Exhibit 24

Department of the Army
Regional General Permit (RGP) SAJ-105
and
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
West Bay Ecosystem Management Agreement (EMA)
Individual Project Approval Checklist

Completion of this Individual Project Approval Checklist is required to demonstrate project compliance with the requirements of Regional General Permit (RGP) SAJ-105 and the EMA as indicated in Special Condition 18.a. In order for a proposed project to qualify for authorization under RGP SAJ-105 and under the EMA, all applicable responses must be marked "Yes" or Non-applicable (N/A).

	Yes	**No**	**N/A**	
1.				Was a draft application submitted to the appropriate agency representatives two weeks prior to the individual project approval meeting pursuant to Special Condition 18.a.? Date of draft application submittal: _____ Date of individual project approval meeting: _____
2.				Was acomplete application to the Corps for this project made using the form "Joint Application for Environmental Resource Permit/Authorization to Use State-Owned Submerged Lands/Federal Dredge and Fill Permit", Form #62-346.900(1)?
3.				Were exhibits provided which show the specific location of the proposed project and confirm that the proposed project is located within the RGP area boundaries (1"=200' or other appropriate scale)?
4.				RGP SAJ-105 only authorizes Section 404 activities. Are all regulated activities associated with the proposed project located: 1) in Section 404 waters only, or 2) if there are associated Section 10 activities, will these Section 10 activities be evaluated separately as a NWP, GP, LOP or IP?

5.				Does the application include a written scope of the project which describes the type of project and confirms that it comports with activities authorized by the RGP (i.e. the proposed project is a type of residential, commercial, recreational, or institutional development)?
6.				Are project wetland delineations in accordance with the most recent guidance and wetland delineation manual or manual supplement issued by the Corps (which as of this date is the *Interim RegionalSupplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual: Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region (2008)*), or the State of Florida methodology prescribed in Chapter 62-340, F.A.C., *Delineation of the Landwater Extent of Wetlands and Surface Waters* (whichever is the most landward line of wetlands)?
7.				Have Corps wetland delineation data sheets and a completed Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination Form (Exhibit 21) been completed, signed, and included for the project?
8.				Have all wetlands on the project site been identified as either converted or unconverted quality wetlands?
9.				Do all wetlands identified as converted wetlands on the proposed project site consist of hydric pine plantations as shown on the aerial photo dated March 2007 (Exhibit 5), non-Section 10 ditches, or non-Section 10 borrow pits; and were confirmed by a combination of remote sensing and ground-truthing; and has a March 2007 aerial photo been included indicating the project boundary?
10.				Have converted wetlands as shown on the aerial dated March 2007 (Exhibit 5) been subjected to ongoing silviculture activities within the past 5 years from the pre-application meeting?
11.				Do proposed direct impacts to converted wetlands comply with the 15% limit as specified in Special Conditions 5.a. and 5.b. of the RGP?

12.				Are unconverted wetland impacts limited to impact types allowed by Special Condition 5.c. (Road and bridge crossings, boardwalks and paths, linear infrastructure including stormwater conveyances but not stormwater ponds, utility corridors, and any other linear access facilities necessary to support the associated development)?
13.				Has consideration of the following factors been demonstrated by the Applicant for determining if bridging or directional boring of the unconverted wetlands is practicable: 1) the degree of water flow within the wetland, 2) the length of the wetland crossing, 3) the topography of the wetland and associated upland, and 4) the degree to which a roadway would adversely affect the movement of wildlife expected to use the wetland?
14.				If impacts to unconverted wetlands are proposed to exceed 100 feet in width of combined filling or clearing for a road crossing, has need been adequately demonstrated by the Applicant?
15.				Was first preference for each new unconverted wetland road crossing location given to existing silviculture road crossings?
16.				If road crossings at locations other than existing silviculture road crossings are proposed, was the crossing designed and constructed to minimize wetland impacts?
17.				For each road crossing proposed at a point where no previous silviculture road crossing existed, will an existing silviculture road crossing within the same sub-watershed be removed and the wetland connection restored?
18.				Overall, do the application's drawings and other exhibits that document and show the number, type, location, and acreage of all wetland impacts sufficiently confirm that the proposed project fully complies with this RGP?
19.				Has the Applicant avoided placing fill material in wetlands for septic tanks or drainfields?
20.				Will only clean fill and rock material compatible with existing soils (e.g., soil, rock, sand, marl, clay, stone, and/or concrete rubble) be used for wetland fills?

