



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

HEALTHCARE COSTS

- STATE OF IOWA, CD1, CD2, CD3, CD4, and NATIONAL -

Field Dates:

State of Iowa, Iowa CD1, Iowa CD2, Iowa CD3, Iowa CD4: May 27 – June 23, 2026

National: February 11-26, 2026

Sample Sizes:

State of Iowa: 2000 **Iowa CD1:** 500 **Iowa CD2:** 500 **Iowa CD3:** 500 **Iowa CD4:** 500

National: 2,509

Confidence Interval:

State of Iowa: +/-2.9% **Iowa CD1, Iowa CD2, Iowa CD3, Iowa CD4:** +/-5.5-6.0%

National: +/- 2.9%

Samples Provided by: Multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege. Sample collection and quality control was managed by QuantifyAI under the direction of the University of Maryland's Program for Public Consultation.

Note: Rows may not add to 100% due to rounding

[Q13-17, 37-43 previously released]

[Q9-12, 18-24, 26-36, 44-59 withheld for future release]

We are going to share with you some proposals that have been put forward that have the goal of reducing the price of drugs. For each one, please select whether you favor or oppose it.

Q1. As you may know, many drug companies charge a higher price for drugs in the US than in other developed countries. To ensure that prices are not higher in the US, it has been proposed that the federal government set maximum prices based on what the drugs are sold for in other developed countries.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	86%	14%	0%
Republicans	90%	10%	0%
Democrats	86%	14%	0%
Independents	76%	24%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	87%	13%	1%
Republicans	88%	11%	1%

Democrats	90%	10%	0%
Iowa CD1	88%	11%	1%
Republicans	87%	12%	1%
Democrats	92%	8%	1%
Iowa CD2	84%	15%	1%
Republicans	88%	11%	1%
Democrats	89%	11%	0%
Iowa CD3	87%	12%	1%
Republicans	91%	8%	1%
Democrats	88%	12%	0%
Iowa CD4	87%	13%	0%
Republicans	88%	12%	0%
Democrats	91%	10%	0%

When a company develops a new drug, they can get a patent so that they are the only company that can sell the drug for up to 20 years. Some drug companies have been extending the amount of time their drug has no competition by paying other generic drug companies to hold off selling the drug, enabling the original patent holder to continue to charge higher prices.

Q2. Here is a proposal: Make it illegal for drug companies—whose patent on a drug has come to an end—to pay generic drug companies to hold off making and selling that drug.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	76%	24%	0%
Republicans	79%	21%	0%
Democrats	77%	23%	0%
Independents	64%	36%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	78%	21%	1%
Republicans	78%	22%	1%
Democrats	81%	18%	1%
Iowa CD1	79%	21%	0%
Republicans	78%	22%	0%
Democrats	79%	20%	1%
Iowa CD2	78%	21%	1%
Republicans	76%	22%	1%
Democrats	85%	15%	0%
Iowa CD3	80%	20%	1%
Republicans	80%	19%	1%
Democrats	80%	19%	1%
Iowa CD4	75%	24%	1%
Republicans	77%	23%	0%
Democrats	79%	19%	2%

As you may know, some patented drugs have been developed with the aid of federal funding.

Q3. Here is a proposal: In the event the federal government:

- determines the price of a patented drug is unaffordable to some or most of the people that need it,
- and that drug was developed with the aid of federal funding,

the federal government will override the drug company's patent and license other companies to produce the drug.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	79%	21%	0%
Republicans	83%	17%	0%
Democrats	78%	22%	0%
Independents	68%	32%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	81%	18%	1%
Republicans	83%	15%	2%
Democrats	79%	20%	1%
Iowa CD1	82%	17%	0%
Republicans	87%	13%	0%
Democrats	82%	18%	0%
Iowa CD2	78%	20%	2%
Republicans	78%	18%	4%
Democrats	80%	20%	1%
Iowa CD3	81%	18%	0%
Republicans	81%	18%	1%
Democrats	84%	17%	0%
Iowa CD4	80%	17%	2%
Republicans	87%	12%	2%
Democrats	72%	24%	4%

Here are two proposals that would reduce the cost of health insurance for some people:

Q4. Allow people, aged 55 years or older, to purchase a Medicare plan which is now only available to those 65 and over.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	80%	20%	0%
Republicans	75%	25%	0%
Democrats	84%	15%	1%
Independents	83%	17%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	81%	19%	0%
Republicans	79%	21%	1%
Democrats	84%	16%	0%
Iowa CD1	83%	17%	0%
Republicans	82%	18%	1%
Democrats	81%	19%	0%
Iowa CD2	80%	19%	1%

Republicans	79%	19%	2%
Democrats	85%	15%	0%
Iowa CD3	79%	20%	1%
Republicans	73%	26%	1%
Democrats	85%	15%	0%
Iowa CD4	82%	18%	0%
Republicans	81%	19%	0%
Democrats	84%	17%	0%

