Request for Proposals to Develop an Issue Paper for a Prospective Agricultural Offset Project Type

April 06, 2012

Background

The Climate Action Reserve (Reserve) is a national offsets program working to ensure integrity, transparency, and financial value in the U.S. carbon market. It does this by establishing regulatory-quality standards for the development, quantification, and verification of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction projects in North America; issuing carbon offset credits known as Climate Reserve Tonnes (CRT) generated from such projects; and tracking the transaction of credits over time in a transparent, publicly-accessible system. Adherence to the Reserve's high standards ensures that emissions reductions associated with projects are real, permanent and additional, thereby instilling confidence in the environmental benefit, credibility and efficiency of the U.S. carbon market.

The Reserve is currently developing GHG emission reduction project protocols for the agricultural sector in the United States. To date, one agricultural project protocol has been completed and adopted by the Reserve Board (the Rice Cultivation Project Protocol), and another protocol is scheduled for completion in mid-2012 (the Nitrogen Management Project Protocol). A third agricultural protocol addressing carbon sequestration on production cropland (the Cropland Management Project Protocol) was initiated for development in early 2011; however, this protocol development process was subsequently suspended. To continue exploration of potential carbon sequestration project activities in the agricultural sector, the Reserve is contracting for the development of an issue paper to address key questions related to two potential Land Use Change (LUC) project activities: (1) avoided conversion of threatened grasslands, and (2) conversion of marginal cropland to grassland. These activities have the potential to prevent the release of carbon in soils or enhance soil carbon, respectively.

To assist in this effort, the Reserve is seeking a contractor to conduct necessary supporting research and analysis and develop a comprehensive issue paper addressing carbon offset protocol development for these two potential LUC activities.

Project Overview

The issue paper is meant to substantiate and add depth to the Reserve's own initial assessment of agriculture LUC activities and to serve as the basis for discussion about the potential for an agriculture LUC offset project protocol with a variety of stakeholders. Respondents to this request for proposals must propose to develop an issue paper that covers everything in the Scope of Work. Proposals that cover only a portion of the Scope of Work will not be considered.

The project activities to be evaluated include two different agriculture-related LUC activities that impact carbon storage in soils. The geographic scope of the analysis should be limited to croplands and grasslands in the United States.

Table 1: Proposed Project Activities

Project Activity	Description
Avoided Conversion of Grassland (AGC)	The conversion of grassland into production cropland or other land development can rapidly decrease soil carbon stocks as a result of soil disturbance and removal of permanent vegetation. By permanently conserving grassland that otherwise would have been converted into alternative use, substantial emissions of carbon may be avoided.
Conversion of Marginal Cropland to Grassland (CCG)	Setting aside cropland that is otherwise capable of producing food and converting it into a permanent non-tree vegetative cover, such as grassland, can substantially increase soil carbon sequestration as a result of eliminating soil disturbance, increasing permanent belowground biomass in roots and shoots, and possibly increasing overall organic matter inputs from permanent vegetation compared to a cultivated system.

Scope of Work

The issue paper will analyze, review, and summarize existing research, data, and quantification methodologies based on a review of relevant literature, datasets, and consultation with sector experts. After completion, the paper will be reviewed and further edited by the Reserve in anticipation of being publicly distributed. The paper may also be used to inform public stakeholder discussions in the development of a protocol for quantifying and crediting emission reductions/removals.

The issue paper must include analysis of the following topics:

1. **Synthesis of Existing Relevant Methodologies**
   For scoping purposes, the Reserve requires a review of existing methodologies relevant to North American agriculture LUC offset project activities. For this task, examine available published and/or public draft versions of methodologies relevant to LUC project activities in North America. Specifically, the following methodologies must be included in the review:

   - *Ducks Unlimited Avoided Grassland Conversion Project in the Prairie Pothole Region – Project Design Document*[1]
   - *Verified Carbon Standard:*

[1] http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/files/20090323_du_agc_ccba_final_for_release.pdf

- *Approved VCS Methodology VM0017 – Adoption of Sustainable Agricultural Land Management*[2]
- *Proposed VCS Module/Tool – Soil Carbon*[3]
- *Proposed Methodology – Methodology for Sustainable Grassland Management (SGM)*[4]

- *Chicago Climate Exchange – Sustainably Managed Rangeland Soil Carbon Sequestration Offset Project Protocol*[5]

For the above methodologies, and any additional relevant methodologies, provide a summary of the following topics, as applicable:

- What are the project activities eligible for crediting?
- What are the limitations due to geographic location, soil types, cropping systems or other parameters?
- What are the methods for determining additionality?
- How are baseline soil organic carbon levels determined?
- How is soil organic carbon sequestration measured and quantified?
- What are the methods for determining and/or accounting for leakage due to indirect land use change (ILUC)?
- How is permanence of soil carbon addressed?

