Bloodborne Pathogens



Significant risk of transmission

Required follow-up measures



- A needlestick
- A nonsexual contact that:
 - Exposes the person's nonintact skin or mucous membrane to the blood or body fluids of another AND
 - Is of a nature that it would pose a significant risk of transmission of HIV or Hepatitis B if the source person were infected

Significant risk of transmission



Significant risk of transmission

- No legal definition
- Rules say consider factors:
 - Type and volume of body fluid
 - Concentration and virulence of pathogen (if known)
 - Type of exposure
- Case-by-case determination based on current science



Significant risk of transmission

Required follow-up measures





- Exposed person: suffers a needlestick or gets blood/body fluids on broken skin or mucous membrane
- Source person: the person who contributes the blood or body fluids

Required follow-up measures

- Specific measures depend on whether source person is known or unknown
- Unknown source person:
 - Offer HIV testing to exposed person
 - Determine whether exposed person has been vaccinated for Hepatitis B
 - Vaccinate for Hepatitis B if indicated



Follow-up to reduce risk of disease

- Known source person:
 - Exposed person's attending physician or occupational health care provider must notify source person's attending physician.
 - Source person's physician must test source for HIV and Hepatitis B and notify exposed person's physician of results.
 - Exposed person's physician offers follow-up in accordance with the rules.



Attending physician

- Health care facilities may release the name of a source person's physician to the exposed person's physician on request
- If no attending physician, health department should step in





 Do you have to know or suspect a source person has HIV or Hepatitis B for the bloodborne pathogen rules to apply?

 No. What is important is the nature of the contact, not any knowledge or suspicions anyone may have about the source person's HIV or HBV status. Must a source person give informed consent before being tested?

 No. The rules allow testing without consent, so long as the test can be performed without endangering the safety of either the source person or the person administering the test.



 What if the source person will not submit to the test?

- Use existing blood sample, if available.
- Public health remedies are available (injunction, misdemeanor charges).
 Whether to use them is a judgment call.

- What about biting or spitting incidents? Do you test anyone, and if so who?
- Remember there are two steps before you get to the question of testing ...

Significant risk of transmission



 Do the rules authorize testing for Hepatitis C or other pathogens?

 Currently the rules do not authorize testing, but a person could be tested with consent.

Criminal defendants

- Nonsexual exposure:
 - Magistrate can order person detained
 - But decision about whether to test should be made by public health

Criminal defendants

- Sexual offenders
 - Victim requests tests
 - DA petitions judge
 - Judge orders tests
 - Public health role:
 - Not involved in deciding whether to test
 - But may have to conduct test
 - And will have to conduct follow-up counseling



Contact information

Jill Moore
 UNC School of Government
 919.966.4442
 moore@sog.unc.edu

