

From: [GOLDER, Walker](#)
To: [Bob Eakes](#)
Cc: [Mike Murray](#); [Pat Field](#)
Subject: RE:
Date: 09/11/2008 08:14 AM

Bob,

Thank you for your suggestion at the meeting that we talk about this further. I think your suggestion below is a good place to start and I am looking forward to continuing our discussion. I am tied up (not literally, I was able to get off the island safely☺) all day today and tomorrow. I will be able to respond more completely over the weekend or early next week.

Thanks again,
Walker

Walker Golder
Deputy Director
Audubon North Carolina
7741 Market Street, Unit D
Wilmington, NC 28411-9444
Tel: 910-686-7527
Fax: 910-686-7587

[DONATE ONLINE to protect NC's birds and habitats.](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: Bob Eakes [mailto:bobeakes@aginet.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2008 5:14 PM
To: GOLDER, Walker
Cc: Mike Murray; Pat Field
Subject:

Hello Walker,

Hope you had as much fun at the past meeting as I.

I would like to open a thought process on Cape Point which does not bring anything else into play. I really do understand that it would be hard for either you or I to not use this thought process on other areas but I do not know how else to start the dialogue.

So, how do we start this.

I would suggest that any prenesting closure which is pretty much accepted by both sides not have a buffer system if the bird is inside of and removed from harm because of the size of the closure. An example would be a bird puts a nest inside the closure, maybe in the exact middle, and there should not be a reason for a great deal of concern because everything is closed around the nest already. So, a different species does the same and so on. If the closure takes in all of the buffer needed then I think NPS should monitor same but not make a great big deal of it.

If I did not make sense, write it off to being brain dead from the meeting and I will try again.

0075415

Bob Eakes