

Comment Log: Private Dock Rules, Aug 2026

Name	Comments	Support/Oppose (Generally)
Opposed		
Will Harlan - Center for Biological Diversity	1.8M members: concerns of damage to marsh ecosystem from construction of oversized docks. Appear to prioritize convenience of affluent owners ahead of public right to access/enjoy marsh. Weakening protections more than other states. Research documents harm from large docks due to shade, changes in flow and contaminate leaching. Shading = loss of biomass and changes to foodweb, decrease in filtration and increase in erosion, development of salt pannes. Wrack accumulation from pilings, snother mash resulting in losses similar to above; creek collapse. Create more edge habitat which harm species that use marsh for nesting/foraging, lower nesting success, more access by predators. larger structures would predictably increase effects. Tripling area coverage. Greater than 50% increase in length will allow predators to penetrate farther into marsh habitat. Multiplying effect of many more docks due to longer length. DNR should not spend public resources benefiting small, privileged group - based on report this is supporting 2 individuals. Dock rules will accelerate upland development due to new deep water access. Conflicts with DNR's responsibility to protect public interest; larger than CMPA rules. Urge rejecting rules as steward of public interest.	Opposed
Heather Werner	2 X w/ additional comments: longer docks not supported, opens wetlands to too much habitat destruction and human impact. Go back to current standards	Opposed
Alice Keyes - One Hundred Miles	2 X w/ attachments: Stakeholder committee member, cannot support draft due to departure from long standing/sci based standards, ambiguity, and new scale of structures. 1700 members: restore limited size, clarify standards for mod/reconstruction/maintenance so not a pathway to expansion; new notice, admin, and enforcement standards. Docks have potential to impact WQ, wildlife, nav and neighbors. Rules should ensure private use of public resource causes minimal impact - which current rule does not; weakens important safeguards. Exceeds max dimensions for community/commercial docks, impacts boating, fragments habitat for T&E species, shades marsh and accumulates wrack all which exceed .1 acre, minor impact. Recommends changes to definitions, specifically to disallow modified or reconstructed docks to scale up to meet larger standards, and to clarify, add or eliminate others; create additional notification and/or justification requirements; minimize standards for walkways to not exceed .1 acre with max width 4ft. for ADA/mobility access but not golf carts; eliminating all variances until more studies, research and coordination is conducted and a "hardship" provision developed; and adding application fees and fines for non compliance. Recommends amending rules to require updated and accurate dock database and a dock builder certification program. Overall intent of rulemaking is supported but not while weakening long-standing protections w/o considering science. Urge board to revise rules before adoption	Opposed
Jessica Howell-Edwards	2 X w/ additional comments: Wild Cumberland Org Proposal departs from long standing scientific standards, creates ambiguity and allows private structures at scale that exceeds historical practice. Would be largest docks in SE. No inventory of docks. No study of impacts of ridiculously long docks so how can Board undertand how changes will impact marshes. Urges Board to listen to constituents and employ science	Opposed
Connie Darbyshire	Additional walkway length is too much; marshlands should be protected and nourished; should not be expectation of marsh property owner to get to deep water by harming marsh; retain current standards; marsh is state's greatest asset that protects communities, wildlife, fisheries, economy. Once fragmented, consequences will extend beyond individual property. do the right thing for future generations. Adopt clear, science standards, provide reasonable access while protecting marshes.	Opposed
Rebecca Lang	Allowing docks 9000+sq.ft. is direct violation of CMPA. Larger docks is in conflict with DNR mission. Protect marsh for future and ecological benefits. No need to increase dock sizes.	Opposed
V. Kevin Lang	Article indicated new regs are shaped to meet needs of particular private landowners and the engineers and dock builders that stand to profit from loosening of existing standards. DNR has information and comments that longer and wider docks will negatively impact marsh. DNRs job is to protect resource for public, as owner and through CMPA. New regs will increase known impacts of shading and fragmentation and habitat. DNR needs to extend its consideration of regs in light of what's now public knowledge. Failure to consider comments with evidence of special interests shaping new regs presents a problem for CRD.	Opposed
Jon Stevensen	Benefits wealthy property owners. Larger sizes unnecessary to access waterways. 6ft wide is wider than what's needed for handicapped. Possible damage to marshes is too risky	Opposed
Paget Hines	Concerned with increase in size plus additional variance, tripling previous proposal despite public comment. Docks this size fragment habitat, shade, collect wrack and longest will cross 1/3mile of public marsh. Recommend rule that reflects public's clear preference for stronger protections consistent w/CMPA.	Opposed
Sharon Bordeaux	Concerns of many are being ignored to benefit a few. Playing with fire as health of marsh is monumental importance. Reminiscent of secret orchestration of data center. Do better	Opposed
Sallie Cooper	Current rule will negatively impact flora/fauna and devestate marshes and species within, and also how we recreate in a shared resource. Rule would allow for docks larger than any east US. No studies on safety and aesthetic in shared waterways. How will grandiose docks impact marshes with chem leaching, massive shaded areas. Strongly oppose and urge Board to listen to many, not the few, protect the resource.	Opposed
Gretchen Bowden	Desires of few homeowners outweighing negative impact on public marshland. Do not support increase in length width. Revert to 3000sq.ft.	Opposed
Steven Luxenberg	Disappointed the stakeholders recommendations were ignored and larger sizes proposed plus a variance. Doesn't serve best interests of the coast/marshes since docks inhibit flow of materials on water. Proposal pushed by a few property owners and lobbyists who curried favor -- not how policy should be set.	Opposed
David Weitnauer	DNR choose integrity over special interests. Recommend rules reflecting science about danger of longer docks to health of salt marsh. Serve public interest by honoring Stakeholder consensnus report and reject push by few. Personal and professional failure if Ms. Andrews doesn't do what's right.	Opposed
William Dopson	DNR is no longer protecting marshes from harmful private interests as was believed when he helped develop CMPA. Now DNR appears to be acting in best interest of homeowner and developers and not in the marsh. Urge denial of the proposal	Opposed
