

Submitter: Troy Hadley
On Behalf Of: Registered to testify at March 8th Hearing
Committee: Senate Committee On Natural Resources
Measure: SB789

I was registered to testify & in attendance at 3/8/23 hearing, ran out of time to be able to testify

My name is Troy Hadley, and I am asking you to oppose SB 789.

I am a 5th generation farmer in the Silverton hills, where we are very limited to what crops we can grow due to elevation, slope, lack of irrigation, shallow heavy clay soils, etc. Fine fescue has been our primary crop for 70+ years. Canola is the only rotation crop we've tried through the years that also provides an economic return that makes it worth growing. The addition of canola into our rotation since 2013 has all but eliminated our most problematic weeds, reducing the need for more harmful chemical applications and also the amount of acres we need to open field burn. My yields on fine fescue and oats have consistently increased by 20% over what I got before having canola in the rotation too.

Under the current system, a private group basically tells ODA where canola can be planted. The 500 acre limit also prevents me and other growers from developing value added markets, because to have enough product to supply food oil customers, or dairies with meal, we would need to be more in the 5000 acre range.

Many of the oppositions arguments are flat out untrue. Canola has not been at all difficult to control as volunteers, and is actually much easier to control than other specialty seed crops like turnip, radish, and meadowfoam that persist in the soil longer. You DO NOT see canola along Valley roadsides when you see the yellow blooms in the spring - that is wild mustard that has proliferated due to lack of ODOT roadside management.

Any limitations on canola should apply evenly to ALL brassica species. To claim that '500 acres is what coexistence looks like' is laughable. 500 acres was the number OSU lobbied for in 2013 to be able to conduct a reputable research study. It was NEVER intended to be an upper acreage limit, particularly when that legislatively requested research showed no additional concern based on pest, disease or weed issues. This is market protectionism pure and simple, and for government to consider a law on this basis is just wrong.

Thank you for your time, and please oppose SB 789.