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Perimeter vs. Area Preservation

Which is better preserving the perimeter or area of lakes? Florida officials in the State Senate and House are torn about which method will keep the precious lake habitats flourishing. While preserving the large lakes seems like the bigger and better choice according to Senator Blowsmoke, Representative Foghorn’s proposal of preserving small lakes also makes a strong case for better conservation. Both politicians offer bills that preserve over 50% of lake habitat in Florida and work to preserve the lake habitat in the most favorable way.

Both Senator Blowsmoke and Representative Foghorn propose strong arguments for preserving the lake habitat in Florida. Senator Blowsmoke claims that preserving the biggest five lakes area-wise, would be most beneficial because “Big Lakes=Big Conservation.” By preserving big lakes, larger fish and aquatic plants and animals are preserved because the area of the lakes is larger. Larger lakes are usually much deeper than smaller lakes and therefore can hold more wildlife within the lakes. There is more space in the center of the lakes for aquatic life to flourish. Representative Foghorn revokes that claim. Instead, he believes that “More Lakes=More Conservation.” Foghorn claims that developing the five largest lakes perimeter-wise and preserving the rest would be more effective because more of the shorelines are protected. By preserving the perimeter of the small lakes, the wildlife extending beyond just the lakes would also be preserved. Both proposals hope to conserve the beauty and wildlife in the lakes of Florida.

Although Senator Blowsmoke and Representative Foghorn claim that they have the best conservation solution, Representative Foghorn’s bill is more beneficial to the lake habitats. When calculating the percent of preservation of the two proposals, Blowsmoke’s proposal preserves about 58% of lake area while Foghorn’s idea saves about 62% of shoreline. Although both politicians are correct in claiming that their ideas preserve over 50% of lake habitat, Foghorn’s proposal preserves more lake habitat than Blowsmoke’s proposal. Foghorn’s proposal conserves the shoreline of the lakes, which extends much farther than just the lake’s area. By conserving the shoreline, the forests along the lakes are preserved. Many surrounding plants and animals feed off of insects and animals living in the lakes, but do not actually live in the lakes. By preserving the perimeter surrounding the small lakes, these local animals will also be able to survive. Birds like the loon and other animals like the green frog build nests and breed along the shores. The preservation of many small lakes is important for the reproduction and continued growth of many species. Another benefit of preserving the shoreline of lakes, like Foghorn suggests, is that the soil around the lake will not be polluted with chemicals and pesticides and in turn will not pollute the lakes. If the shorelines are not conserved and streets and homes are constructed around lakes, the groundwater can be contaminated and flow into the lakes, diminishing its water quality. If only five large lakes are preserved the chances of one of them being contaminated is much higher and the amount of water contaminated is much greater than if one of the small lakes is contaminated. Not only do the plants around lakes help control pollution but they also help prevent erosion. By preserving the perimeter around the small lakes, the water quality and safety of the animals living in the pond are also preserved (Shoreline Habitat).

While Senator Blowsmoke’s idea seems like the “bigger” and “better” choice, his proposal lacks depth and long-term stability of the lakes. By only conserving the area of five large lakes, the area around the lakes gets diminished. Foghorn’s proposal of conserving the perimeter of the smaller lakes creates a healthier and more stable lake habitat.

Works Cited

“Shoreline Habitat.” [*http://extension.unh.edu/fwt/Shorelines.htm#Important*](http://extension.unh.edu/fwt/Shorelines.htm#Important)*.* University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension, 1995. Web. 23 Sept. 2012.