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THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT: MAGIC BULLET OR BAND-AID FOR PATIENTS AND HEALTH CARE WORKERS INFECTED WITH THE HUMAN IMMUNODEFICIENCY VIRUS?

‘If you are asked to treat a patient with [the plague and] no chance of recovery,’ wrote one surgeon in a late 14th-century book of advice for medical students, ‘say that you will be leaving town shortly and cannot take the case.’

INTRODUCTION

The acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), which has rapidly assumed epidemic proportions in many urban areas, has confronted the medical profession with difficult ethical and legal dilemmas. In particular, many physicians and other health care workers refuse to care for patients infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and many patients fear they will contract the disease from infected physicians.

The magnitude of the AIDS epidemic is reflected in an array of alarming statistics and projections. An estimated one million persons in the United States are infected with the HIV virus. It is projected that by 1993 there will be as many as 225,000 Americans living with AIDS. Large urban centers, such

---

1 “Magic bullet” is medical jargon suggesting that a therapeutic intervention will provide a miraculous cure for an ailment. Penicillin was such a cure for syphilis. Stephen J. Clark, Magic Bullets, 92 AM J. MED. 85, 86 (1992).
6 Id. at 117.
as New York City, have been disproportionately affected by the AIDS epidemic. However, practitioners and health care facilities in rural and suburban areas are increasingly being called upon to care for HIV-infected patients as the AIDS epidemic spreads beyond large metropolitan areas.

AIDS is unique among diseases that have previously confronted the medical community. While less contagious than hepatitis B or poliomyelitis, AIDS is uniformly fatal. Moreover, an

---


8 The number of AIDS cases reported from geographic areas with populations of less than 500,000 rose from 10% before 1985 to 15% in 1988. CDC, First 100,000 Cases of Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome-United States, 38 Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep. 561, 561 (1989). Conversely, the proportion of new cases of AIDS reported from New York City and San Francisco fell from 44% before 1985 to 25% in 1988. NATIONAL COMM'N ON AIDS, supra note 7, at 32. In 1989 the number of newly reported cases of AIDS in the United States increased 37% in rural areas as compared to only 5% in metropolitan areas. Id. at 158. It is predicted that 80% of new AIDS cases will occur in geographic areas outside of New York City and San Francisco. Id. at 32. See also Raymond C. Bredfeldt et al., AIDS: Family Physicians' Attitudes and Experiences, 32 J. Fam. Pract. 71, 72 (1991) (thirty-two percent of family practitioners in communities with fewer than 2500 residents have dealt with AIDS patients); Stephen L. Green et al., Community-Based Plan for Treating Human Immunodeficiency Virus-Infected Individuals Sponsored by Local Medical Societies and an Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome Service Organization, 151 Archives Internal Med. 2061 (1991) (community-based care for HIV-infected patients by primary care providers in Virginia); note 194 and accompanying text infra.

enormous social stigma is attached to the diagnosis of AIDS that encompasses both fear of contagion and prejudice directed toward the victims' lifestyles. The negative attitude of society toward the disease is reflected in many health care professionals' reluctance to care for HIV-infected patients or refusal to treat such patients.

In 1990 the National Commission on AIDS, an advisory body to the President and the Congress, decried the shortage of physicians willing to take care of HIV-infected patients as one of crisis proportions. In particular, the Commission observed that only 2000 of the nation's 600,000 practicing physicians were on the referral list maintained by the Physicians Association for AIDS Care. National organizations of health care professionals have universally maintained that physicians and other health care professionals have an ethical duty to provide care for HIV-infected patients, notwithstanding the occupational risk of HIV transmission. However, given the critical shortage of physicians

---

10 "AIDS brings with it a special stigma . . . [D]islosure . . . can lead to social opprobrium among family and friends, as well as loss of employment, housing and insurance." Behringer v. Medical Ctr. at Princeton, 592 A.2d 1251, 1269-70 (N.J. Super. Ct. Law Div. 1991). See also Cain v. Hyatt, 734 F. Supp. 671, 680 (E.D. Pa. 1990) ("To conclude that persons with AIDS are stigmatized is an understatement; they are widely stereotyped as indelibly miasmic, untouchable, physically and morally polluted.").