Q5. Offer a government-run public option (similar to Medicare) and allow all individuals who want to, to buy into it.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	80%	20%	0%
Republicans	76%	24%	1%
Democrats	86%	14%	0%
Independents	79%	21%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	80%	20%	0%
Republicans	76%	24%	0%
Democrats	86%	14%	0%
Iowa CD1	83%	17%	0%
Republicans	81%	18%	1%
Democrats	89%	11%	0%
Iowa CD2	79%	20%	1%
Republicans	75%	24%	1%
Democrats	85%	14%	1%
Iowa CD3	80%	20%	0%
Republicans	74%	26%	0%
Democrats	86%	14%	0%
Iowa CD4	76%	24%	0%
Republicans	73%	27%	0%
Democrats	82%	18%	0%

Now, we are going to look at treatment for drug and alcohol misuse and addiction, also known as substance use disorder.

Q6. How high a priority should it be for the government to ensure that every person who needs and wants treatment for their substance use disorder is able to get it?

	Very high priority	Somewhat high priority	Very - Somewhat high priority	Low priority	Not at all a priority	Low - Not at all a priority	Ref/DK
National	50%	38%	88%	9%	3%	12%	0%
Republicans	46%	40%	86%	11%	4%	15%	0%
Democrats	58%	35%	93%	5%	1%	7%	0%
Independents	42%	42%	84%	11%	5%	17%	0%

Iowa (Statewide)	45%	44%	89%	8%	3%	11%	0%
Republicans	39%	48%	87%	12%	2%	14%	0%
Democrats	52%	42%	94%	5%	1%	6%	0%
Iowa CD1	44%	44%	88%	9%	3%	12%	0%
Republicans	36%	48%	84%	15%	1%	16%	0%
Democrats	49%	46%	95%	4%	0%	4%	1%
Iowa CD2	48%	39%	87%	9%	4%	13%	1%
Republicans	45%	40%	85%	12%	3%	16%	0%
Democrats	53%	40%	93%	7%	1%	7%	0%
Iowa CD3	45%	45%	91%	8%	1%	9%	0%
Republicans	37%	50%	87%	13%	1%	13%	0%
Democrats	53%	42%	94%	5%	1%	6%	0%
Iowa CD4	43%	48%	91%	5%	4%	9%	1%
Republicans	37%	54%	91%	7%	2%	9%	0%
Democrats	53%	39%	92%	4%	4%	8%	0%

Q7. Here is a proposal: Increase government spending on substance use disorder by \$13 billion which would mean nearly all people who want and need treatment would get it.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	75%	25%	0%
Republicans	69%	31%	0%
Democrats	83%	17%	0%
Independents	70%	30%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	76%	23%	1%
Republicans	69%	31%	0%
Democrats	84%	16%	0%
Iowa CD1	77%	22%	0%
Republicans	70%	29%	1%
Democrats	84%	16%	0%
Iowa CD2	73%	26%	1%
Republicans	71%	29%	0%
Democrats	81%	18%	1%
Iowa CD3	79%	21%	1%
Republicans	72%	28%	0%
Democrats	84%	15%	0%
Iowa CD4	74%	25%	1%
Republicans	63%	37%	1%
Democrats	87%	13%	0%

Q8. As you may know, a law was passed in 2021 which temporarily increased subsidies for health insurance in the ACA marketplace. Recently, those increased subsidies were ended, thus raising the healthcare costs (premiums and deductibles) for households on ACA insurance.

Here is a proposal: Renew the increased subsidies for ACA health insurance, so that low- and middle-income households on ACA will not have a major increase in health insurance costs.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	81%	19%	0%
Republicans	73%	27%	0%
Democrats	90%	10%	0%
Independents	80%	20%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	82%	17%	1%
Republicans	77%	23%	1%
Democrats	91%	8%	1%
Iowa CD1	82%	17%	1%
Republicans	82%	17%	0%
Democrats	88%	11%	1%
Iowa CD2	82%	18%	1%
Republicans	75%	25%	0%
Democrats	91%	7%	2%
Iowa CD3	84%	15%	1%
Republicans	77%	22%	1%
Democrats	93%	7%	0%
Iowa CD4	81%	18%	1%
Republicans	73%	27%	1%
Democrats	93%	7%	0%

Q25. There has been a debate about how much the Federal government spends on Medicaid, the program for people with low incomes. If spending on Medicaid is reduced, this would result in fewer people being covered by Medicaid. If spending on Medicaid is increased, this would allow more people to be covered by Medicaid.