Ad Platt	DNR should protect resources and state lands. Proposed give away to benefit a few is wrong. Lesser docks have already degraded marshes, trapped wrack, blocked creeks, contested access over ownership, lost habitat, formed salt pans, and increased flooding. Urges vote down of giveaway of valuable public lands.	Opposed
Kris Bisgard	Do not allow docks longer than 30ft. Protect coast and wildlife.	Opposed
Ann Pequigney	Do not consider tripling current allowance	Opposed

Cindy Stevens	Do not increase size of docks and do not allow any docks at all to be constructed except by licensed contractor. Have witnessed poorly constructed docks, many not maintained, block sunlight from marsh and changing ecology. Witnessed how much dock debris washes up - does not decompose, is large and hard to carry or remove. Struggle to paddle some creeks through rows of docks, esp in shallow or narrow waterways. Docks make it difficult to swim and be seen by boaters. Please maintain current dock sizes, and check construction is safe and stable - engineering and electrical done by professionals.	Opposed
Scott Revels	Docks 5 football fields is too long over marshlands, generates debris. Public docks are available. Spanning a creek of 20ft will cut off access to fishing areas. Keep status quo (common sense rules)	Opposed
Betsy Cain	Experience with a long dock and extreme wrack accumulation has resulted in changes in marsh environment and creek system. Area where docks are located is imp for bank stabilization, storm damage and biodiversity. Docks put this in jeopardy, esp long docks which interrupts natural flushing of wrack. Balance critical marsh health by sound conservation, science and consideration of outcomes. Current proposal goes in wrong direction, benefiting a few that can afford luxury. Majority consensus is clear; amend draft back to existing standards.	Opposed
Courtney Reich - Georgia Conservancy	Georgia Conservancy urges stronger limits on docks to protect marshlands. Supports prohibiting docks from spanning creeks wider than 20ft and limiting variances to 10%; rules otherwise substantially weaken existing protections. The proposed rules would allow docks covering 9,900sq.ft. of marsh which exceeds def'n of minor impact under CMPA and can cause additional ecological damage through shading and effects on surrounding habitat. Variance process lacks clear, objective, science-based standards and may be subject to lawsuits. Fees for dock permits should be imposed. Fishing license costs more than a dock and DNR staff ability is limited on inspections and also permit processing times. No inventory of existing docks and no publicly available science supports proposed changes. Board needs to know how changes will impact resources. Water access is impact to coastal GA life and DNR has protected public trust but size expansion of docks is not a way to facilitate reasonable access to the public. It provides an expanded private right to marshfront prop owners despite known and potential impacts. Statewide regulations would only satisfy a few owners - could be setting precedence for policies benefiting a few. Urge Board to maintain current dock sizes and stronger regs for construction and maintenance.	Opposed
James Finklea	Happy for people to see nature, discouraged by litter and damage caused by dock shading. Marshes are picturesque and helpful to residents and tourists. Future is too crowded or docks are falling apart. Long docks become tax burden, no boats at some docks. Rec additional tax for unnecessary use of public space. Addition size is bad idea, monstrous space. May they pay deeply to ruin public marsh before or after sale of property.	opposed
Janet Kaylo	Incomprehensible to triple size. Previous standards in place for a long time and should be kept. Variance is problematic - open to abuse by those who can afford it. DNR meant to protect the environment. Maintenance wording is unclear and if you can afford it you can make it bigger. Protect marshes and wildlife	Opposed
Joanna Angell	Maintain current regs or strengthen them regarding length of walkway. Regs are unfair to wildlife and many people to allow private interests affect the health of marsh.	Opposed
Henry Parkman	Marsh is rare, valuable, worthy of protection. Oppose the rule: CRD has ignored stakeholder process, including the consensus report and input of stakeholders and public; and the substance of the rule will harm marsh for the benefit of a few. Rules should be modified to accommodate the interests represented in the stakeholder consensus report.	Opposed
Robert Stewart	Need clarification on how a dock corridor, or deviation of extended property line, would be approved.	Opposed
Gerlad Haram	new dock volume is impediment to free movement of wildlife; marsh is most imp resource, not to be compromised by unreasonable docks.	Opposed
Jordan Henderson	No private docks on Cumberland	Opposed
Lynn Copeland	Objects to longer and wider docks; no regard for natural resources. Proposed sizes are ridiculous	Opposed
Danielle Ramos	Opposed to allowing largest docks in SE. Not a modest adjustment to the framework - it's an unprecedented giveaway of a shared public resource. Will devastate marshes, harms species and jeopardize public recreational uses. Board lacks basic information needs: no complete inventory of docks; no study of individual or cumulative impacts.	Opposed
Ethelyn Simpson	Opposed to significant increase in length and size; will diminish beauty. Keep status quo	Opposed
Tyson Edwards	Opposed. Marshes are a public trust resource and proposal will land a few landowners right to build docks longer than anywhere else in SE, major change w/o complete inventory of existing docks or a study of individual or cumulative impacts on human use or species. Wants kids to experience places. Unless state has data that marsh will not be impacted, it is responsible to reject proposal	Opposed
Brooke Michael - Birds Georgia	Opposes current rules and urges revisions; supports OHM. Marshes support coastal life and food web, esp marsh nesting specialists and others that roost and forage in marsh. Dock alter this habitat w/shading, physical disturbance, edges and fragmentation; impact is greater than footprint. Walkway size exceeds SC. Recommends 3000sq.ft walkway, require reconstructed docks comply with original footprint (e.g., not be enlarged if already existing). Ecological concerns for marsh specialists: habitat loss and degradation caused by shading and loss of 50%+ biomass which reduces breeding habitat (loss of continuous dense veg to hide from predators); this is known threat and cause for population decline. loss of grass density affects food resources - diminishing shellfish and fish nurseries essential for wading birds, etc. These will impact SWAP species of Highest Conservation Concern. Predation Concerns: cause of nest failure - longer docks increase amount of edge habitat and nest predation and serve as perches for avian predators, presence of which will discourage nesting. Board should limit to 3000sq.ft, establish science-based eligibility for variances, prevent expansion of existing docks, consider cumulative habitat impacts, maintain stronger requirements for construction, inspection, maintenance, debris removal.	Opposed
Carol Wingo	Opposes docks that are longer than those currently in use	Opposed
