

**March 3, 2023**

**Washington State Pharmacy Quality Assurance Commission**



**Commission Business Meeting Materials**

**SAFETY.      QUALITY.      INNOVATION.**



# PROPOSED RULE MAKING

**CR-102 (July 2022)**  
**(Implements RCW 34.05.320)**  
Do **NOT** use for expedited rule making

CODE REVISER USE ONLY

OFFICE OF THE CODE REVISER  
STATE OF WASHINGTON  
FILED

DATE: January 18, 2023

TIME: 7:56 AM

WSR 23-03-109

**Agency:** Department of Health – Pharmacy Quality Assurance Commission

Original Notice

Supplemental Notice to WSR 22-20-100

Continuance of WSR

Preproposal Statement of Inquiry was filed as WSR 20-17-143; or

Expedited Rule Making--Proposed notice was filed as WSR \_\_\_\_\_; or

Proposal is exempt under RCW 34.05.310(4) or 34.05.330(1); or

Proposal is exempt under RCW \_\_\_\_\_.

**Title of rule and other identifying information:** (describe subject) WAC 246-945-486 (New) Return and reuse of unexpired medications – Department of corrections and WAC 246-945-488 (New) Safe donation of unexpired prescription drugs. The Pharmacy Quality Assurance Commission (commission) is proposing new sections in chapter 246-945 WAC for the implementation of Substitute Senate Bill (SSB) 6526, an act relating to the reuse and donation of unexpired prescription drugs. The supplemental proposal removes a prescriber notification requirement from WAC 246-945-488(2)(h)(i).

**Hearing location(s):**

Date:	Time:	Location: (be specific)	Comment:
3/3/2023	9:20 a.m.	<p>The Pharmacy Quality Assurance Commission will provide a virtual and a physical location for this hearing to promote social distancing and the safety of the citizens of Washington State.</p> <p><b>Physical location:</b></p> <p>Capital Region ESD 113 6005 Tye Dr SW Tumwater, WA 98512</p> <p><b>Virtual:</b></p> <p>Please download and import the following iCalendar (.ics) fields to your calendar system.</p> <p>Daily:</p> <p><a href="https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/tZIsdu2hqzMuHNJhIIH4KKYkCjwBU5J0e2Ps/ics?icsToken=98tyKuGurzouE9GdtB-">https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/tZIsdu2hqzMuHNJhIIH4KKYkCjwBU5J0e2Ps/ics?icsToken=98tyKuGurzouE9GdtB-</a></p>	

[BRpwABYj4LPPwmFxbgo13IBPpK3R4STr9FehVElqOojV](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86114958466)

Topic: PQAC Business Meeting 2022

To access the meeting on March 3, 2023 at 9 a.m., go to <https://zoom.us/join> or <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86114958466> and use the Webinar ID 861 1495 8466

The access options include one tap mobile:

US:  
+12532158782,,86114958466#  
or  
+16699009128,,86114958466#  
Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 253 215 8782 or  
+1 669 900 9128 or  
+1 346 248 7799 or  
+1 669 444 9171 or  
+1 386 347 5053 or  
+1 564 217 2000 or  
+1 646 558 8656 or  
+1 646 931 3860 or  
+1 301 715 8592 or  
+1 312 626 6799

Webinar ID: 861 1495 8466  
International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86114958466>

**Date of intended adoption:** 3/3/2023 (Note: This is **NOT** the **effective** date)

**Submit written comments to:**

Name: Joshua Munroe  
Address: PO Box 47582 Olympia, WA 98504-7852  
Email: <https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/policyreview>  
Fax: 360-236-2901  
Other: N/A  
By (date) 2/17/2023

**Assistance for persons with disabilities:**

Contact Joshua Munroe  
Phone: 360-236-2987  
Fax: 360-236-2901  
TTY: 711  
Email: [PharmacyRules@doh.wa.gov](mailto:PharmacyRules@doh.wa.gov)  
Other: N/A  
By (date) 2/24/2023

**Purpose of the proposal and its anticipated effects, including any changes in existing rules:** The 2020 Washington state legislature passed SSB 6526, an act relating to the reuse and donation of unexpired prescription drugs. SSB 6526 permits the Department of Corrections (DOC) pharmacy to accept returns of unit dose packages. The law also allows the commission to adopt rules to allow the safe donation of prescription drugs under chapter 69.70 RCW including, but not limited to, allowing pharmacy to pharmacy donation of unexpired prescription drug stock.