Thinking about federal spending on Medicaid over the last few years, do you think spending should be:

	Increased a lot	Increased some	Increased a little	Increased	Kept the same	Reduced	Reduced a little	Reduced some	Reduced a lot	Ref/DK
National	28%	27%	15%	70%	21%	9%	4%	1%	3%	0%
Republicans	19%	24%	16%	59%	28%	13%	6%	2%	5%	0%
Democrats	39%	32%	13%	83%	14%	3%	2%	1%	1%	0%
Independents	24%	25%	21%	69%	22%	9%	5%	1%	4%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	24%	31%	18%	73%	18%	9%	4%	2%	2%	0%
Republicans	14%	27%	21%	62%	24%	13%	7%	4%	2%	0%
Democrats	32%	34%	16%	83%	13%	4%	2%	1%	1%	0%
Iowa CD1	25%	29%	20%	74%	17%	9%	5%	2%	2%	0%
Republicans	13%	27%	18%	57%	26%	17%	10%	6%	2%	0%
Democrats	33%	32%	21%	86%	10%	4%	3%	0%	1%	0%
Iowa CD2	23%	35%	14%	72%	16%	11%	7%	1%	3%	1%

Republicans	16%	34%	16%	66%	17%	15%	10%	2%	3%	1%
Democrats	32%	32%	14%	78%	17%	6%	4%	1%	1%	0%
Iowa CD3	23%	31%	19%	73%	20%	7%	2%	4%	1%	0%
Republicans	13%	24%	26%	62%	28%	9%	1%	7%	1%	0%
Democrats	32%	39%	15%	86%	12%	2%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Iowa CD4	24%	30%	18%	72%	19%	8%	3%	1%	4%	1%
Republicans	16%	22%	26%	63%	25%	11%	6%	2%	4%	0%
Democrats	33%	33%	15%	80%	13%	5%	1%	1%	4%	2%

Methodology

Fielding and Sample Size: The surveys were fielded by the Program for Public Consultation (PPC) at the University of Maryland's Civic Innovation Center, with representative non-probability samples obtained from multiple online panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege.

National

Field Dates: February 11-26, 2026 Total Sample Size: 2509 Response Rate: 7.6%
Four-fifth Sample Sizes: 1991 to 2020

State of Iowa

Field Dates: May 27 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 2000 Response Rate: 8.0%

Iowa CD1

Field Dates: May 28 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 500 Response Rate: 7.1%

Iowa CD2

Field Dates: May 28 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 500 Response Rate: 8.4%

Iowa CD3

Field Dates: May 28 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 500 Response Rate: 8.7%

Iowa CD4

Field Dates: May 27 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 500 Response Rate: 7.8%

Pre-Stratification and Weighting: The samples were pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, educational attainment, household income, and home ownership. Benchmarks were obtained from the Census Bureau's 2024 and 2025 American Community Surveys, as well as the 2024 Current Population Survey's Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

The national sample was also weighted by Census region and partisan affiliation. In the Iowa samples, the distribution of partisan affiliation was weighted to be within expectations, based on voter registration data for non-leaners and/or Cook's Partisan Voting Index for leaners.

National

Confidence Interval of Four-fifth Samples: +/-2.9% Min Weight: 0.25 Max Weight: 2.51 Mean Weight: 1.0

State of Iowa

Confidence Interval: +/-2.9% Min. Weight: 0.06 Max Weight: 6.65 Mean Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD1

Confidence Interval: +/-5.9% Min. Weight: 0.12 Max Weight: 6.70 Mean Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD2

Confidence Interval: +/-5.5% Min. Weight: 0.06 Max Weight: 5.45 Mean Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD3

Confidence Interval: +/-5.6% Min. Weight: 0.13 Max Weight: 5.60 Mean Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD4

Confidence Interval: +/-6.0% Min. Weight: 0.08 Max Weight: 6.02 Mean Weight: 1.0

Confidence Intervals were calculated using the sample variance of the weights using the following formula:

CI = Square root $((1+\text{variance})/\text{sample size})$

Sample Collection: Sample collection was managed by Quant-E with oversight from PPC. Samples were drawn from multiple large online panels, including Cint, Prodege, and Dynata, whose members are recruited using non-probability sampling methods. The selected sample was invited to participate via email invitation, push notification, or SMS for cell phone users. Respondents were offered cash or cash-equivalent incentives to participate in the survey.

Data Collection and Privacy: Survey responses were collected directly on the Qualtrics platform. Only respondents with a provided link could take the survey, using their computer, laptop, tablet, or mobile phone.

Privacy and security measures were taken to ensure that data was collected in adherence to the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation policies for data privacy and security, as well as the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).

Quality Control: Quality control measures in the sample collection process to disqualify duplicate respondents and survey bots included:

- checking respondents' IP addresses to determine if there are duplicate respondents
- employing an "operating system & Web browser check" to determine if there are any cross-panel duplicates
- using hCaptcha to detect and disqualify survey bots.

Quality control measures within the survey to disqualify dishonest or mischievous respondents, as well as survey bots, included:

- an attention-check question, e.g. Select the word that does not belong. [Tuesday]; [Friday]; [April]; [Wednesday]
- an honesty question, e.g. What have you done in the past week? Select all that apply. [Won a gold medal at the Olympics]; [Watched TV]; [Got a license to operate a Class SSGN submarine]; [Read a book]
- a speed limit, which disqualified respondents who moved through the first quarter of the survey at a pace roughly triple the average reading speed.

Lastly, respondents were removed from the sample who answered less than half the substantive questions, or who engaged in straight-lining.