2. Scope and Definitions of Project Activities

The project activities described in Table 1 assume that only grasslands would be eligible for inclusion in an LUC protocol. However, grassland is only one sub-type of rangeland found in the U.S.[6] Provide an analysis of the other rangeland types that could be included, and assess the limitations for other rangeland LUC activities.

Specifically, the following items should be addressed:

- Assess the primary rangeland types and geographical regions that should be considered for inclusion in an avoided rangeland conversion methodology. The applicability of a specific type of rangeland and/or geographic region may depend on i.) soil carbon content and the ability of the native vegetation to enhance organic soil carbon stocks, and ii) the suitability of the rangeland for use as production cropland or other land use. For example, the grasslands of the Northern Great Plains region of the U.S. may have the greatest potential for sequestering carbon and avoiding large emissions from soil disturbances due to the high organic carbon content of the mallisol soils combined with large positive trends for converting grasslands into croplands. Examples of the rangeland categories/regions that should be assessed are:

2 http://www.v-c-s.org/methodologies/VM0017
3 http://www.v-c-s.org/methodologies/module-soil-carbon
4 http://www.v-c-s.org/methodologies/methodology-sustainable-grassland-management-sgm
5 https://www.theice.com/publicdocs/ccx/protocols/CCX_Protocol_Sustainably_Managed_Rangeland_Soil.pdf
6 Rangelands are varied and abundant in the United States, making up an estimated 31% of the land surface area of the U.S. Rangelands are characterized as being undeveloped, 'non-cultivated' and 'non-forested' lands with ecosystems consisting primarily of native vegetation. The U.S. has several types of rangeland, including grasslands, shrublands, woodlands, and deserts. Pasture lands are lands that are typically managed specifically for livestock grazing; however grazing is also common on unmanaged rangelands, so the two categories (pasture/rangeland) should not be considered mutually exclusive.

i. Grasslands of the Northern, Central, and Southern Great Plains
ii. California annual grasslands
iii. Shrub and bunchgrass lands of the Great Basin
iv. Pinion-juniper woodlands of the west

- Livestock animals are often found on private and public rangelands and retired cropland in the U.S. While there are some GHG benefits associated with the addition of grazing livestock on rangelands and retired croplands (most notably increases in soil organic matter and belowground carbon deposition), there are also secondary emissions increases of non-CO_2 GHGs. Previous scoping work performed for the Reserve highlighted the difficulties with estimating the secondary GHG impacts from the addition of livestock grazing, such as increased N_2O emissions from manure land application and soil compaction, and increased CH_4 emissions from enteric fermentation. [7] The issue paper should characterize the difficulties and uncertainties associated with quantifying changes in non-CO_2 GHG emissions from grazing lands and discuss options for addressing these challenges. If grazing lands were to be included in either AGC or CCG project activities, are there reasonably accurate and scientifically accepted methods for quantifying GHG impacts from livestock (i.e. enhanced soil biomass and carbon deposition, increased methane emissions from enteric fermentation and manure management, and increased nitrous oxide emissions from land application and soil compaction)?

For CCG projects, the following questions should be addressed:

- Recognizing the possible adverse effects associated with removing productive cropland from cultivation, the Reserve intends to limit this LUC activity only to 'marginal' or degraded croplands. What are options for defining such categories?
  i. Would the USDA Erodibility Index (EI)[8] serve as a potential benchmark for classifying 'marginal' cropland, or should the definition encompass a broader category?
  ii. Is the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) approved tool: *Tool for the identification of degraded or degrading lands considered in implementing CDM A/R project activities* applicable for U.S. croplands and grasslands?