Dale Critz Jr.	Opposes increase in sizes and should be limited to 4000sq.ft to balance property rights and shared access/protection. Witnessed marsh damage and visual pollution from docks. This will become a tragedy of the commons. State will be giving free give to private owners especially when they purchased the property knowing full well that a dock was already not allowed.	Opposed
Charles Muise	Opposes increasing dock size due to envtl, view, safety and public use impacts; reduce # of docks and stricter enforcement. Further restriction is public interest	Opposed
Robert Mixson	Opposes increasing dock size; keep current. Marshes are habitat and protect against hurricanes	Opposed
wimf@aim.com	opposes larger docks on public lands	Opposed
Alice Dunick	Opposes long docks b/c of damage to salt marshes. Do not change current standards.	Opposed
Cynthia Patterson	Opposes new proposed length/width. SWAP IDs marsh as critical habitat which docks destroy, reducing # and diversity of T&E species. Urge limiting to 3000sq.ft. Update dock database. Align regs with neighbor states. Protect publicly-owned marsh.	Opposed

Suzan Satterfield	Opposes regs that will allow larger docks on Cumberland. References 15,000ft (sic) as ridiculous and ostentatious on public marshlands; GAs historic protection have prevented overbuilding and we are not like FL who once had a beautiful coast. Why would a homeowner need a dock longer than the Sav. River bridge; suspect more development and marina will come. Respect natural coast esp. w/increased flooding and climate impacts. Hopes NPS will stop damage of public lands.	Opposed
Sally Coenen	Protect marshes for public, as intended by CMPA. Long docks, esp greater than 1/10 acre will fragment and shade marsh, accumulate wrack. Docks 1/3 mile will affect public views and increase damage and debris from storms. Urge denial.	Opposed
Susan Shipman	Public Trust means marshes held for all Georgians - they are not property of anyone but instead public property for use by all. Core principle which underpins natural resource conservation and establishes role of government to hold and manage. History of public trust to early 500's is important. Now, public resource is pressured by private interests and Board rule to expand docks significantly to a footprint of nearly 10,000 acres. Far exceeds neighboring standards and puts common property at risk. Need for rules is understood; DNR has prioritized marsh protection and green initiatives for over a decade supporting sustainable growth w/o compromising coastal ecosystems. Urge board to enact strong, science based standards for realistic and minor alterations of public marshes without fragmenting habitat, damaging marsh ecology, vistas or wildlife. Large docks will do just that. GA coast is for grandchildren and is too valuable to be carved up by large docks w/o safeguards. DNR must accept its Trustee role.	Opposed
Mary M Sipple	Reasonable access must balance with responsibility to protect marsh for all and future generations. Must establish overall limit that a dock can use. Issue is how much of a public resource can be occupied by private structure and with what safeguards. Urge DNR to establish meaningful max size for docks, to comply with CMPA (1/10ac) which is still flexible for property owners; require justification for larger docks that considers shading, fragmentation, nav, water quali, etc.; clarify rebuilding and modifying existing docks; provide public notice of variances/exceptions; improve oversight w/accurate database, application fees, professional construction standards. Once marshes are fragmented, consequences extend beyond individual property.	Opposed
Rebecca Lang	Reject draft and revise. Don't triple current square footage; 1500ft. by right plus variance only benefits wealthiest Georgians regardless of public land. big docks harm habitat by shading, wrack accumulation and fragmentation. Supports clearer regulations. Recommends limiting max length to 1,000ft. or 4,000sq.ft., adding speci	Opposed
Catherine Gussler	Reject draft and revise. Don't triple current square footage; 1500ft. by right plus variance only benefits wealthiest Georgians regardless of public land. Supports clearer regulations. Recommends limiting max length to 1,000ft. or 4,000sq.ft., adding specific definitions for minor and major maintenance, clarifying modification and reconstruction. Supports prohibiting bridging of smaller creek and requiring electrical proof. Protect public, wildlife. Base rules on research and data	Opposed
Lucy Crosswell	Reject draft and revise. Don't triple current square footage; will shade, fragment and accumulate wrack. 1500ft. by right plus variance only benefits wealthiest Georgians regardless of public land. Supports clearer regulations. Recommends limiting max length to 1,000ft. or 4,000sq.ft., prohibiting hoists on small creeks. Enable fees, support dock database and monitoring of cumulative impacts. Supports prohibition on free flowing water and turtle sensitive lighting. Rules must be based on research and data.	Opposed
Janice Meirr	Reject draft and revise. Don't triple current square footage; will shade, fragment and accumulate wrack. 1500ft. by right plus variance only benefits wealthiest Georgians regardless of public land. Supports clearer regulations. Recommends limiting max length to 1,000ft. or 4,000sq.ft., prohibiting hoists on small creeks. Enable fees, support dock database and monitoring of cumulative impacts. Supports prohibition on free flowing water and turtle sensitive lighting. Rules must be based on research and data.	Opposed
Mary Morrison	Reject draft rule; do not increase dock size to benefit select people; marsh is valued and should not be harmed.	Opposed
Ann Fuller	reject rules and realign with CMPC rules for community/commercial docks, 1000ft. Longer docks are indefensible, monied interests are driving decisions. Current rule triples previous and current size, absurdly long walkway and variance should be scrapped in consideration of public interest and marsh health. in favor of spanning waterways and requiring proof of electrical permitting	Opposed
Sue Stephenson	Representing The Abigails: urge Board reject current draft allowing longer and wider docks - will increase fragmentation and diminish ecology. Specifically recommend limit of 4000sq.ft., no hoists on small creeks, add new section for fees to support CRD staff for permit review/processing/inspection and new database to monitor cumulative impacts	Opposed
KD West	Responding to Commissioner Poole's comments: only a wealthy person would build a dock to accommodate a golf cart. Please do not allow further damage to satisfy rich	Opposed
Cassandre Miller	revert to 3000sq.ft. Current proposal unnecessary and longer than anyone else in southeast. Where is due consideration of marshland and navigability? Longer than savannah river bridge; boggles common sense and integrity.	Opposed
Mark	Rule lacks provisions for maintenance of large # of Chatham Co docks from 75-80 years ago w/causeways, and should be addressed.	Opposed
Lauren Cook	Rule should be strengthened by returned 3,000sq.ft. max for walkway	Opposed
