

**From:** "tmullen@westvail.com%inter2" <tmullen@westvail.com>  
**Subject:** Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 11/24/2005 04:26 PM CST  
**Date Sent:** 11/24/2005 04:26:56 CST  
**Date Received:** 11/24/2005 04:46:31 CST

---

Email: tmullen@westvail.com

FirstName: Tom

LastName: Mullen

Address1:

Address2:

City:

State:

zipcode:

Question1: Keep in mind that many of the "unintended consequences" have also been beneficial consequences to many farmers and land owners. By discouraging farmers from entering into program such as CRP and similar we will be destroying some of the potential for farmers to diversify their production options: crop harvesting vs. crop harvesting and habitat preservation that has far reaching social and economic benefits.

Question2: US farmers need a level playing field with regards to export/import factors. These factors are many. If the US consumer of agricultural and manufactured goods continues to demand that they always receive the lowest price for goods paid on the international market. It will be necessary of US trade policy be carefully reviewed with the intention of balancing the scales of US vs. foreign trade practices.

Question3: Many large farms are simply able to operate on a larger economy of scale than others. More acres produces more without a proportionate increase in costs. Again it will be important for new legislation to allow for diversity in ways to achieve income levels that make farmers engage in needed agricultural production, conservation, etc.  
Question4: Farm policy can best achieve conservation and environmental goals by allowing farmers/landowners to enjoy financial benefits by preserving, enhancing, for the purpose of conservation and public benefit.

Question5:

Question6: Part of the research should definitely serve the purpose of growing conservation, and preservation of critical land for habitat stability regarding wildlife.