The proposed WAC 246-945-486 specifically allows the DOC pharmacy to accept for return and reuse noncontrolled unexpired legend drugs in unit dose packages, or full or partial multiple dose medication cards from the facilities it serves. The DOC pharmacy must ensure product integrity by adhering to RCW 69.70.050(1), (2), and (5).

The proposed language in WAC 246-945-488 adopts the required conditions for donated prescription drugs outlined in chapter 69.70 RCW, but also adds a requirement that participating pharmacies must submit an additional form to the commission as notification of participation in the program. They must also notify the commission when terminating

participation in the program. The proposed rule also directs participating pharmacies to develop policies and procedures that facilitate compliance with the statutory requirements. The policies and procedures must also include an additional requirement to notify the prescriber when donated medications are dispensed to a patient.

In addition, WAC 246-945-488 contains measures to ensure patient safety and product integrity such as separating the donated drugs from the rest of the pharmacy's drug stock and maintaining a separate inventory. Finally, the rule also adds the clarification that practitioners, pharmacists, medical facilities, manufacturers, wholesalers, or persons to whom a prescription drug was prescribed are not required to obtain a wholesaler license when donating drugs to a pharmacy.

Following the public rules hearing held on November 17, 2022 the commission determined that the proposed rule language required an amendment to WAC 246-945-488(2)(h)(i) to remove a prescriber notification requirement that was deemed unnecessary in order to provide donated prescription drugs to patients with a valid, standing prescription.

**Reasons supporting proposal:** SSB 6526 requires the commission to adopt rules allowing the DOC pharmacy to accept returns of unit dose packages or full or partial multiple dose medication cards from the facilities it serves and reuse the unexpired medication. The bill also allows the commission to adopt rules allowing the safe donation of prescription drugs under chapter 69.70 RCW including, but not limited to, allowing pharmacy to pharmacy donations of unexpired prescription drug stock. The proposed rules improve accessibility and visibility of the drug donation program under chapter 69.70 RCW while ensuring optimal patient safety and product integrity.

The commission determined during the November 17, 2022 public rules hearing that the prescriber notification requirement found in WAC 246-945-488(2)(h)(i) was superfluous if a patient already has a valid prescription for the drug donated via the prescription donation program. Furthermore, it was decided that any delay caused by notifying prescribers for a prescription they have already issued could be deleterious to the patient's health.

**Statutory authority for adoption:** RCW 18.64.005; SSB 6526 (chapter 264, Laws of 2020) codified as RCW 18.64.610 and RCW 69.70.110

**Statute being implemented:** SSB 6526 (chapter 264, Laws of 2020) codified as RCW 18.64.610 and RCW 69.70.110

**Is rule necessary because of a:**

Federal Law?  Yes  No  
Federal Court Decision?  Yes  No  
State Court Decision?  Yes  No

If yes, CITATION:

**Agency comments or recommendations, if any, as to statutory language, implementation, enforcement, and fiscal matters:** None

**Type of proponent:**  Private  Public  Governmental

**Name of proponent:** (person or organization) Pharmacy Quality Assurance Commission

**Name of agency personnel responsible for:**

	Name	Office Location	Phone
Drafting:	Joshua Munroe	111 Israel Rd SE, Tumwater, WA 98501	360-236-2987
Implementation:	Joshua Munroe	111 Israel Rd SE, Tumwater, WA 98501	360-236-2987
Enforcement:	Marlee O'Neill	111 Israel Rd SE, Tumwater, WA 98501	360-480-9108

**Is a school district fiscal impact statement required under [RCW 28A.305.135](#)?**  Yes  No

If yes, insert statement here:

The public may obtain a copy of the school district fiscal impact statement by contacting:

Name:  
Address:  
Phone:  
Fax:  
TTY:  
Email:  
Other:

**Is a cost-benefit analysis required under [RCW 34.05.328](#)?**

- Yes: A preliminary cost-benefit analysis may be obtained by contacting:  
Name: Joshua Munroe  
Address: PO Box 47852 Olympia, WA 98504-47852  
Phone: 360-236-2987  
Fax: 360-236-2901  
TTY: 711  
Email: PharmacyRules@doh.wa.gov  
Other: N/A

No: Please explain:

**Regulatory Fairness Act and Small Business Economic Impact Statement**

Note: The [Governor's Office for Regulatory Innovation and Assistance \(ORIA\)](#) provides support in completing this part.