- What specific activities might be required to transform cropland to grasslands (e.g., application of organic amendments, (re)introduction of native species)? Would simply retiring cropland from production be an adequate measure to increase soil carbon stocks at a suitable rate to support project development?

---

[7] Refer to the background paper on GHG assessment boundaries and leakage for the cropland management protocol, available at: http://www.climateactionreserve.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/CMPP_Background_Paper_-_GHG_Assessment_Boundaries_and_Leakage.pdf

[8] Highly Erodible Land (HEL) has an Erodibility Index (EI) of at least 8. Erosion equation factors are used to determine the EI for NRI sample sites. The EI indicates the potential of a soil to erode, considering climatic factors and the physical and chemical properties of the soil. The higher the index, "the greater is the investment needed to maintain the sustainability of the soil resource base if intensively cropped."

3. **Potential Reduction Opportunity and Cost of Reductions**
   For scoping purposes, the Reserve requires a realistic assessment of potential GHG reduction opportunities, both regionally and nationally, and associated cost estimates for achieving GHG reductions through LUC projects.

   Specifically, the following items should be addressed for both potential project activities:

   - Assess the technical and economically feasible reduction potential for project activities within the United States, considering regional variations and economic limitations. Include in the analysis a breakdown of potential by region and by rangeland sub-categories.

   - Estimate a typical cost of achieving reductions for the two project activities (\$/tonne of CO_2e). Make sure to factor in opportunity costs associated with foregoing land-use conversion or taking cropland out of production.

   - Which geographic locations have the most reduction potential, and why?

   - Is there significant potential for LUC projects located in California?

4. **Additionality and Land Use Trends**
   GHG reduction projects registered with the Reserve must be “additional,” i.e., they must be projects that would not have occurred in the absence of a carbon offset market. As a first step towards developing additionality criteria for LUC practices, it is important to have a detailed understanding of relevant regulatory requirements, regional land use trends, and conservation grant programs. For both AGC and CCG projects, project eligibility may be constrained to specific project activities, geographic locations, ecosystems, and/or cropping systems within the U.S. to ensure additionality.

   In addition, for AGC projects, an LUC protocol will likely require an additionality test that provides assurance that the project area would have been converted to active cropland or other development within a short timeframe in the absence of the carbon project.

   To date, the Reserve has gathered and analyzed data related to national land use change trends using the USDA National Resource Inventory (NRI) database, and USDA Farm Service Agency (FSA) Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) statistics. The NRI data indicates that over the period from 1982 – 2007, cropland area has been steadily decreasing, largely due to development (net loss of 10.8M acres) and conversion to pasture (net loss of 11.8M acres). During this period, there was also a net positive area of rangeland that was converted into cropland (0.5 M acres). While the total acreage of rangeland has decreased during the 1982 – 2007 time frame by 0.5M acres, much of the net loss was reversed during the 2002 – 2007 period when the gross area of *cropland* taken out of production and returned to *rangeland* became positive and quite substantial (0.83 M acres). While difficult to demonstrate through the national database, it is likely that participation in the USDA Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) is an influential driver of the trend of taking cropland out of production from 2002 – 2007. Using the most recent five-year time period of 2002 – 2007, national data indicate a baseline trend of cropland conversion to pasture[9] of approximately 0.27%/yr and cropland conversion to rangeland of 0.05%/yr. This small but consistent trend shows that some level of cropland

[9] Note the NRI definition of Pastureland indicates that Pastureland includes grazed and un-grazed grasslands

conversion to grass/pasture/grazing lands is occurring under business as usual, and may be largely driven by the CRP program.

To gain a better understanding of relevant trends, further analysis needs be undertaken for each proposed project type to assess the extent to which the proposed project activities are occurring in the absence of a carbon market, and the circumstances under which these activities occur. For the issue paper, the contractor must provide an analysis of the USDA NRI database, CRS statistics, and other land use trend data sources to develop a sub-national assessment and explanation of land use conversion trends relevant to the two project activities. This assessment should be combined with an investigation of the typical barriers (costs, regulatory burdens, decreased crop production etc.) faced by growers and land owners in undertaking CCG and AGC projects, respectively.

