that is collected for analysis)
- Improves clarity of closure definitions and decisions (i.e., clearer standards/decision points in practice).
- Improves consistency of closure decisions (i.e., reduces variability in how tools/pathways are applied).
- Improves timeliness of closure decisions (i.e., supports faster progression through closure pathways).
- Provides practical and usable tools (i.e., implementable guidance and decision-support tools that can be used operationally).

- Maintains a neutral, evidence-based posture (i.e., practical/evidence-based review rather than advocacy or policy revision).
- Improves closure outcomes and administrative certainty (i.e., better outcomes + clearer administration, including long-term liability certainty).
- Identifies efficiency opportunities for consideration, either within the current existing policy or from jurisdictional scan (ideas may identify potential policy/regulatory considerations, but the project is not to propose changes)
- Demonstrates clear pathways to reduce closure timelines and administrative burden
- Supports proportionate, risk-based decision-making and reduces potential for over-remediation
- Identifies viable pathways for sites where closure is currently difficult or stalled
- Produces outputs that can be readily adopted by industry and regulators

Timeline: The project is expected to be completed within six (6) months from the date of contract execution.

Budget: \$80,000 is the upper cap and proponents are encouraged to submit competitive pricing.

8. Proposal Requirements

- Presents information on project team and relevant qualifications/experience.
- Presents a clear understanding of project objectives and deliverables.
- Presents methodology, work plan, timeline and budget.
- Provides proof of insurance.
- Please refer to INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS for more information on Proposal Requirements.



AUPRF 2026 Request for Proposals

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS

MAY 2026

www.ptac.org
Suite 1550,
520 Fifth Avenue SW
Calgary, AB. T2P 3R7

Instructions for Proposal Submissions

AUPRF 2026 RFPs

1 Purpose & Scope

These instructions apply to all competitive solicitations funded by the Alberta Upstream Petroleum Research Fund (AUPRF) and administered by PTAC Petroleum Technology Alliance Canada. They define how Proponents must prepare and submit proposals, how proposals are evaluated, the timelines for decisions and notifications, and key commercial and legal terms applicable to AUPRF-funded projects.

2 Submission – Content Requirements

2.1 Proponent & Company Information

- Legal name and address
- Primary contact name, title, email, and phone
- Brief company overview and relevant services

2.2 Technical Proposal

- Understanding of the problem statement and scope
- Proposed methodology and approach
- Work plan, milestones, and schedule
- Team composition; max 2-page bios/CVs with roles and expertise

2.3 Financial Proposal

- Itemized cost breakdown (e.g., labour categories and rates, materials, travel, subcontractors)
- Proposed milestone-based payment schedule (payments tied to deliverables)
- Leveraged funding

2.4 Formatting and Page Limits

Unless otherwise specified in a particular RFP, no strict page limits apply; include the content necessary to enable a thorough assessment.

3 Submission — Method & Logistics

Submit by email to info@ptac.org with subject line: *AUPRF – RFP ID – Proponent Company Name*.

Proposals submitted by other means will not be accepted.

- **Deadline:** Proposals must be received on or before the RFP deadline indicated in each RFP document; late submissions will not be considered.

- File format: A single combined PDF is preferred, plus any required spreadsheets or forms specified in the RFP.
- Validity: Proposals must remain irrevocable and open for acceptance for 90 days from the submission deadline.
- Questions & FAQs: Refer to the AUPRF call for proposals landing page and any RFP-specific instructions for updates and clarifications.

4 Eligibility, Legal & Commercial Terms

- PTAC reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal, in whole or in part, and to cancel or amend an RFP without liability.
- Proponents are responsible for all costs associated with preparing and submitting their Proposals.
- Confidentiality applies to information provided by PTAC; Proponents may be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement. Proposals will be kept confidential and will be accessed only by evaluators.
- Intellectual property (IP) arising from AUPRF projects may be owned by AUPRF funders, or AUPRF funders receive a royalty-free operational use right. No other IP ownership or sharing options (if IP is being generated) are acceptable.
- Minimum insurance: Commercial General Liability (CGL) of \$5,000,000 and Professional Liability of \$2,000,000.
- Disclosure of intent to subcontract and any actual or potential conflicts of interest is required.
- Governing law: Province of Alberta, Canada.