**(1) Identification of exemptions:**

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, **may be exempt** from requirements of the Regulatory Fairness Act (see [chapter 19.85 RCW](#)). For additional information on exemptions, consult the [exemption guide published by ORIA](#). Please check the box for any applicable exemption(s):

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under [RCW 19.85.061](#) because this rule making is being adopted solely to conform and/or comply with federal statute or regulations. Please cite the specific federal statute or regulation this rule is being adopted to conform or comply with, and describe the consequences to the state if the rule is not adopted.

Citation and description:

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt because the agency has completed the pilot rule process defined by [RCW 34.05.313](#) before filing the notice of this proposed rule.

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under the provisions of [RCW 15.65.570](#)(2) because it was adopted by a referendum.

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under [RCW 19.85.025](#)(3). Check all that apply:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">RCW 34.05.310</a> (4)(b)<br>(Internal government operations) | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">RCW 34.05.310</a> (4)(e)<br>(Dictated by statute)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">RCW 34.05.310</a> (4)(c)<br>(Incorporation by reference)     | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">RCW 34.05.310</a> (4)(f)<br>(Set or adjust fees)  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">RCW 34.05.310</a> (4)(d)<br>(Correct or clarify language)    | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">RCW 34.05.310</a> (4)(g)<br>((i) Relating to agency hearings; or (ii) process requirements for applying to an agency for a license or permit) |

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under [RCW 19.85.025](#)(4) (does not affect small businesses).

This rule proposal, or portions of the proposal, is exempt under RCW \_\_\_\_\_.

Explanation of how the above exemption(s) applies to the proposed rule:

**(2) Scope of exemptions: Check one.**

- The rule proposal is fully exempt (*skip section 3*). Exemptions identified above apply to all portions of the rule proposal.
- The rule proposal is partially exempt (*complete section 3*). The exemptions identified above apply to portions of the rule proposal, but less than the entire rule proposal. Provide details here (consider using [this template from ORIA](#)):
- The rule proposal is not exempt (*complete section 3*). No exemptions were identified above.

**(3) Small business economic impact statement: Complete this section if any portion is not exempt.**

If any portion of the proposed rule is **not exempt**, does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses?

No **Briefly summarize the agency's minor cost analysis and how the agency determined the proposed rule did not impose more-than-minor costs.** The proposed rule does not require changes to a licensee's or a pharmacy's existing practices or infrastructure. For pharmacies that choose to participate in the prescription donation program, costs are limited to one-time costs—procuring additional shelving/storage, time taken creating policies and procedures, and time taken to fill out the necessary registration form—and the recurring cost of maintaining a separate inventory for donated items. The agency estimates that the probable one time cost to comply with the optional program could be as high as \$733.50 which is significantly less than the minor cost threshold of either 1% of average annual payroll (\$6,639.73) or .3% of average annual

gross business income (\$53,119.28). The agency determined that the requirements to comply with the optional program did not impose more-than-minor costs on small businesses.

It was further determined that the proposed amendment to WAC 246-945-488(2)(h)(i) to remove the prescriber notification requirement would not affect existing cost estimates.

Yes      Calculations show the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses and a small business economic impact statement is required. Insert the required small business economic impact statement here:

The public may obtain a copy of the small business economic impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by contacting:

Name: Joshua Munroe

Address: PO Box 47852 Olympia, WA 98504-7852

Phone: 360-236-2987

Fax: 360-236-2901

TTY: 711

Email: PharmacyRules@doh.wa.gov

Other: N/A

**Date:** January 17, 2023

**Name:** Teri Ferreira, RPh

**Title:** Pharmacy Quality Assurance Chair

**Signature:**



# Commission SBAR Communication

---

**Agenda Item/Title: Review of Title VI and Other Federal Regulations Related to Accessibility**

**Date SBAR Communication Prepared:** February 24, 2023

**Reviewer:** PQAC Staff

**Link to Action Plan:**

Action       Information       Follow-up       Report only

**Situation:** At the January business meeting, the Pharmacy Quality Assurance Commission (commission) discussed a conceptual draft of the accessible labeling rule. This discussion included identifying a possible intersection between this rulemaking and various federal laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