11 See NATIONAL COMM'N ON AIDS, supra note 7, at 55. See also note 3 supra. This Note will deal primarily with the duty of physicians to care for HIV-infected patients and will only tangentially discuss issues related to other health care providers and ancillary health care workers.

12 See NATIONAL COMM'N ON AIDS, supra note 7, at 167.

13 Id. at 164. The Commission also observed that in New York City, with over 200,000 HIV-infected inhabitants, only 22% of physicians and dentists had ever tested a patient for HIV. Id. Moreover, the Gay Men's Health Crisis's referral list of "qualified private AIDS specialists" willing to accept patients only contained approximately 50 names. Id. But see Gemson, supra note 7, at 1102 (In a 1988 survey, 90% of 473 primary care providers in New York City had ordered an HIV antibody test.).

14 Professional medical organizations that have promulgated policy statements maintaining that physicians have an ethical duty to treat HIV-infected patients include the American Medical Association (American Medical Ass'n, Report of the Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs: Ethical Issues Involved in the Growing AIDS Crisis, 259 JAMA 1360 (1988)), the American College of Physicians and the Infectious Diseases Society of America (Health and Pub. Pol'y Comm., American College of Physicians and the Infectious Diseases Soc'y of Am., The Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) and Infection with the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), 103 ANNALS INTERNAL MED. 460, 462 (1988)), the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (Society of Thoracic Surgeons Ad Hoc Comm. on AIDS, Report to the Membership, 47 ANNALS THORACIC SURGERY, 946, 948 (1989)), the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (Committee on Ethics, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Human Immu-
willing to treat HIV-infected patients, society cannot rely on ethical canons of the profession that impose an obligation to provide care.\textsuperscript{16}

The AIDS epidemic has eroded the ethical standards of the medical profession. Many practitioners and health care students believe they are entitled to adopt internal standards of professional conduct and no longer acknowledge an obligation to provide care to all patients they are qualified to treat.\textsuperscript{16} Especially disturbing are studies suggesting that approximately one-third of medical students and physicians-in-training have planned their future professional lives to avoid contact with HIV-infected patients.\textsuperscript{17} Moreover, educational programs that attempt

\textsuperscript{16} See Troyen A. Brennan, \textit{The Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) as an Occupational Disease}, 107 \textsc{Annals Internal Med.} 581, 583 (1987) (editorial) ("It is unrealistic to expect high-quality care for AIDS victims simply because the ethical codes of health care workers call for care for all the sick and injured."). But see note 192 and accompanying text infra.

\textsuperscript{17} See Paul M. Arnew et al., \textit{Orthopedic Surgeons’ Attitudes and Practices Concerning Treatment of Patients with HIV Infection}, 104 \textsc{Pub. Health Rep.} 121, 121 (1989) (eighty-five percent of 325 orthopedic surgeons surveyed in New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Miami and Washington, D.C., claimed the right to refuse care); Carol A. Bernstein et al., \textit{Medical and Dental Students’ Attitudes about the AIDS Epidemic}, 65 \textsc{Acad. Med.} 458, 459 (1990) (thirty-six percent of 150 medical students and 70% of 54 dental students at a northeast university failed to acknowledge a responsibility to treat all patients); Bredfeldt et al., supra note 8, at 71 (sixty-three percent of family practitioners believed physicians have the right to refuse care); Charles J. Currey et al., \textit{Willingness of Health-Professions Students to Treat Patients with AIDS}, 65 \textsc{Acad. Med.} 472, 473 (1990) (fifty-two percent of 150 medical and dental students at a southeast university believed they had a right to refuse care); Theodore B. Feldmann et al., \textit{Attitudes of Medical School Faculty and Students Toward Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome}, 65 \textsc{Acad. Med.} 464, 465 (1990) (thirty-four percent of 170 medical school faculty members at the University of Louisville and 45% of 227 medical students claimed a right to refuse care); Barbara Gerbert et al., \textit{Primary Care Physicians and AIDS: Attitudinal and Structural Barriers to Care}, 266 \textsc{JAMA} 2837, 2839, 2841 (1991) (thirty-two percent of 1121 primary care physicians surveyed nationwide believed they did not have a responsibility to treat HIV-infected patients); R. Nathan Link et al., \textit{Concerns of Medical and Pediatric House Officers about Acquiring AIDS from Their Patients}, 78 \textsc{Am. J. Pub. Health} 455, 457 (1988) (twenty-four percent of 250 New York City medical and pediatric physicians-in-training believed it was not unethical to refuse to provide care for AIDS patients); \textit{Many Plan to Avoid AIDS Care in Practice}, \textit{Internal Med. News & Cardiology News}, Aug. 15-31, 1990, at 1 (seventeen percent of 1045 physicians-in-training in 41 medicine training programs nationwide believed physicians in private practice have no duty to care for AIDS patients).