5 Evaluation Criteria & Process

5.1 Scored Criteria and Weights

| <i>Criterion</i> | <i>Weight</i> |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Technical Approach | 30% |
| Relevant Experience | 30% |
| Cost | 25% |
| Leveraged Funds from Other funders | 5% |
| Team Qualifications | 10% |

5.2 Screening & Completeness

Proposals are first screened for completeness and compliance (deadline, required sections, and required disclosures). Incomplete or non-compliant Proposals may be removed from further consideration at PTAC’s discretion.

5.3 Committee Review, Scoring & Deliberation

The relevant AUPRF technical committee reviews Eligible Proposals. Committee members score Proposals using the standardized scoring sheet before a deliberation meeting, where compiled results are discussed, and recommendations are confirmed.

PTAC may request clarifications, additional information, or presentations from Proponents to support evaluation before final ranking.

6 AUPRF Review & Communication Timelines¹

The following applies to AUPRF RFPs for **Ecological Research Planning Committee (ERPC), and Reclamation Remediation Research (RRRC)**, unless a specific RFP states a different schedule:

| <i>Step</i> | <i>Date</i> |
|---|---|
| 1. RFP Release | May 1, 2026 |
| 2. Submission of Questions | May 22, 2026 |
| 3. Answers to Questions Posted on PTAC Website | May 29, 2026 |
| 4. Proposal submission deadline | June 17, 2026 5 pm Mountain Time |
| 5. Decision ratification | July 30, 2026, or sooner |
| 6. Award notifications | July 2026 |
| 7. Target project start | Summer 2026 (unless otherwise specified) |

7 Communication

- All communications by the proponent to PTAC should be directed to info@ptac.org and AUPRF2026 RFPs should be included in the subject line.
- PTAC will notify the Proposal's primary contact by email of the outcome (award or non-award).
- Unsuccessful Proponents may request high-level feedback on strengths and areas for improvement.
- Public Communications: PTAC/AUPRF may publish award highlights after contract execution.

8 Contracting, Payments & Reporting

- A standard AUPRF Funding Agreement will be issued to successful Proponents for review and execution.
- Payments are quarterly milestone-based and tied to accepted deliverables, as specified in the Funding Agreement.
- Executed agreements are retained in the AUPRF contracts repository managed by PTAC.

¹ AUPRF 2026 RFPs for Well Decommissioning Research (WDRC), Water Innovation Planning (WIPC), and Air Research Planning (ARPC) **follow a different timeline and deadline.**

9 Compliance & Reserved Rights

PTAC may amend or cancel an AUPRF RFP at any time; any changes will be communicated to all prospective Proponents. Proponents must comply with all instructions, including confidentiality, insurance, subcontracting disclosures, and conflict-of-interest requirements.

10 Proponent Checklist

- Company information (legal name, address, contacts, overview)
- Technical proposal (approach, work plan, schedule, team bios/CVs)
- Financials (itemized costs; milestone-based payment plan, leveraged funding)
- Disclosures (subcontracting intent; conflicts of interest)
- Insurance confirmation (CGL \$5M; Professional Liability \$2M)
- Submission format (single PDF + required forms); deadline; 90-day validity

11 Legal Conditions

11.1 Non-Binding Solicitation; No Obligation to Award

This Request for Proposals (RFP) is not an offer to contract. No contractual, quasi-contractual, fiduciary, or other legal obligations of any kind are created by this RFP or by any submission, communication, or conduct of PTAC unless and until a written Funding Agreement is executed by duly authorized representatives of PTAC and the successful Proponent. PTAC may cancel, amend, or suspend this RFP at any time without liability.

11.2 PTAC's Reserved Rights

Without limiting any other rights, PTAC may, in its sole discretion and without liability: (a) accept or reject any or all Proposals; (b) accept a Proposal in whole or in part; (c) waive non-material irregularities; (d) seek clarifications; (e) negotiate changes to scope, schedule, and pricing with one or more Proponents; and (f) cancel this RFP at any time. The lowest-priced Proposal will not necessarily be selected.

11.3 No Claim for Compensation; Bid Costs

Each Proponent is solely responsible for all costs associated with preparing and submitting its Proposal, as well as any related activities. PTAC shall not be liable for any such costs or damages, whether or not the Proponent is selected for award.

