



1110 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
P: 202.842.0500
F: 202.289.0916
PSBRESEARCH.COM

ROBERT GREEN
PRINCIPAL

TO: National Community Pharmacists Association & Interested Parties
FROM: Robert Green, Penn Schoen Berland
DATE: July 17, 2015
RE: [72% of voters support transparency legislation for generic drug costs](#)

The key findings below reflect a national poll of n=1,200 likely voters conducted online by Penn Schoen Berland (PSB) from June 4-9, 2015. The margin of error for this study is +/- 2.83% at the 95% confidence level for likely voters. Some percentages may add to more or less than 100% due to rounding.

Transparency legislation would update pharmacies weekly on generic drug costs

In our survey, we measured support for generic drug reimbursement transparency legislation among likely voters. The legislation was described to voters as:

Proposed legislation that would require Pharmacy Benefit Management (PBM) corporations to update all pharmacies, including independent community ones, on the cost of generic drugs every week to reflect market conditions

Voters read arguments from both sides of the argument about the legislation

As part of the survey, voters were presented with a series of “pro” and “con” statements regarding proposed transparency legislation.

All voters saw five statements in support of transparency legislation and four statements opposing transparency legislation. No given respondents saw all of the examples listed below.

Examples of statements shown to be *against* transparency legislation (*truncated*):

- *PBMs typically reduce prescription drug costs by 30 percent. If proposed legislation were to take effect nationwide, it could increase spending by employers, taxpayers, and public programs on generic prescription drugs by \$6.2 billion per year.*
- *Patients likely won't save money as a result of the legislation. In reality, these bills are about one thing: more money for drug stores.*
- *In 2013, the average pharmacist owning a single pharmacy earned \$247,000. These pharmacists aren't hurting, they just want to increase their take-home pay.*
- *Pharmacies and PBM corporations sign contracts so that pharmacies can provide medication to patients that the PBM represents. The government should not be allowed to meddle and change these legally binding contracts*
- *If enacted, this legislation could increase how much drugs cost for seniors. Most seniors live on a fixed income, and cannot afford higher premiums.*

Examples of statements shown to **support** transparency legislation (truncated):

- *PBMs claim to save money for the employers and government plans they represent, but they fight against transparency laws because all they really care about is protecting their obscene profit margins.*
- *The PBM corporations are overcharging the government and American taxpayers... And because they don't have to disclose what any of these prices are, no one knows the difference.*
- *Would you ever fill up your car with gas without knowing the price first? That's what independent community pharmacies have to do every day.*
- *Many community pharmacies serve rural areas or inner-city neighborhoods. Without fair reimbursements, many of these pharmacies will not be able to afford to do business.*
- *Unfair reimbursements hurt senior patients disproportionately because they are most likely to need drugs that pharmacies can't afford to buy.*
- *PBM lobbyists are working around the clock to fight laws like these that would bring transparency to their industry.*
- *Many Americans choose community pharmacies because they like the personalized care their pharmacists provide, but without fair reimbursements some will close.*
- *In 2013, our nation's 22,000 community pharmacies employed more than 220,000 full-time workers, and reforming generic drug reimbursement policies would help ensure communities around the country keep these jobs.*

After seeing arguments from both sides, voters answered the following question:

Given everything you've read, would you say you support or oppose proposed legislation that would require PBM corporations to update all pharmacies, including independent community ones, on the cost of generic drugs every week to reflect market conditions?

Likely Voters (%)	All	Party			Age				Gender	
		D	R	I	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+	M	F
SUPPORT LEGISLATION	72	70	68	76	76	72	71	67	76	69
OPPOSE LEGISLATION	28	30	32	24	24	28	29	33	25	31

Voters support proposed legislation

Voters overwhelmingly support generic drug reimbursement transparency legislation. Across age, gender, and party lines voters agree that forcing community pharmacies to blindly fill prescriptions without knowing how much they will be reimbursed is wrong.

PBMs may claim that they are saving employers and the government money, but voters recognize that their practices are harmful towards independent community pharmacies, their employees, and the millions of people that rely on community pharmacies for their prescription medications.

Implementing mandatory generic drug disclosure and transparency legislation does not only save employers and patients money, it is also supported by a large majority of voters who recognize the importance of transparency and accountability, especially when it comes to something as crucial as people's medication.