21.				Has the Applicant demonstrated that wetland fill will not sever a jurisdictional connection or isolate a jurisdictional area?
22.				If the site includes/abuts unconverted wetlands, will all unconverted wetlands within the project site include preserved buffers (except at road crossings), which on an individual impact site basis, are comprised of uplands and/or converted wetlands and are on average 50 feet wide, with a minimum 30-foot width?
23.				If the site includes/abuts a natural stream or tributary, is a preserved buffer with a minimum of 100 feet in width as measured from the edge of the stream or tributary included in the site plan?
24.				Except for the control of exotic plant species, will the application of fertilizers, herbicides, or pesticides be prohibited in all preserved buffers?
25.				Will compensatory mitigation for individual project wetland impacts be satisfied within one or more of the following: 1) mitigation banks; 2) Conservation Units; or 3) within the project site?
26.				If the project includes compensatory mitigation located within the Conservation Units or on individual project sites, does the proposed compensatory mitigation plan comply with the requirements of 33 CFR Part 332, “Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources”?
27.				Were direct wetland impacts associated with the proposed project and the compensatory mitigation to offset those direct wetland impacts calculated in terms of functional units (FU), as determined using the Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method (UMAM) with each acre of impact to converted wetlands assessed at 0.53 FU, and each acre of impact to unconverted wetlands assessed at 0.87 FU?
28.				Will the compensatory mitigation be implemented concurrent with or before proposed project impacts?

29.				Conservation Units (CUs): If the proposed project or a portion of the project is located within the EMA area, and in a sub-watershed in which one of the CUs is located, will The St. Joe Company place perpetual conservation easements with the DEP as the grantee on portions of CUs equal to the percentage of the total acreage of approved projects in the affected sub-watershed per the following calculation: Using the EMA area only, divide the total acreage within an approved project boundary in a sub-watershed (including impact and preserved area) by the total acreage of land within the sub-watershed minus the area of any conservation units with the same sub-watershed?
30.				Will perpetual conservation easements with the DEP as the grantee, be placed on wetlands not authorized for impact on each project site (including offsite preservation areas to meet the 15% converted wetland requirement) following individual project approval, but prior to commencing any activities authorized by this RGP (or according to the timeframe specified as a special condition in the project specific approval); and does the proposed conservation easement comport with Exhibit 19 of the RGP?
31.				For projects that include off-site preservation of converted wetlands, are the boundaries of the off-site preservation area reasonable and include intermixed and adjacent unconverted wetlands?
32.				For compensatory mitigation conducted outside of a mitigation bank, will a perpetual conservation easement with the DEP as the grantee, be placed on the mitigation area prior to commencing any activities authorized by this RGP on the individual project for which the mitigation is approved (or according to the timeframe specified as a special condition in the project specific approval); and does the proposed conservation easement comport with Exhibit 19 of the RGP?
33.				Has a set of signed and sealed stormwater management system plans been submitted by a Florida registered professional to the DEP for review as required by Part III, Section D of the ERP application?

34.				Does the application include a signed statement by a Florida registered professional certifying that the project conforms to Chapter 62-346 F.A.C. and Applicant's Handbook, Volumes 2, to the additional level of treatment as set forth in the EMA, and to the heightened sediment erosion control measures (RGP Exhibit 2)?
35.				Was documentation of coordination with SHPO provided?
36.				If required by the SHPO, did the applicant conduct a Phase I archeological and historical survey on the proposed project site?
37.				If required, will measures identified to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse impacts to historic properties listed, or eligible for listing in the *National Register of Historic Places*, or otherwise of archeological or historical, be made special conditions of the RGP authorization for the proposed project?
38.				Was documentation provided with respect to the Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephals*) that states whether or not a bald eagle's nest is located on or in the vicinity of the project site?
39.				If a bald eagle's nest occurs within 660 feet of a project, has the applicant followed the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's May 2007 National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines? Has the applicant contacted the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission for recommendations relative to Florida's Bald Eagle Management Plan and Permitting Guidelines to ensure the project is consistent with the provisions of Rule 68A-16.002, Florida Administration Rule? Have appropriate protections been incorporated in the project and documentation provided showing how the appropriate protections will be implemented?

40.				Has documentation of coordination with the FWC regarding any needed fish and wildlife surveys for the project area, and any measures needed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts to state listed/protected fish and wildlife species and their habitats including any plan to obtain a permit if required by Chapter 68A-27, F.A.C. been provided?
41.				Has an updated ledger balance sheet demonstrating compliance with the RGP been submitted in accordance with Special Condition 14?
42.				If the project is located within a Conservation Unit for an activity listed in Special Conditions 12.d (4), (6), (9), (11), and 12.e, has the Checklist for Activities Requiring Conservation Unit Project Approval within Type I and Type II Conservation Units been completed and provided?