The following items should be addressed to inform the additionality assessment for CCG projects:

- Evaluate the extent to which data is available that could be used to determine regional cropland conversion rates (cropland to grassland)
    1. For regions where data is available, provide an estimate of conversion rates (i.e. acres/yr. converted). If possible, separately assess conversion from cropland to grassland (non-grazing), and cropland to pasture/grazing land.
    2. Is there a significant trend (nationally and/or regionally) of conversion from croplands to pasture, or cropland to grasslands (non-pasture/grazing lands). Which regions have the lowest conversion rate?

- Evaluate the rates of participation in the USDA Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and any other relevant federal or state land /conservation programs. Given the existing cap on land enrollment in the CRP, are there opportunities for carbon offsets to drive conversion of croplands to grasslands beyond what is occurring under the CRP program? Are there foreseeable regulatory or market developments (such as high commodity prices) that will alter the level of participation in the program?

- USDA NRI data indicates that the total area of croplands designated as Highly Erodible Land (HEL) has decreased since 1982. What are the primary drivers for HEL acreage decreases and to what extent do trends relate to enrollment in CRP or other non-CRP cropland conversion programs. To what extent has this decrease happened outside the CRP program and absent a carbon market?

- Evaluate any laws or regulatory programs relevant to agricultural land use, highlighting any state or federal legal requirements that may be driving conversion of croplands to range, grass, or pasture lands. Are there any known legal requirements that can explain the existing trends in cropland conversion? Are there any specific forthcoming legal requirements that may require the conversion of any marginal or degraded croplands to range, grass, or pasture lands?

- Evaluate financial, technical, institutional and/or other barriers and drivers for potential project activities that would affect project additionality.

The following items should be addressed to inform the additionality assessment for AGC projects,

- Evaluate the extent to which data is available that could be used to determine regional grassland conversion rates (grassland to cropland, and grassland to other land development)
    i. For regions where data is available, provide an estimate of conversion rates (i.e. acres/yr. converted). If possible, separately assess conversion from grassland to cropland, and grassland to other land development.
    ii. If possible, provide an assessment of the most common land uses for converted grassland (i.e. cropland, urban development, golf courses etc.).
    iii. Which regions have the *lowest* conversion rates of grassland to cropland? Which regions have highest conversion rates of grassland to other land development?

- Evaluate the rates of participation in the USDA Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and any other relevant federal or state land /conservation programs. Are lands currently enrolled in the CRP program likely to remain in the program? If not, is there any data to assess what happens to land that is not re-enrolled or otherwise drops out of the program? Is there data to assess the extent to which the CRP enrolled acreage has decreased since 2007 due to high commodity prices? Can a trend be projected into the future regarding CRP enrollment? Use this information to assess the potential for carbon offsets to play a role in preventing formerly enrolled CRP land from reverting back to production cropland.

- Evaluate any laws or regulatory programs relevant to rangeland protection and/or land use, highlighting any state or federal legal requirements that may be requiring the conservation of existing rangelands. Are there any known legal requirements that can explain the existing trends? Are there any specific forthcoming legal requirements that may require the protection of relevant rangelands?

- Evaluate financial, technical, institutional and/or other barriers and drivers for potential project activities that would affect project additionality.

- For AGC projects, the LUC protocol would require an additionality test that provides assurance that the project area would have been converted to active cropland or other land development within a short timeframe in the absence of the carbon project. One option would be to utilize a fair market valuation test to determine if the value of converting the project land to another land use would be significantly greater than the value of retaining the land as grassland (this is the approach used to assess additionality of avoided conversion projects in the Reserve Forest Project Protocol V3.2). Provide an assessment of whether and how such a test could be constructed, specifically addressing the following items:

    i. While forest land has a measurable value as a source of timber, it is unclear how to value grasslands in a similar fashion. Assess the potential values that could be applied to grassland valuation (e.g. cattle grazing, hunting, recreation, etc.). Estimate a ‘typical’ value for grasslands (per unit area). If necessary, delineate between the proposed potential grassland types (i.e. grassland, shrubland, woodland).

ii. Assess a ‘typical’ value (per acre) for cropland. Limit the analysis to the primary commodity crops for simplicity (i.e. corn, soy, wheat).

iii. If possible, assess a value (per acre) for other primary land uses (other than cropland).

