

HICPAC Isolation Precautions Guideline Workgroup Call

May 2, 2024, 2:00 pm ET

Participants

Workgroup: Mike Lin, Sharon Wright, Hilary Babcock, William Bennett, Lisa Brosseau, Elaine Dekker, Judith Guzman-Cottrill, Morgan Katz, Anu Malani, Mark Russi, Erica Shenoy, Julie Trivedi, Deborah Yokoe
CDC: Mike Bell, Sydney Byrd, Marie de Perio, Alex Kallen, David Kuhar, Kenneth Mead, Devon Okasako-Schmucker, Melissa Schaefer, Erin Stone, David Weissman, Laura Wells

Agenda

- Attendance and conflicts of interest disclosure
- Recap last meeting
- Discuss logistics, workgroup charge, and path forward
- Continue to identify interests
- Select interests to consider in the solution
- Next steps

Discussion Summary

- No new conflicts of interest were disclosed.

Discuss logistics, workgroup charge, and path forward

After recapping the previous meeting, Dr. Wright reviewed some logistics and the workgroup (WG) charge.

- Meeting minutes are produced for these meetings and will be sent to the WG.
- The WG charge was reviewed and discussed.
 - The WG is tasked with answering four questions from CDC and then will move on to Part II, which is the disease-specific guidance.
 - The approach has been to highlight areas of agreement in order to focus on areas where there needs to be more discussion.
 - The WG was reminded that workgroups serve as an arm of HICPAC to inform and aid the committee in decision-making at the public meetings.

Continue to identify interests

- The WG reviewed the concept of focusing on interests rather than positions in decision-making.
- A summary of the list of interests created at the last meeting was presented, and WG members were asked if they had anything to add.
- A comment was made that whatever solution is created needs to be adaptable to evolving science.
- A discussion ensued on whether all the key stakeholders are included in the WG [e.g., OSHA and patient and healthcare personnel (HCP) representatives].
 - It was clarified that other federal agencies are not members of the committee or workgroup per Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) rules, but drafts are sent to OSHA for their feedback.
 - WG members expressed that as clinicians working in various healthcare settings, they do represent patient and HCP interests.
 - A WG member suggested a union would be a better option to represent HCP.

Select interests to be considered in the solution

- WG members debated if “meets OSHA regulations” should be included on the list.
 - Some said it should be included due to this guideline's potential impact on worker health and safety.
 - Others stated that CDC guidelines and OSHA regulations are both considered when creating policies for their facilities, so there isn't a need to include OSHA regulations in CDC guidance.
- WG members discussed if there are interests that they all agree should be included in the list.
- Three interests were specifically discussed:
 - Protects HCP and patients from infection/infectious particles
 - Is feasible/able to be implemented/understandable
 - Is sustainable
- A WG member said they understood the need for feasibility and the ability to implement but that health should be first.
- WG members agreed that the protection of HCP and patients is top priority.
- There was a discussion about real-world issues for implementation and how feasibility can impact health.
 - If a recommendation is difficult to implement, then compliance could go down, and protection will be less.
- Risk assessment was highlighted as a crucial element in decision-making about PPE use.

Next Steps

- Feedback from today's discussion will be incorporated into the list of interests.

The call adjourned at 3:02 pm with no additional comments or questions.

The next Workgroup call is scheduled for May 9, 2024, at 2 pm ET.