CHESAPEAKE FUND

Request for Proposals to Establish Nitrogen Offset Credits in the Tuckahoe Watershed, Maryland

October 2009

General. Proposals need to meet the following minimum criteria in order to be considered for approval:

- Practice is credited by the Chesapeake Bay Program, but is not required to satisfy legal or regulatory requirements (See Table 1).
- Project will result in nitrogen reductions in the Tuckahoe watershed.
- Additionality – The project will not occur in the absence of funding provided by the Chesapeake Fund.
- Include contact information of the submitting entity.

Elements Needed for Potential Offset-Generating Projects. The general information required for an offset proposal submittal is as follows:

1. Project Implementer
   - Name
   - Address
   - County
   - Zip Code

2. Watershed and Watershed Segment

3. Current Practices. This information is needed in order to estimate current nitrogen loads from the property.

   - Current crop (should represent crop in the rotation that is the most management intensive)
   - Expected yield
   - Current tillage method
   - Total commercial N applied
   - Total manure applied (type, amount, incorporation method, TN and NH4-N content of manure from manure analysis (can also use average values if analysis not available))
   - Residual nitrogen (from manure, legumes, biosolids)
   - Current BMPs (describe all current BMPs, including acreage of all adjacent riparian and conservation buffers, existing wetlands, etc.)

For pasture, we also need to know:

- Type of animals (refer to the NutrientNet spreadsheet for list of animal types)
- Number of animals
- Avg. weight of animals
- Number of days grazed
- Number of hours grazed/day

4. Project Description

- BMP
- BMP units (acres, feet)
- Expected lifespan
- Expected timeline for implementing the project
- Expected annual nitrogen reductions *

5. Describe any preservation/conservation easements on lands where offset generating BMPs are to be implemented.

6. Describe additional environmental benefits of the project, beyond nitrogen reduction e.g., habitat, carbon sequestration, etc.

* NOTE: We recommend estimating the expected nitrogen reductions by using the NutrientNet spreadsheets available online prior to submitting the proposal. If you need help with the calculations, please contact Mindy Selman at the World Resources Institute: mselman@wri.org or (202) 729-7644. These estimates, however, should be viewed as preliminary as WRI staff will run the final calculations for all submitted proposals.

Questions about the application process should be directed to Beth McGee of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation (see contact info below).

Project Proposals are due Friday January 15, 2010 by email or hard copy:

Dr. Beth McGee
Philip Merrill Environmental Center
Chesapeake Bay Foundation
6 Herndon Avenue
Annapolis, MD 21403

Email: bmcgee@cbf.org
Phone: 410-268-8816

After tentative funding decisions have been made by the Chesapeake Fund, potential project implementers will be asked to contact Water Stewardship, Inc. (WSI), to get an estimate of costs associated with monitoring and verification of their project. This cost estimate will be added to the total cost of the project. If the project is selected for funding, project implementers will be asked to coordinate with WSI to develop a suitable monitoring and verification plan.

Table 1. Agricultural conservation practices in the Chesapeake Bay watershed model and ranking under the various criteria.

Agricultural Best Management Practice (BMP)	Confidence in Expected N Reductions	Assurance of Management	Other Environmental Benefits
Conservation-Tillage	Low	Medium	Medium
Forest Buffers	High	High	High
Wetland Restoration	High	High	High
Land Retirement	High	High	High
Grass Buffers	High	High	High
Enhanced Nutrient Management	Low	Low	None
Cover Crops	Medium	Low	Medium
Tree Planting	High	High	High
Off-Stream Watering w/ Fencing	High	Medium	Medium
Off-Stream Watering w/o Fencing	Medium	Medium	Medium
Off-Stream Water w/ Fencing & Rot. Grazing	High	Medium	High
Row Crop to Grass or Pasture	Medium	High	High
Dairy Feed Management	Low	Low	Medium
Ammonia Emissions Reductions	Medium	Medium	Low
Mortality Composter	High	Medium	Low

Table 2. Ranking and Weighting System for Proposed Projects.

Criteria	Rank	Weight	Score
Cost-effectiveness (N pounds per dollar)	Quartiles Based on projects submitted. e.g., in first quartile score = 3; second quartile score = 2; 3rd or lower=1.	50	
Project Area?	3: if in targeted watershed; 1 if in nitrogen loading hotspot	20	
Conf. in expected Reductions	See table above: 3 if high; 2 if medium; 1 if low.	10	
Assurance of Mngt.	See table above: 3 if high; 2 if medium; 1 if low	10	
Other Env. Benefits	See table above: 3 if high; 2 if medium; 1 if low	10	
Total			