\textsuperscript{17} See notes 53-57 and accompanying text infra.
to reverse purported "fears and prejudices" are arguably of dubious merit or at best an inadequate response. Public officials and legislators have concluded that comprehensive legal remedies are required to compel health care workers to meet their ethical obligation to provide quality care to HIV-infected patients.

The transmission of HIV from an infected Florida dentist to five of his patients has had profound and far-reaching effects on health care policy. The public's fear of contracting HIV from an infected health care provider has engendered discrimination directed against health care workers known or perceived to be infected with HIV. Loss of livelihood due to termination of employment or loss of medical practice often follows the disclosure of the serostatus of an infected physician.

The recently enacted Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive rights, protections and legal remedies to HIV-infected individuals seeking health care in both the private and public sectors. Meanwhile, Congress has also recently approved legislation designed to protect the public from the risk of HIV transmission in the health care setting. If enacted, this legislation would require that states either adopt guidelines issued by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) on preventing transmission of HIV and hepatitis B virus in the health care setting or develop "equivalent" guidelines. CDC guidelines permit the imposition of practice restrictions on HIV-infected physicians who perform procedures associated with a

---

18 Investigators are divided as to whether educational programs can reverse health care professionals' reluctance to care for HIV-infected patients. See notes 48-53 and accompanying text infra.
19 See note 174 infra.
20 See notes 129-43 and accompanying text infra.
22 Id.
24 See notes 173-205 and accompanying text infra.
25 See notes 130-32 and accompanying text infra.
27 See notes 130-33 and accompanying text infra.
risk that the physician’s blood will contact the patient.\textsuperscript{28} Although Congress intended that the protections afforded HIV-infected health care workers by the ADA not be compromised by adoption of CDC (or equivalent) guidelines by the states,\textsuperscript{29} this Note argues that an inherent conflict exists. In enacting the ADA, Congress sought to protect HIV-infected persons seeking health care from discriminatory exclusion and HIV-infected health care workers from discriminatory employment practices.\textsuperscript{30}

The ADA employs a “significant risk” standard to determine whether exclusionary practices are discriminatory.\textsuperscript{31} If courts determine that HIV-infected physicians who perform exposure-prone procedures pose a “significant risk” of contagion, then imposition of practice restrictions pursuant to CDC guidelines would not constitute discriminatory exclusion under the ADA.\textsuperscript{32} It would follow that the risk to which a physician is subjected when performing an exposure-prone procedure on an HIV-infected patient must also be deemed “significant” for purposes of the ADA.\textsuperscript{33} In that case, a physician who refuses to perform an exposure-prone procedure on an HIV-infected patient would not be engaging in discriminatory conduct.

On the other hand, if courts determine that the risk of transmission from patient to physician is not “significant,” thereby holding that exclusion of HIV-infected patients from exposure-prone procedures constitutes unlawful discrimination, it

\textsuperscript{28} These procedures have been termed exposure-prone. \textit{See} CDC, \textit{supra} note 26, at 4; notes 121-23 and accompanying text \textit{infra}.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{See} notes 132-33 and accompanying text \textit{infra}.

