

The same old misinformed arguments used for nearly 40 years against corn and ethanol continue to show up in opinion pieces by the Star Tribune.

As a corn farmer and board member for Chippewa Valley Ethanol Co., I know that ethanol has a positive impact in my greater Minnesota community through a valuable market for locally grown corn and offering good paying jobs.

Corn farmers today produce more corn from the same amount of acres as 20 years ago. In fact, acres for corn production has remained relatively flat in Minnesota while average yields have increased from 100 bushels/acre in the 1990s to 185 bushels/acre today.

The subsidy trope used to denigrate corn farmers and the ethanol sector is tired. The farm safety net accounts for 0.2% of the federal budget to ensure an affordable and abundant food supply. The federal tax code is littered with incentives to a whole host of economic sectors. We seem to only decry a subsidy when it is one we don't understand fully.

An ignored reality is that ethanol is better for human health than gasoline. It replaces aromatic compounds in gasoline and reduces emissions that increase the risk of cancer ([Hormel Institute](#)). Over 90% of vehicles on the road today burn gasoline. The choice is: use fossil-based additives that cause cancer or blend ethanol to reduce risk. The answer seems obvious to me.

Minnesota's agriculture sector constantly strives to develop and use best management practices that help us feed and fuel the world. I invite the columnist to visit with me for the real implications of corn farming and ethanol production on greater Minnesota.

Richard Syverson

Clontarf, MN