iv. Is there data, research, or other evidence that could be used to determine a ‘Grassland Conversion Discount Factor’ (RCDF) that would function in the same manner as the ‘Avoided Deforestation Discount Factor (ADF)’ in the Reserve Forest Project Protocol V3.2, Equation 6.11? The discount factor represents the confidence level that project land would have been converted in the absence of the project.[10]

5. Baseline Data Requirements

- How feasible and accurate would it be to apply standardized methods for estimating baseline emissions? What degree of standardization is possible?
- What data is necessary to characterize baseline soil carbon storage? How far back in time should soil carbon data be available to assess the baseline for these project types?
- Is there soil data that could be used to estimate either regional or ecosystem specific common practice baseline soil carbon levels?[11]

6. Leakage Due to Indirect Land Use Change

In order to have a comprehensive quantification methodology, a LUC protocol must require actions to mitigate, and/or conservatively estimate the increases in GHG emissions that occur outside the project boundary due to direct or indirect land use changes that may result from the project activity (i.e. “leakage”). Of primary concern for leakage are potential shifts in agricultural production (or other land uses) that may occur outside of the project area due to either: i) avoidance of productive cropland expansion or land development in the project area**,** or ii) retirement of existing productive (or marginally productive) cropland. In both instances, it is likely necessary to assume that some or all of the land development or crop production that is precluded due to the project activity will still occur outside of the project boundary. The GHG emissions increases that result from the leakage could be very significant, and in some instances may be of similar magnitude as the net carbon sequestered within the project area. Provide a comprehensive assessment of leakage risk and management, addressing the following tasks:

- Perform a comprehensive review of literature pertaining to Indirect Land Use Change and GHG emissions. A significant body of research has been published on ILUC GHG emissions and the use of economic models for estimating ILUC impacts associated with production of biofuels. As a starting point, the Reserve has provided a list of references to literature that may be pertinent to this assessment:

[10] For the Forest Project Protocol, a value of 80% (i.e. the value of development is 80% higher than the value of the forested land), was the level chosen to provide complete confidence that the forest was under imminent threat of conversion. A value between 40-80% requires that GHG removal estimates be discounted to reflect some level of risk that the forest would not have been converted. Values less than 40% indicate that the forest was not legitimately threatened by imminent conversion.

[11] This approach is similar to the assessment area approach used to set common practice carbon stock levels in the Reserve’s Forest Project Protocol.

i. Searchinger T, Heimlich R, Houghton RA, et al. (2008) *Use of U.S. Croplands for Biofuels Increases Greenhouse Gases Through Emissions from Land-Use Change. Science*, 319, 1238-1240.Kretschmer
ii. Plevin RJ, O'Hare M, Jones AD, Torn MS, Gibbs HK (2010) *Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Biofuels, Indirect Land Use Change Are Uncertain but May Be Much Greater than Previously Estimated*. Environmental Science & Technology, 44, 8015-8021.Yeh
iii. Malins, C. *IFPRI-MIRAGE 2011 Modeling of Indirect Land Use Change: Briefing on Report for the European Commission Directorate General for Trade.* International Council on Clean Transportation.
iv. Berry, S., Schlenker, W. (2011). *Technical Report for the ICCT: Empirical Evidence on Crop Yield Elasticities.* International Council on Clean Transportation.
v. Prins A, Stehfest E, Overmars K (2010). *Are models suitable for determining ILUC factors*? Bilthoven.
vi. Murray BC, Sohngen B, Ross MT (2007) *Economic consequences of consideration of permanence, leakage and additionality for soil carbon sequestration projects*. Climatic Change, 80, 127-143.
vii. Wu J (2000) *Slippage effects of the conservation reserve program*. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 82, 979-992.
viii. Yeh S, Gibbs H, Mueller S, Nelson R, O'Connor D (2010). *Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) Indirect Land Use Change Expert Workgroup: A Report to the California Air Resources Board*

- Assess potential mechanisms that could be incorporated in a protocol to mitigate leakage risk. For instance, limiting eligibility for cropland retirement only to the most marginally productive lands may ensure minimal leakage risk. Are there specific crops or geographic regions where leakage may be less of a risk?