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{See} note 174 \textit{infra}.

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{See} notes 152-58, 161-67, 185 and accompanying text \textit{infra}.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{See} notes 152-58, 161-67, 185 and accompanying text \textit{infra}.

\textsuperscript{33} The risk of transmission of HIV from patient to physician during the performance of an exposure-prone procedure is as great or greater than the risk of transmission from physician to patient. \textit{See} pt. II A of this Note and notes 107-14 and accompanying text \textit{infra}. It is not possible to compare precisely the relative risk to both parties. Several determinants of risk have not been accurately qualified.

In only 29\% of 99 percutaneous injuries sustained in a study of 1382 surgical procedures did the sharp object causing injury to the surgeon recontact the patient’s open wound. Jerome Tokars et al., \textit{Percutaneous Injuries During Surgical Procedures, in VIIth Int’l Conference on AIDS, Florence, Italy, June 16-21, 1991}, at 83 (abstract Th. D.108). Thus, in over two-thirds of instances in which the physician had been exposed to the risk of transmission, the patient had not. \textit{Id. See also} note 111 \textit{infra}. Additional uncertainty is introduced by conflicting data as to how frequently percutaneous injuries to the surgeon result in bleeding with possible inoculation of the patient’s blood. \textit{See} note 111 \textit{infra}.
must follow that the risk of transmission from physician to patient is also not "significant." In that case, an HIV-infected physician who follows infection-control precautions but is nevertheless excluded from or restricted in performing exposure-prone procedures pursuant to CDC guidelines would be a victim of discriminatory conduct under the standards of the ADA.

Thus, irrespective of how courts interpret the "significant risk," an inherent conflict exists between provisions of the ADA that protect HIV-infected physicians from unjust discrimination, and the congressional mandate that states adopt CDC (or equivalent) guidelines to protect patients from HIV-transmission in the health care setting. The courts will likely resolve this conflict between the doctor and patient to the physician's disadvantage by invoking policy considerations and principles of professional ethics. Such a resolution will place the physician in a double bind. Physicians are compelled to expose themselves to the risk of contracting HIV from infected patients during the performance of exposure-prone procedures, but if occupational transmission does in fact occur, they are excluded from further practice of the profession on the basis of a risk to the patient that is comparable or not as great.

This Note will focus on the crisis in access to health care for HIV-infected persons and will argue that a one-dimensional legislative approach aimed at compelling physicians to care for HIV-infected patients is an inadequate response. By preventing discriminatory exclusion of HIV-infected persons from health care services, the ADA is expected to help alleviate the severe shortage of health care professionals willing to provide care for HIV-infected patients. This Note argues, however, that legal remedies alone, while compelling some physicians to provide treatment for HIV-infected patients, can neither force physicians to "care" for HIV-infected persons nor ensure that HIV-infected persons receive quality health care in the private sector. Moreover, as the HIV epidemic continues its spread to economically disadvantaged segments of society, lack of adequate financial resources will become an even more insurmountable barrier, restricting the access of HIV-infected persons to health care in the private sector, irrespective of available legal remedies. This

---

34 Some of the largest proportional increases in the incidence of AIDS have occurred among women, African-Americans and Hispanics, that is "disenfranchised populations
Note discusses measures that must be adopted to supplement anti-discrimination legislation. Health care workers must be adequately protected from the risk of occupational transmission of HIV and its devastating financial consequences. In addition, health care financing reforms must be enacted to ensure access to quality health care for HIV-infected persons.

I. PHYSICIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD HIV-INFECTED PATIENTS

Reluctance to care for HIV-infected patients is not limited to practicing physicians but extends also to physicians-in-training (housestaff, house officers) and medical students. Before...
completion of their training, future generations of physicians have already formed firmly entrenched negative attitudes toward caring for HIV-infected patients.\textsuperscript{36} Many medical students and housestaff view HIV-infected patients as "adversaries" from whom they must protect themselves due to the risk of contagion.\textsuperscript{37} They perceive a lack of institutional support in their dealings with HIV-infected patients and complain that hospitals fail to provide adequate training, counseling, infection-control

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{36} See Bernstein et al., supra note 16, at 458 (one-third of 150 students in a northeast medical school do not want to train in a hospital or a specialty with a high prevalence of AIDS); Currey et al., supra note 16, at 473 (fifty-two percent of 150 medical and dental students in a southeast university would not treat AIDS patients if given the choice); Feldmann et al., supra note 16, at 465 (fifty-one percent of 170 medical school faculty members at the University of Louisville and 44\% of 227 students would prefer not to treat AIDS patients); Rodney A. Hayward & Martin F. Shapiro, A National Study of AIDS and Residency Training: Experiences, Concerns, and Consequences, 114 ANNALS INTERNAL MED. 23, 26 (1991) (twenty-three percent of 1745 senior medical residents in training programs in ten states would not provide care to patients with AIDS and an additional 10\% were uncertain); Link et al., supra note 16, at 457 (twenty-five percent of 250 medical and pediatric housestaff in New York City would not care for AIDS patients if given the choice); Vipul Singh et al., AIDS and Residency Training, 114 ANNALS INTERNAL MED. 605, 605 (1991) (letter to the editor) (nearly 40\% of 198 house officers across the nation will refuse to treat patients with AIDS after completion of training); Bonnie J. Tesch et al., Medical and Nursing Students' Attitudes about AIDS Issues, 65 ACAD. MED. 467, 468 (1990) (twenty-two percent of 445 medical students at the Medical College of Wisconsin would refuse to treat AIDS patients); INTERNAL MED. NEWS & CARDIOLOGY NEWS, supra note 16, at 22 (more than one-third of 1045 medical housestaff in 41 training programs nationwide did not intend to care for HIV-infected persons in the future); Many Residents Would Choose Not To Treat Patients With AIDS, FAM. PRAC. NEWS, July 1-14, 1990, at 1 (twenty-three percent of 2463 medical housestaff in 10 states nationwide would not treat homosexual patients with AIDS).

\textsuperscript{37} See, e.g., Bernstein et al., supra note 16, at 459 (thirty-six percent of 150 medical students and 56\% of 54 dental students in a northeast medical school expressed anxiety about the risk); Currey et al., supra note 16, at 473 (seventy-seven percent of medical and dental students at a southeast university were concerned about the risk to their health); Feldmann et al., supra note 16, at 465 (twenty-six percent of 485 medical students at the University of Louisville believed they were placed at risk by being exposed to AIDS patients); Hayward & Shapiro, supra note 36, at 23 (twenty-three percent of 1745 senior medical residents in training programs nationwide would not work in a high-prevalence area due to fear of infection and 39\% were very concerned about contracting AIDS from patients); Link et al., supra note 16, at 456 (forty-eight percent of medical and 30\% of pediatric housestaff in New York City expressed moderate to major concern about caring for AIDS patients); Singh et al., supra note 36, at 605 (universal fear of occupational transmission of HIV among 198 housestaff from seven hospitals across the nation); FAM. PRAC. NEWS, supra note 36, at 1 (forty percent of 2463 medical housestaff nationwide were concerned about occupational risk); INTERNAL MED. NEWS & CARDIOLOGY NEWS, supra note 16, at 22 (two-thirds of 1045 medical housestaff in 41 training programs nationwide feared occupational risk).
devices and health and disability coverage. The media coverage given to the travails of a house officer at a major teaching hospital who allegedly acquired HIV infection through occupational exposure reinforced this perception.

Surveys of health care professionals indicate a pervasive and entrenched reluctance to care for HIV-infected patients. These studies indicate that 20-40% of students and physicians-in-training and the majority of providers would refuse to treat patients with AIDS if given the option. An even greater percentage of those surveyed believe that health care professionals have the right to refuse to care for HIV-infected patients. A large number expressed anxiety about caring for HIV-infected patients from fear of contracting the disease. While nearly all health care workers surveyed believed that AIDS patients are entitled to the highest quality of health care, few were willing to provide such care themselves.