Judith Cavill	Stongly opposed. The dimensions are excessive. Marshlands are public and valuable for habitat, coastline protection, fisheries, natural heritage. Private convenience shouldn't take over protection of public lands. Deeply concerned about large private docks on cumberland island in particular. Troubled the proposal substantially increases size despite significant public opposition to an earlier, less large proposal. public lands should come first. Urge Board to reject larger sizes, adopt conservative limits that minimize imipacts and preserve public resources for the future.	Opposed
Patsy Munden	Stongly opposed. Wealthy individuals should not bribe public officials. DNR = destruction of natural resources. Will affect voting.	Opposed
Ramsey Nix	Strongly oppose revisions to walkway plus variance, blatantly ignores prior public input from stakeholder and town hall meetings where stronger, more protective and science based rules were called for and recommend against expanded sizes. Excessive long docks will cause irreversible fragmentation of marshes with docks nearly 1/3 of a mile over public marsh. Science demonstrates shading effects, habitat fragmentation and wrack accumulation - including studies commissioned by CRD. DNR cannot quantify actual impact of docks; doubling or tripling size is irresponsible regulatory rollback. private structures this size amounts to privatization of public views and resources as marsh belongs to all citizens, not just waterfront owners. Variance further opens door to more extreme encroachment. Urges CRD to withdrawal size increase of walkways, retain current standards, eliminate variance for length and honor the spirit of CMPA and public trust. Marsh is irreplaceable natural heritage; do not sacrifice ecological integrity for a few.	Opposed
Holly Roy	Support limits on size of docks. Proposal must be because builders and officials can make money by extending sizes. Ridiculous to say cost of building will curb dock size without regulations, naive. Keep current standards in place, protect marshes.	Opposed

Emily Floore-St. Marys Riverkeeper (via email from Tory Adams)	Supports rulemaking, generally; 3 issues: shading effect on marshes - should consider effect of longer docks beyond physical structure - esp prolonged shading as study in NE showed 87% loss of biomass after 3 years. Is variance necessary? Protected species: screen proposed dock location for protected species impacts; if sensitive habitat is present, add protective measures. Cumulative effects: rules are focused on individual structures - should consider cumulative impacts. SC study of 7000 dock permits equaled marsh loss of ~150 acres. Develop step to evaluate cumulative impacts at waterway level in process, including dock density, existing shading, etc. Maintain records of docks.	Opposed
Daniel Jones	Tripling of size represents a stunning corruption in the process. State's advisory committed proposed doubling but still not enough for political clout. Outright corruption or at least public's perception. Urges reconsideration of outrageous proposal and adhere to stakeholder recs.	Opposed
William Juraschek	Unconscionable - benefits limited number of well to do individuals, not general public. Limit docks to 4ft wide	Opposed
Lesley Lochridge	Urge Board to maintain current standards, adopt stronger regs for construction/maintenance. Marsh belongs to the people, not individuals, held in public trust. CMPA declared marsh vital. Docks break up intact system and habitat. Decline in bird species occurs within 50ft of a dock. more frequent/severe storms break up poorly built/maintained docks and no owner bears responsibility. SWAP ids marsh as critical habitat for marsh birds. Today's healthy marsh is result of decades of protection and relaxing standards undermines.	Opposed
Beth Reed	Vehemently opposed to changing the rules. Current standards are adequate and interests of a few should not dictate new regulations.	Opposed
Mary Martin	Vehemently opposed when we don't know how many docks there are and then build the largest in the SE? decimate marshes, increase impacts from recreational use on a public resource. No study of impacts. It is CRDs job to understand how changes in framework will impact the resource its charged with protecting.	Opposed
Suzanne Pruitt	Via mail: clear rules appreciated and property owners should have reasonable access. Concerned with increases in size and how much of a public resource should be occupied by private structures and with what safeguards. Recommend: establish a meaningful max size that should not exceed CMPA minor; require variances to be justified by need and science; clarify rebuilding and modifications (cannot increase size); give neighbors and public opportunity to comment on larger docks; maintain database, consider application fees, and establish professional standards for construction.	Opposed
Erin Cay	Via mail: clear rules appreciated and property owners should have reasonable access. Concerned with increases in size and how much of a public resource should be occupied by private structures and with what safeguards. Recommend: establish a meaningful max size that should not exceed CMPA minor; require variances to be justified by need and science; clarify rebuilding and modifications (cannot increase size); give neighbors and public opportunity to comment on larger docks; maintain database, consider application fees, and establish professional standards for construction.	Opposed
Brian Riemann	Via mail: strong opposition to revised draft; significantly expands standards, removes critical caps and risks cumulative harm. Urge board to revise rule: new size is unprecedented - 50% more than current practices and other states up to nearly 1/4 acre - restore 3000sq.ft. coverage; consider shading damage and impacts more than .1 acre w/o mitigation degrades wetlands; encroaches on public trust doctrine; variance process lacks clear, objective and sci-based criteria - needs hardship evaluation that is not subjective or an unnecessary burden on CRD staff and/or regulatory inconsistency. Requests revisions to impose a total footprint limit, cap walkway lengths, define strict variance standards	Opposed
Michael Colston	w/ additional comments - over development and lack of regulations have impacted counties south of Atlanta	Opposed
Katherine Brokaw	w/ additional comments - regularly visits coast for beautiful landscape	Opposed
Sharon Hindery	w/ additional comments: current docks can be ridiculously long already, visually unsightly. Bigger docks will create more shade and impact marsh beneath. Docks are rarely used enough to justify existence and impacts on neighbors.	Opposed
Esther Stokes	w/ additional comments: Atlantans love the GA coast and are concerned.	Opposed
David Weitnauer	w/ additional comments: changes for longer docks being driven solely by SI homeowners; request to reject the rules	Opposed
Tina Ridley	w/ additional comments: concern for increased tourism. Davis Poole should recuse himself from CMPC. Reminds CRD of its mission/vision.	Opposed
Norris Wootton	w/ additional comments: current draft will be harmful for coastal environment; should not become law	Opposed
Helen Rogers	w/ additional Comments: deeply disturbed by erosion of marsh protections that increase length and marsh coverage and substantially diverge from current. Proposal not based on discernable science, including DNR's own research. As taxpayer, alarmed that public marshlands being given away for personal private use w/o scientific study of impacts on flora, fauna and erosion.	Opposed