11.4 Limitation of Liability

To the maximum extent permitted by law, PTAC shall not be liable to any Proponent for indirect, incidental, consequential, special, punitive, or exemplary damages, loss of profit, loss of opportunity, or loss of reputation arising out of or related to this RFP, the evaluation process, or any decision to award or not award funding, even if advised of the possibility of such damages. Any direct liability of PTAC to a Proponent is strictly limited to the reasonable, proven out-of-pocket costs of preparing the Proposal, which the parties agree is disclaimed by Section 4.

11.5 Verification and Clarifications

PTAC may request clarifications, additional information, or presentations from any Proponent and may verify any information contained in a Proposal through interviews, reference checks, third-party sources, or site visits. Failure to respond promptly may result in disqualification.

11.6 Grounds for Disqualification

PTAC may, at any time, disqualify a Proposal or rescind a selection if: (a) the Proposal is late, incomplete, or non-compliant; (b) the Proponent fails to disclose or address an actual or potential conflict of interest; (c) the Proposal contains misrepresentations or misleading information; (d) the Proponent engages in collusion, unfair competition, improper influence, lobbying outside the authorized contact, or attempts to obtain confidential information not publicly available; or (e) adverse information materially affecting the Proponent's qualifications comes to PTAC's attention.

11.7 Proponent Representations & Warranties

By submitting a Proposal, the Proponent represents and warrants that: (a) the Proposal is accurate, complete, and not misleading; (b) all proposed work product will not infringe intellectual property or other rights of third parties; (c) the Proponent and proposed subcontractors are duly qualified and in good standing; and (d) it will maintain the insurance required by the RFP and Funding Agreement.

11.8 Confidentiality; Use and Disclosure

Information provided by PTAC in connection with this RFP is confidential and may be used solely for Proposal preparation and evaluation. Proponents must not disclose such information to any third party except their team members, advisors, or subcontractors who have a need to know and are bound by confidentiality obligations no less protective. PTAC may disclose Proposals to its funders, technical committees, advisors, and partners for evaluation and administration and may make disclosures as required by law or court/government order.

11.9 Intellectual Property & License to Use

Subject to the Funding Agreement, IP arising from the Project may be owned by AUPRF funders, or funders will receive a perpetual, royalty-free right to use the IP in their operations without additional compensation. Proponents must ensure they have all the rights necessary to grant such ownership or licenses. If IP is generated by the proposal/project, no other IP ownership or sharing options are acceptable. If IP is not generated by this project, this provision is unnecessary.

11.10 Subcontracting

The Proponent must disclose its intent to subcontract any portion of the work. PTAC reserves the right to approve or reject proposed subcontractors. The Proponent remains fully responsible for all subcontracted work.

11.11 Proposal Validity

Proposals must remain irrevocable and open for acceptance for 90 days after the submission deadline.

11.12 Acceptance Not a Waiver

PTAC's acceptance of a Proposal, or its failure to identify deficiencies, does not waive any requirement of the RFP or Funding Agreement and does not relieve the Proponent from responsibility for compliance or performance.

11.13 Order of Precedence; Entire Agreement

In case of conflict, the following order of precedence applies: (1) the executed Funding Agreement (including schedules), (2) the specific RFP (including addenda), (3) these Proponent Instructions, and (4) the Proposal. The executed Funding Agreement constitutes the entire agreement for project performance.

11.14 Governing Law and Forum

This RFP and any related dispute are governed by the laws of the Province of Alberta and the federal laws of Canada applicable therein, without regard to conflict-of-laws rules. The parties attorn to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of Alberta, sitting in Calgary.

11.15 Insurance & Indemnities

At a minimum, the Proponent shall maintain CGL of \$5,000,000 and Professional Liability of \$2,000,000, as well as any other insurance required by the Funding Agreement. Proponents will indemnify and hold harmless PTAC, its officers, directors, employees, and agents from third-party claims arising out of the Proponent's acts or omissions in connection with the Proposal or the Project, subject to the Funding Agreement.

11.16 Addenda and Questions

Only written addenda issued by PTAC form part of the RFP. Proponents are responsible for monitoring the RFP communication channel (the PTAC website) and ensuring their Proposal reflects all addenda.