38 Link et al., supra note 16, at 458.
39 Hacib Aoun, When a House Officer Gets AIDS, 321 New Engl. J. Med. 693, 693 (1989). The former house officer lamented, "[i]f we are to be in the front line, then we must be sure that we are better protected . . . [N]o other health worker should have to go through what I have endured." Id. at 696. The hospital's administration refused to acknowledge that HIV infection was transmitted at the workplace, did not renew the house officer's contract and denied him benefits. Id. at 695. In addition, the plight of an unpaid extern who allegedly acquired AIDS through occupational exposure and her court battle with New York City and its Health and Hospitals Corporation received national media attention. Prego v. City of New York, 147 A.D.2d 165, 541 N.Y.S.2d 995 (2d Dep't 1989); Arnold H. Lubasch, Judge, in Shift, Discloses that Prego Will Get $1.35 Million, N.Y. Times, Mar. 10, 1990, at 27.
40 See notes 36-37 and accompanying text supra.
41 See notes 3, 11-13, 36 and accompanying text supra. See also Bredfeldt et al., supra note 8, at 73 (twenty-three percent of family practitioners are unwilling to provide care for AIDS patients); Gerbert et al., supra note 16, at 2839 (fifty percent of 1121 primary care physicians would not treat HIV-infected patients if given a choice); Somogyi et al., supra note 34, at 51 (over one-third of community physicians in a New York City hospital would not accept new AIDS cases).
42 See note 16 supra.
43 See note 37 supra.
44 See Ben J. Atchison et al., Occupational Therapy Personnel and AIDS: Attitudes, Knowledge, and Fears, 44 Am. J. OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY 212, 214 (1990) (eighty-six percent of 119 midwest occupational therapists believed that AIDS patients are entitled to the highest quality of health care but only 51% were willing to provide such care); Gerbert et al., supra note 16, at 2837 (sixty-eight percent of 1121 primary care physicians believed physicians have a responsibility to treat HIV-infected patients, but only 50% would provide care themselves if given a choice); Suzanne M. Selig et al., Threat of AIDS: Relationship Between Knowledge and Attitudes, 17 Am. J. INFECTION CONTROL 43, 44 (1989) (letter to the editor) (ninety-two percent of 94 health care workers in a
It has been suggested that negative attitudes held by health care workers toward HIV-infected patients are derived in large measure from irrational "fears, ignorance and prejudice." While homophobia, avoidance of terminally ill patients and antipathy toward intravenous drug users causes some health care workers to eschew HIV-infected patients, fear of contagion is the overriding factor. In addition, economic concerns contribute substantially to AIDS avoidance. Practitioners fear loss of patients and staff were it to become known that they treated AIDS patients.

midwest city believed that AIDS patients deserve the highest quality of health care but only 29% were willing to provide such care).

See National Comm'n on AIDS, supra note 7, at 166.

See Richard C. Herman, Risks of HIV Exposure to Medical Students and Health Care Personnel, 264 JAMA 1187, 1187 (1990) (fear of contagion, not homophobia or discomfort with caring for dying patients, underlies reluctance to care for HIV-infected patients). See generally Joseph M. Merrill et al., AIDS and Student Attitudes, 82 S. Med. J. 426 (1989). See also note 37 supra. But see Cooke & Sande, supra note 35, at 1335 (male housestaff experience greater anxiety and perceive a higher risk in treating homosexual AIDS patients than do female housestaff); Currey et al., supra note 16, at 472 (homophobic attitudes and apprehension were associated with reluctance by health care students to provide care to patients with AIDS); Thomas J. Ficarrotto et al., Predictors of Medical and Nursing Students' Levels of HIV-AIDS Knowledge and Their Resistance to Working with AIDS Patients, 65 Acad. Med. 470, 470 (1990) (homophobia, antipathy toward intravenous drug users and lack of knowledge were associated with reluctance by health care students to care for AIDS patients); Gerbert et al., supra note 16, at 2837 (homophobia and antipathy toward intravenous drug users prevalent among primary care physicians nationwide; physicians who treated 10 or more HIV-infected patients expressed less negative attitudes but also perceived less risk of contagion); Hayward & Shapiro, supra note 36, at 28 (medical residents' nationwide reluctance to provide care for AIDS patients correlated with dislike of homosexuals and intravenous drug users); Fam. Pract. News, supra note 36, at 1 (homophobia, antipathy toward intravenous drug users, fear of contagion and perceived futility in treatment predicted unwillingness of housestaff to care for AIDS patients); Internal Med. News & Cardiology News, supra note 16, at 22 (medical housestaff who did not intend to care for AIDS patients had more negative attitudes toward homosexuals and intravenous drug users than those who intended to care for AIDS patients).