Antonia Martin	w/ additional comments: do not allow docks on Cumberland Island (or do a land swap)	Opposed
Dale Thorpe	w/ additional comments: docks are detrimental to health of marsh; science shows value of marsh	Opposed
Matt Herman	w/ additional comments: docks are too long, already	Opposed
Norman Jacobs	w/ additional comments: draft is unacceptable and should be rejected; tripling sq.ft. & length will impact wildlife and marsh viability; refer to SkIO research - do better to protect the coast, environment and wildlife.	Opposed
Alice Vaughan	w/ additional comments: enough catering to the ultra wealthy; marsh deserves protection. Tripling size is irresponsible.	Opposed
Kathryn Propst	w/ additional comments: former and hopefully returning resident - feels greatly impacted. Emphasizes: Regulations must protect public and wildlife, based on research/data. Revisit draft rule	Opposed
Jill Morehouse Lum	w/ additional comments: hear plea, urge the board to reject the rule	Opposed
Lucy Crosswell	w/ additional comments: long docks used less than those closer to homes; visual pollution of long docks; safety of golf carts on docks - would like to see rules discourage this usage.	Opposed
Jill Helton	w/ additional comments: make sound, responsible decisions to protect marsh for children/grandchildren	Opposed
Andrew Thompson	w/ additional comments: many will be negatively impacted by proposed rule	Opposed
Joyce Murlless	w/ additional comments: marsh is basis for rec and seafood industries; nourishes fish for chicken feed - e.g., marsh health extends to industries imp't to the whole state and must be maintained.	Opposed
Danielle Kraemer	w/ additional comments: marshes are one of most effective carbon sinks in world; provide incredible biodiversity. Duty to keep marshes untouched and natural as possible.	Opposed
Nancy Jenkins	w/ additional comments: must preserve wildlife and ocean critters	Opposed
Kathryn Kyker	w/ additional comments: no justification for ending historic protection of marshes when protection is needed now more than ever.	Opposed
Joe Costyn	w/ additional comments: no long docks, no sense of place, leave natural beauty alone	Opposed
Ruth McMullin	w/ additional comments: no need to change current restrictions on docks	Opposed
Christa Kerby	w/ additional comments: questions docks 5 football fields in length	Opposed
Catherine Bradshaw	w/ additional comments: reject rule for private docks on Cumberland; docks will harm marsh	Opposed
Joan Shinnick	w/ additional comments: reject rule so marshland is protected and not turned into private property	Opposed

John Grainger	w/ additional comments: reject substantial increases in area and/or length. Marshfront properties shouldn't be allowed to override existing standards because the want or can afford it. Further encroachment into marsh is not in public interest and seems to be accomodating only a select few. CRD should not bow to development interests.	Opposed
Cydney Wells	w/ additional comments: Rule only benefits wealthiest Georgians who can buy access to the water regardless of how much public land they would cross. Large oversize projects damage marshes. Objective must be minimal obstruction not to contort it for personal convenience.	Opposed
Katherine Warden	w/ additional comments: stunned at CRD actions with no support and plenty of science and public sentiment against it; reconsider.	Opposed
Nicolas Zart	w/ additional comments: Took time and energy to represent what so many think is best for coast. Lobbyism has no place in environment. Children will pay higher price. Request new section be added to assess fees to support staff resources for permit review and inspections, also an accurate database to monitor cumulative impacts.	Opposed
Terry Kelly	w/ additional comments: urge board to follow wishes of conservationists and not allow bigger private docks	Opposed
Christa Hayes	w/ additional comments: urge board to keep in mind marsh is facing multiple manmade stressors from large scale deforestation and water issues caused by construction (warehouses, data centers); combined effects of direct damage to marsh from dock construction then long term disruption of ecosystem is irresponsible; burden is too great to carry; saltmarsh benefits are hurricane absorption, food, beauty for soul; who can support meager benefits to developers compared to loss of saltmarsh wren, clapper rail, dolphins; revise rule.	Opposed
Kathleen Wannemuehler	w/ additional comments: urge Board to reconsider to protect shared resources and public lands, not allow few landowners to damage and destroy. Consider future generations, not short term gains for a few.	Opposed
Rena Patton	w/ additional comments: urgency to do our part and stop expansion of dock sizes	Opposed
Helen Haynes	w/ additional comments: urges protection of marsh habitat and marine life	Opposed
Roderick Jude	w/ additional comments: urges rejecting changes- extremely important to them	Opposed
Robert Del Bueno	w/ additional comments: why bother with transparency of the process revealed	Opposed
Debbie Critz	w/ additional comments: why did DNR take time and effort to convene committee then ignore the proposal. Shame and embarrassment re. influence and behind scenes machinations which trumps welfare of coast.	Opposed
Benjamin Carswell - Coastal Georgia Audubon Society	w/ attachments: 200 members - emphatically impose size increases due to unacceptably harmful effects on marsh dwelling bird populations, especially Worthingtons wren and MacGillivrays sparrow which are ranked w/critical global importance. One is a candidate for T&E listing. Birds don't use areas w/predators which dock walkways provide perch for. Long docks will turn large area of marsh into smaller patches that will decrease bird abundance and diversity. Rules exceed limits est. in CMPA rules for marinas/community docks, triple current limit, exceeds minor alteration in CMPA. Rules must be scientific, aligned with CMPA. Board should amend draft to more conservative size limit. Failure to do so fails to honor state's rule as steward of public trust.	Opposed
David Kyler - Center for a Sustainable Coast	w/ attachments: detailed analysis shows 1500 lots affected by new regs; area of impact would exceed 300 acres, resulting in shading, consequences of storm damage, risk of marsh contamination, and public harm from debris. Price of docked properties increases, benefits only gained by select few or by developers. vast majority of public will suffer degradation of marsh vistas and habitat functions, both meant to be protected under CMPA. Eco services will be impacted and quality of life. marshes are public trust resource. Rules are not in public interest of state. No justification provided for enlarging footprint over public trust lands; exceeds CMPA rules; adopt effective shading impact ceiling, monitor impacts, require mitigation. RL should address post authorization property subdivisions - esp if such will then disqualify it for CMPA exemption. Require disclosure of such subdivision; record RL on property records. Clarify effect of suspension and revocation, as it relates to subdivisions or change in use.	Opposed