- To determine the magnitude of leakage from ILUC, three questions must be addressed: i) How much land will be brought *into* production (or converted to other land uses) to compensate for land taken out or precluded from production/conversion ii) where will the compensating conversions occur in relation to the project area (i.e. will leakage be localized, or will it primarily occur in other regions/ecosystems, and iii) what are the biomass and soil carbon stock values for the ecosystem type where the compensating conversions occur? Considering the challenges, assess the viability that a leakage methodology can be developed that can accurately and/or conservatively estimate leakage impacts in a standardized manner for LUC projects. Provide recommendations that can guide methodology development, including recommendations for which economic equilibrium models and data sets may be most useful for development of a quantification approach. It is acceptable to propose options not discussed in this RFP. As a starting point, examine the following:

  i. Methodologies used by the California Air Resource Board to assess ILUC impacts for the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (CARB LCFS). The CARB LCFS methodology utilizes an economic equilibrium model called GTAP.
  ii. Methodologies used by the U.S. EPA to conduct a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of biofuel GHG emissions for the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS); The U.S. EPA methodology relies on use of the FASOM economic equilibrium model.

iii. Availability of data to determine default biomass and carbon stocks for various regions/ecosystems, and crop types. As a starting point, the CARB LCFS model uses a global data set of 31 ecosystem types developed by the Woods Hole Research Center.[12]
iv. Applicability of other economic equilibrium models such as MIRAGE, and FAPRI.[13]

7. Risk of Reversal
An LUC protocol would have to ensure the permanence of the carbon sequestered or avoided by an LUC project in order to maintain the integrity of the issued offset credits. Various options exist for ensuring permanence, and these will be evaluated by the Reserve should an LUC protocol be developed.[14] For this issue paper, provide a risk assessment for LUC project activities that assesses specific natural events and land management changes that could lead to a reversal of stored soil carbon on project lands. For each perceived risk, what is the potential magnitude of the reversal and are there management options that could alleviate some or all of the reversal risk?

8. Other Positive/Negative Environmental Impacts
Assess the potential for environmental co-benefits from the project activity, as well as any potential negative consequences.

Timeline and Deliverables

Proposals due to the Climate Action Reserve	May 4, 2012
Contracts awarded	May 21, 2012
Completed issue paper delivered	September 1, 2012

Evaluation Criteria

The Reserve will evaluate proposals for this project based on the following factors:

- Knowledge of and experience working with the agricultural sector on GHG and/or other environmental services
- Knowledge of and experience with collecting/analyzing relevant agricultural land use data sets
- Technical understanding of different carbon sequestration quantification models and methods
- Understanding of the Climate Action Reserve and other GHG programs, and GHG offsets markets
- Comprehensive knowledge of agricultural land conservation programs and policy
- Quality of written materials and technical documents
- Communication and organizational skills
- Competitiveness/value of project budget
- Proven ability to deliver projects on time

[12] Refer to Yeh, et al. (2010).
[13] Refer to Prins et al (2010).
[14] http://www.climateactionreserve.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Options_for_Managing_CO2_Reversals_093010.pdf

Application Process

Interested contractors must submit proposals to the Reserve by **5:00 PM PDT on Friday, May 4, 2012**. No late or incomplete proposals will be considered. All proposals must include the following information:

- Brief cover letter (maximum 2 pages)
- Short proposal (maximum 5 pages) which must include:
    - Statement of qualifications
    - Proposed fixed price budget
    - Proposed schedule
    - Client references (at least three)
- Sample work product (work products will not be returned)

Contractors must bid to work on the entire scope of work contained within this request. Proposals for partial completion of the full suite of deliverables will not be considered.

Interested contractors are also expected to agree to the Reserve's Independent Contractor Services Agreement (available on the Reserve Agriculture Protocols webpage). This should be reviewed by interested contractors and their lawyers prior to submitting a proposal.

Proposals must be submitted via e-mail, fax or mail. Please submit proposals to:

Climate Action Reserve
Attn: Proposal for Issue Paper
523 W. 6th Street, #428
Los Angeles, CA 90014
FAX: (213) 623-6716

or

E-MAIL: policy@climateactionreserve.org
Please include "Proposal for LUC Issue Paper" in the Subject line

Questions?

If you have any questions about the project or proposal process please contact Max DuBuisson at (213) 785-1233 or max@climateactionreserve.org.