

**Bioscience Industry 2009 Legislative Survey:**

1. Name:

John C. Grange

2. What is the office seat you are running for and in what district is that seat?

Kansas House of Representatives, 75th District

3. **FEDERAL RESEARCH INITIATIVES** - Do you support recruiting large-scale federal research initiatives to Kansas, such as the National Bio and Agro Defense Facility which several state stakeholders are currently trying to recruit to Manhattan, Kansas? If yes, how involved should the Kansas legislature be in these recruitment efforts? Do you feel the state of Kansas has assembled the right kind of coalition to go after projects of this magnitude?

I fully support expansion of our recruitment efforts. I have supported this facility since we first were informed of the possibility of it coming to Kansas. I think our Political, and all elected officials along with the major players from Industry and State agencies should all focus on this project to help Kansas prosper and stay at the leading edge of Bio-Science innovation.

4. **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** - At what level of funding do you support the following state-funded economic development agencies, programs and incentives?

	Increase Funding	Maintain Funding	Decrease Funding	Eliminate Funding
Kansas Bioscience Authority (KBA)	-	<b>Selected</b>	-	-
Kansas Technology Enterprise Corporation (KTEC)	-	<b>Selected</b>	-	-
Angel Investor Tax Credits	-	<b>Selected</b>	-	-
Research & Development Tax Credits	<b>Selected</b>	-	-	-
Business Machinery & Equipment Tax Credits	<b>Selected</b>	-	-	-
High Performance Incentive Program (HPIP) Investment Tax Credits	<b>Selected</b>	-	-	-
HPIP Training & Education Tax Credits	<b>Selected</b>	-	-	-

5. **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT** - Using your answers to the economic development funding question above as a guide, please explain your rationale for either increasing, maintaining, decreasing or eliminating funding for each agency, program or incentive. Also, please use the space below to explain any new program/incentive ideas you may wish to introduce or how you plan on reallocating resources.

The reason for maintaining is to allow us to look at the practical application of what we already provide. It would be wishful thinking that we could significantly increase any funding, based upon all the identified needs. I would make sure the state did provide any impediment to progress. This would have to be a public private venture to insure success.

6. **STEM CELLS** - During the 2008 Kansas legislative session, legislators did not engage in much stem cell research or definition discussion, while in other states (such as Missouri), the topic seemed to dominate their legislative session. Do you feel that stem cell definitions and guidelines should be determined at the federal level or at the state level?

Practically I would prefer State level, however from a practical viewpoint and our proximity to researchers in border states, the federal guideline would prevail.

7. **INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION** - Do you support helping to establish guidelines for intellectual property (IP) protection for bioscience companies who wish to partner and engage in research projects with Kansas' research universities?

Absolutely. Development of drugs, processes or equipment will be expensive and there should be protection for this private investment.

8. BIOSCIENCE INDUSTRY GROWTH - What are one or two areas where you feel you could impact the growth of the biosciences industry in Kansas?

The area of prosthetics or innovative development of processes. I am not a technology expert, but I am a mechanical contractor and we are always thinking outside of the "box." I would work to remove obstacles for public private developments.