47 After a New Jersey otolaryngologist's diagnosis of AIDS became known in the community, patients shunned his practice and several employees resigned. Behringer v. Medical Ctr. at Princeton, 592 A.2d 1251 (N.J. Super. Ct. Law Div. 1991). Other HIV-infected physicians have lost their practices or have been discharged when their diagnosis became known. See Barnes et al., supra note 21, at 311-12. See also Bredfeldt et al., supra note 8, at 71 (forty percent of family practitioners believe they would lose patients if it were known they treated patients with AIDS); Barbara Gerbert et al., Changing Dentists' Knowledge, Attitudes, and Behaviors Relating to AIDS: A Controlled Educational Intervention, 116 J. Am. Dental Ass'n 851, 851 (1988) (dentists unwilling to treat 'AIDS patients due to fear of losing patients and staff and of becoming infected); Gross, supra note 7, at B1 (most physicians attending an AMA conference would not them-
Lack of factual knowledge about AIDS does not contribute significantly to the negative attitudes held by health care professionals. While several studies show a correlation between lack of knowledge and reluctance to provide care, other studies fail to confirm these findings. An educational program sponsored by the division of pediatrics at a major New York City hospital, designed to alleviate HIV-related concerns of health care professionals by increasing their factual knowledge, had the opposite effect. Thus, educational initiatives alone will not solve the
problem.

A critical nationwide shortage of nurses and technical personnel contributes to the crisis in health care for HIV-infected persons. As a result of this shortage, health care professionals may reduce their exposure to HIV-infected patients by selecting practice locations and hospitals on the basis of a low prevalence of HIV-infection. While it may be impossible to avoid exposure to HIV-infected patients completely, exposure can be minimized. Despite the rapid spread of HIV-infection to suburban and rural areas, only a small number of acute care hospitals in the United States account for the vast majority of AIDS cases.

Fear of occupational transmission of HIV infection has encouraged physicians to avoid contact with HIV-infected patients in ways that will profoundly affect the future practice of medicine. National surveys indicate that one-fourth to one-third of physicians-in-training were influenced in their selection of a residency program by the prevalence of AIDS. A similar pro-

---

1 in 1,000,000. Link, et al., supra note 16, at 456. One wonders what the reaction would be among the 25% that had sustained percutaneous injuries with needles contaminated with blood from HIV or suspected HIV-positive patients to learn that their actual risk was closer to 1 in 167. See note 64 and accompanying text infra. But see Elisabeth Rosenthal, Practice of Medicine is Changing Under Specter of the AIDS Virus, N.Y. Times, Nov. 11, 1990, at A1 (ten to fifty percent of physicians overestimate their risk). See generally Gerbert et al., supra note 16, at 851 (primary care providers who treat fewer HIV-infected patients perceive greater risk).

In response to the severe shortage of nurses and medical technicians in New York City, attributable in part to the AIDS epidemic, New York Hospital offered Caribbean vacations and cash bonuses to attract new employees. Theresa Agovino, Personnel Shortage Plaguing Hospitals, AIDS Fears and Fewer Entrants Cited, CRAN'S N.Y. BUS., Sept. 24, 1990, at 3.