Zachary Hennessee - SELC	w/ attachments: proposed rules threat to the integrity of marshlands and a concerning retreat from DNR's history of protecting them for the benefit of the public. Rules could lead to a proliferation of enormous private docks, more than three times larger than the largest private docks allowed under the current standards and orders of magnitude larger than the largest community docks. Risk degrading our fragile marsh ecosystem. Prioritize interests of wealthy landowners over the public's rights to access and enjoy public trust resources. GA would be a dramatic outlier among neighbors. Salt marshes are pristine because GA historically has been a leader in protecting them. Ask Board not to retreat from this legacy - instead adopt rules that: limit the length to 1,000ft; limit max to no more than 0.1 acre; set standards for variances -include public input and mitigation; establish fee for admin and protection/rehabilitation of marsh resources impacted by docks. Encourage Board to further study the issue before adopting any regulation that relaxes the existing standards. Longer docks will enable predators to penetrate deeper into marsh. Long docks will not be limited by cost and should not be basis for regulation. More docks leads to increased cumulative impacts. New upland development will increase. Rules "invert" DNRs public trust obligations for private landowner convenience. DNR is fiduciary charged with protecting public's interest first. Dock inventory should be completed and should calculate how many new docks will be built with new length; without this information the Board cannot understand changes to regulatory framework.	Opposed
Maggie Van Cantfort - Altamaha Riverkeeper	w/ attachments: support comments by OHM and GC. CRD needs to confirm applicants meet all requirements; enforcement of derelict dock removal needs to be strengthened; non motorized vessels should be prioritized and allowable for a 2nd hoist; require turtle friendly lighting; minimize dock size to .1 acre; and improve dock inventory.	Opposed
Monica Thorton - TNC (via email from Talia Levine)	w/ attachments: TNC partners w/DNR. Opposes expansion of allowable impacts w/o sci analysis, assessment of cumulative impacts or a clear public review process. Supports OHM comments. Public engagement was not commensurate with significance of changes or impacts. No analysis of existing research related to dock density, shading, exceeds minor alteration. variance raises questions of consistency with intent/implementation of CMPA. Concerns this is not in keeping with Public Trust Doctrine. Board should understand impact of decision on SWAP priorities which should be addressed by subject matter experts w/nothing to gain from proposal. CAC, C<PC and public should be provided scientific information used to develop NEW proposal and be allowed time to review and contribute to discussions.	Opposed
Catherine Lovett	x2 w/ additional comments: disheartened with new changes because marsh is unique/valuable. Not in the best interest of the marsh.	Opposed
Christina Williams x2	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Whitney Edenfield x2	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Lori Norden x2	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Elvira & Douglas Rivalsi x2	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jacquelyn Clark x2	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Melanie Fenley x3	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
MaryBeth Deiters x5	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
John & Nancy Crosby x3	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed

Cort Atkinson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Beth Remmes	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Barbara Stahnke	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Nancy Maier	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Ruth Wilson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
William Kehoe	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Duessa Pujat	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jennifer Taylor	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Julie Sutton	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Joyce Cotter	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Victoria Weeks	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Margaret Kelly	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jenny Watkins	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Alex Dileo	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Charon Sharp	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Ann Bullock	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Linda Mahoney	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Donna Haram	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
John Schacke	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Tina Wilkinson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Susan Lamb	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Teresa Ashman	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Mickey Youmans	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Nina Dutton	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jennifer Fletcher	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Keren Giovengo	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
David Hobbs	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Nancy Webb	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Beth DiGiovanni	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Amilda Cole	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Rachel Tandy	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Kelly Brewer	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Eleanor Rhangos	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Anne Quaille	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Amanda Thompson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Amy Callaway	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Mary P Kelley	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Molly Keyes	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Daniel Hutto	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
LaVaughn Smith	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Lindsey Marcec	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Marc Hanson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Hilary Wilson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jamie Schultz	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Robert Meyers	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Deb Luginbuhl	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Anna Rincom	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Susan Khan	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Susan Emery	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Margaret Sapp	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Dayana Avila	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Robert Gantt	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Delina Malinoff	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Elizabeth Sutton	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Adina Sutton	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Amy Moran	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Kevin Lang	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Kellan Monroe	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Walter & Kimberly Lee	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Robert Delano	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Bryan Roux	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Douglas Kallman	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