**Background:**

**Title VI of the Civil Rights Act 1964 ([42 U.S.C. 2000d](#))**

- Title VI provides that “[n]o person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (42 U.S.C. § 2000d). This includes a prohibition against national origin discrimination affecting limited English proficiency (LEP) persons, see *Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563, 94 S. Ct. 786, 39 L. Ed. 2d 1 (1974).
- Title VI applies to “any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (42 U.S.C. § 2000d). [HHS has confirmed](#) that this definition of a “program or activity” includes health care providers and facilities who receive Medicaid or Medicare reimbursement are subject to Title VI.
- In 2000, Bill Clinton issued [Executive Order 13166](#): Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency (recently [reaffirmed](#) by Attorney General Merrick Garland on November 12, 2022), which required federal agencies to publish guidelines on how recipients of federal financial assistance can provide meaningful language access under the requirements in Title VI.
- HHS has [guidance](#) on its website for federal financial assistance recipients regarding Title VI’s prohibition against national origin discrimination affecting LEP persons. The goal of the guidance is to ensure recipients conduct an individualized assessment of their operation to ensure “meaningful access by LEP persons to critical services while not imposing undue burdens on small business, small local governments, or small nonprofits.” As a result, what amounts of “meaningful access” has the potential to vary greatly based on the recipient.

## Commission SBAR Communication

---

- Title VI is enforced by the Department of Justice and the agencies who provide federal financial assistance to recipients. There is no private cause of action for individual persons to enforce disparate impact regulations promulgated under Title VI, such as those related to language accessibility (*Alexander v. Sandoval*, 532 U.S. 275, 121 S. Ct. 1511, 149 L. Ed. 2d 517 (2001)).

### **Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. § 794)**

- Generally speaking, the Rehabilitation Act protects individuals from discrimination on the basis of disability. In particular, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 provides that no otherwise qualified individual with a disability in the United States can, solely by reason of his or her disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under: (1) any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance; or (2) any program or activity conducted by any executive agency or by the United States Postal Service (29 U.S.C. § 794(a)).
- Similar to Title VI, “program or activity” is defined broadly in the Rehabilitation Act to include all of the operations of “an entire corporation, partnership, or other private organization, or an entire sole proprietorship . . . which is principally engaged in the business of providing education, health care, housing, social services, or parks and recreation.”
- Section 504 can be enforced by a private citizen or by the Department of Justice. In order to prevail on a Section 504 claim, a plaintiff must establish that “(1) [they are] an individual with a disability; (2) [they are] otherwise qualified to receive [a certain] benefit; (3) [they were] denied the benefits of [a certain] program solely by reason of [their] disability; and (4) the program receives federal financial assistance” (*Updike v. Multnomah County*, 870 F.3d 939, 949 (9th Cir. 2017)).
- Whether the conduct of a program or activity amounts to a violation of Section 504 is highly fact specific. For example, in *Bax v. Drs. Med. Ctr. of Modesto, Inc.*, 48 F.4th 1008 (9th Cir. 2022), the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals considered an appeal related to a Section 504 claim and made clear, on multiple occasions, that whether Section 504 was violated is a fact-intensive exercise (*Bax* at 1016 and 1018) and that ultimately the district court in this matter had engaged in “precisely the sort of fact-intensive exercise our precedent requires” by hearing testimony from nine witnesses and considering 132 exhibits (*Id.* at 1014 and 1018).

### **Title III of the American with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. §§ 12181 to 12189; 28 C.F.R. Pt. 36)**

- Title III of the ADA provides that no individual can be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person, or private entity, who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation. A place of public accommodation includes a pharmacy (42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)).



## Commission SBAR Communication

---

- Title III regulations identify three broad principles that underlie the nondiscrimination requirements. These include: (1) equal opportunity to participate; (2) equal opportunity to benefit; and (3) receipt of benefits in the most integrated setting appropriate (28 C.F.R. §§ 36.202-203).
- In addition to these three broad principles, there are also federal requirements that address specific factual situations. For example, 28 C.F.R. § 36.303 addresses the requirement that a public accommodation “shall take those steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals **because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services**, unless the public accommodation can demonstrate that taking those steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations being offered or would result in an undue burden, i.e., significant difficulty or expense.” According to the ADA [Technical Assistance Manual](#), “if a specific requirement applies, it controls over the general requirement”.
- The ADA can be enforced either by private suits by individuals who are subjected to discrimination or have reasonable grounds for believing they are about to be subjected to discrimination (28 C.F.R. § 36.501); or by the Department of Justice if a person or persons have engaged in a pattern or practice of discrimination or a person has been discriminated against and the discrimination raises an issue of general public importance (28 C.F.R. § 36.503).

### **Assessment:**

In addition to the commission's future accessible labeling rules, there are several federal laws covering the same or similar subject matter that may also be applicable to facilities licensed by the commission.

### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommends ensuring that the commission's rules on accessible labeling make clear that its rules do not in any way restrict the application of the federal laws mentioned here or any other applicable federal laws.

### **Follow-up Action:**

Staff will proceed as directed.