William Kehoe	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Barbara Else	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Michael Cook	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Pablo Mancheno	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Raleigh Koritz	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Elaine Sears	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Patrick Maurice	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Lewis Lay	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Mike Peale	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Tracy Cramer	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Maggie Wharton	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Lawrence Kloet	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Donald Privett	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Dr. Bonnie Springer	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jamie Klem	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Cheryl H Helton	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Melanie Furr	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Christina Cotter	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Derin Parker	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Sheryl Roberts	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed

Maggie Miller	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Mary Mowry	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Peter Brodhead	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Kyle Gray	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Daniel Schlagman	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Ric Felker	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Amy Edgy	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Kathy Hodges	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
M Rebessa Carr	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Pamela Brown	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Kathleen Wolfe	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Julie Sutton	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Leurveda Gamer	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Terri Keller	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Miranda O'Shields	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Michelle Jamison	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Michael Fleetwood	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jaime Campora	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Joyce Cotter	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Val Farrelly	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Lacey Irizarry	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Peter Followill	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Michael Henry	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Eric Bumgartner	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Heidi Germano	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Alexandra McNeal	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Connie Boogie	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Holly Roy	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Sarah Schenkman	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Robert Szychowski	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
E. Hodges	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Rebecca Rolles	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Amilda Cole	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Dottie Leatherwood	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Richard Peters	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Tonnia Switzer	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Whitney Edenfield	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Bradley Wilkinson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Paula Harwell	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
James LaPean Sr	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Joy Hamby	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jennifer Taylor	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jerry Banks	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Maria Dabrowski	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Debra Power	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Rebecca Lang	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Elizabeth Dupree	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Andrea Chappelle	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Donna Davie-Speakes	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
John Schacke	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
William Corson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
David O'Conner	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jack Brodhag	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Suzanne Thomas	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Vanessa Jozwiak	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Lauren Brooks	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jonathan Weller	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Fred Winckler	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jeffry White	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Mary Herrington	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Sallie Cooper	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Rachael Francois	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Beverly Miller	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Virginia Zart	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Carol Yager	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Mallorie Davis	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
John Brandon	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Amanda Deitsch	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Lara Sims	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Elise Drake	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Beth Kempe	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Patty Ragland	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Lynda Beam	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
John Robinson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Roxann Drew	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Nichole Dandrea	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jennifer Weil	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Elaine Johnson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Meg Kettlitz	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Emily Culling	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Marilyn Odell	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Summer Deason	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed

Michelle Moyer	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Debra Combs	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jacquelyn Lickness	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Debbie McKeivitt	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Winkler Weinberg	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Kendall Crosby	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Dawn Able	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jamie Klem	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Nancy Grove	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jonathan Mittleider	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Laura Mora	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Teresa Mayes	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
TB	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Sara Micklos	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jerry Lamb	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Elizabeth Sutton	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Carolyn Griffin	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Charles Wilsdorf	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Virginia McKenna	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Ansley Carve	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Libby Miller	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Steve Crowder	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Jenny Watkins	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Kathryn Propst	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Shelly Renner	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Mary Dickerson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Johnnie Crosby	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Sharon Kitchen	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Amanda Castro	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Joshua Soave	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Catherine Stortz	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Arlene Watson	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Charles Schoen	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Sharen Martin	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Diane Klement	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Teresa Ashman	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Barbara Howerton	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed
Raymond Jones	Add guidelines to regulations regarding electrical service to docks	Opposed: Electrical
Janet Mitchell	Docks should be inspected annually for safe electrical to prevent death - at the expense of the owners.	Opposed: Electrical
Jennifer Anderson	Electrical req more important than length/width. Inspections needed. Model coast after lake lanier which has guidelines and rules regarding electrified docks.	Opposed: Electrical
Jordan Caverzasi	Focus should not be on structural footpring but on lessening critical loophole regarding electrical infrastructure. Requiring proof of permit is wise recognition of authority but harsh environment degrades electrical systems. Because these structures are on public land, we have the authority to attach strict safety condition to the licenses and should revoke them when breached. Request amendment to rule that RL is conditioned on maintaining valid electrical certification, safety compliance reports signed by professionals every 3-5 years. Such amendment would not come at cost to CRD who simply receives and holds paperwork. There's an existing precedent and if DNR can police dock length, etc, it can require a digital safety certificate to preserve safety.	Opposed: Electrical
Kimberly Bryant	Make changes to make docks with electricity safe	Opposed: Electrical
Amy Bullard	Needs electrical inspections. Most iimportant issue over length/width. References a list of electrocutions by docks w/injury or death.	Opposed: Electrical
Carla Hall	No local regulations on electricity to docks. Most important issue but no regs or inspections in place. Hoists require electrical. Question of responsibility is barely addressed but must be included in dock regs.	Opposed: Electrical
Crystal Adams	Strongly urges electrical safety requirements and inspections. Recommends permit apps disclose electric plans, require electrical installed by licenced professional, routine safety inspections and post storm, designated authority for ensuing requirements are followed. Model coastal regs after other areas. regs will protect human life.	Opposed: Electrical
Alicia Taylor	Urge regulations for requireng electrical inspections for docks, for life and safety. Dock owners should be responsible for maintaining electrical installation in safe condition and inspected by professionals	Opposed: Electrical
Sheila Stephens	Urges more focus on electrical requirements - more important than dimensions, construction and hoists. No clear oversight over electrical and no one is inspecting them. Someone needs to take responsibility. Necessary to prevent additional tragedy. Recc disclose whether electrical service will be installed. Moreso, periodic safety inspections should occur as even proper systems deteriorate over time, creating a dangerous condition. Aware of other similar tragedies. Make changes in honor of Kale Stephens "Kale's Law"	Opposed: Electrical
Jennifer Hufstetler	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed: Electrical
Jeannine Moss	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed: Electrical
Deborah Ferrell	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed: Electrical
Amethea Keyser	Opposed via Form Letter	Opposed: Electrical
Support		
Phillip Kidney	Children's safety is more important than marsh grass. Marshlands are otherwise protection. Docks should be built and inspected the right way.	Support
Patricia Varnadore	every property owner should have right to access and use there (sic) property; others must be envious	Support
Kirk Whalen	support current draft	Support
Derek Brown	Supports proposal. Docks are good habitat for organisms on the pilings. Birds roost. Wrack washes away. Property owner should be able to build a very long dock - they help the ecosystem. If unsightly to neighbors, that's jealousy.	Support
Not Related		
Ann M. Ellis	2 X: vehement opposition to Cumberland land swap	Not Related
Sharon Steele	Cumberland Island changes	Not Related
Cliff Courtenay	Leave Cumberland alone	Not Related
Brenden Parks	opposes Cumberland land swap	Not Related

Rebecca Rowell	X2 Fuel for shrimpers	Not Related
912-xxx-xxxx	Too many attachgrments to open to read text. Might be spam.	Not Related
Opposed B3:F352via Form Letter	questions regarding future guidelines for edu and licensing.	Questions

Recived LATE

Carolyn Radar	4:35pm
Cathy Barnard	4:36pm
Jack Robertson (also did not sent to CRD Comments)	w/ attachments 4:37pm
Harriet Gilbert	4:53pm
Trudy Pranulis	5:48pm
John Hurst	w/ attachments 6:33pm
Anna Williams	6:37pm
Beth McCarthy	6:55pm
Bill Murdy	7:20pm
Debbie Hornsby	7:57pm
Kathy Riechmann	9:05pm
Susanne Mock	9:09pm
Mary G. Pope	10:16pm
David Vance	
Melanie Fenley	
Randy Tate	