52 See note 7 supra.

53 See, e.g., Bernstein et al., supra note 16, at 459 (AIDS will influence residency choice of 33% of 150 students at a northeast medical school); Deborah J. Cotton, The Impact of AIDS on the Medical Care System, 260 JAMA 519, 522 (1988) (imbalance in case mix in hospitals with high prevalence of AIDS may impair recruiting); Julie L. Gerberding, Reducing Occupational Risk of HIV Infection, 26 Hosp. Practice 61, 61 (1991) (students and housestaff avoid training programs and practice opportunities with a high prevalence of HIV infection); Herman, supra note 46, at 1187 (prevalence of AIDS cases deters medical students from selecting certain residency programs and may have contributed to a decline in interest in internal medicine); Link et al., supra note 16, at 457 (based on their experiences with AIDS patients, 23% of 250 medical and pediatric housestaff in New York City stated they would be influenced in their choice of training program by the prevalence of AIDS if given the opportunity to choose again); Roberta B. Ness et al., House Staff Recruitment to Municipal and Voluntary New York City Residency Programs During the AIDS Epidemic, 266 JAMA 2843, 2846 (1991) (difficulty in attracting U.S. medical graduates to high-AIDS municipal training programs in internal
portion plan to practice in a locale with a low AIDS prevalence. In addition, a desire to avoid contact with HIV-infected patients influenced subspecialty choices in 15-30% of trainees. Negative attitudes toward HIV-infected patients have also contributed to a decline in the proportion of medical students entering specialties with high patient contact, such as internal medicine. Moreover, difficulty in attracting house officers to New York City hospitals, due in large part to the high prevalence of AIDS, has encouraged competition among programs to de-emphasize the number of HIV-infected patients treated at their institutions.

Other studies have failed to confirm a detrimental effect on housestaff recruitment; however, many of these studies suffer from selection bias or inadequate sample size. See Steven L. Brown & John P. Bilezikian, AIDS and Training in Internal Medicine, 323 NEW ENG. J. MED. 1567, 1567 (1990) (letter to the editor) (questionnaire study of 17 senior medical students from New York City indicated that HIV prevalence was the least important factor in choice of training program); Molly Cooke & Merle A. Sande, AIDS and Training in Internal Medicine, 323 NEW. ENG. J. MED. 1567, 1567 (1990) (letter to the editor) (high prevalence of AIDS at the University of California, San Francisco, not a liability in attracting highly qualified applicants).

See Link et al., supra note 16, at 457 (thirty-six percent of 250 medical and pediatric house officers in New York City planned to choose a career path less likely to involve HIV-positive patients as a result of their experiences with AIDS patients); Internal Med. News & Cardiology News, supra note 16, at 22 (twenty-five percent of 1045 housestaff selected a subspecialty based in part on a low AIDS prevalence).

See Bernstein et al., supra note 16, at 459 (twenty-nine percent of 104 northeast medical students will select a subspecialty based on a low prevalence of AIDS patients); Internal Med. News & Cardiology News, supra note 16, at 22 (fifteen percent of 1045 housestaff selected a subspecialty based, in part, on a desire to avoid AIDS patients).

See Cooke & Sande, supra note 35, at 1335 ("The declining preference for residencies in internal medicine and the selection of [other] disciplines . . . by the most academically competitive fourth year students has been attributed in part to AIDS."). See also notes 53-55 supra. But see Mark D. Schwartz et al., Medical Student Interest in Internal Medicine, Initial Report of the Society of General Internal Medicine, Interest Group Survey on Factors Influencing Career Choice in Internal Medicine, 114 Annals Internal Med. 6, 10 (1991) (1240 senior medical students responding to a nationwide survey indicated that their experiences caring for AIDS patients had only a mildly negative influence on their choice of internal medicine as a career).

See Cooke & Sande, supra note 35, at 1335 ("High levels of exposure to AIDS
II. ASSESSMENT OF THE RISK OF TRANSMISSION OF HIV INFECTION

The magnitude of the risk of transmission and whether it can be reduced by reasonable accommodations determines whether denial of medical services to an HIV-infected patient or exclusion from practice of an HIV-infected health care worker constitutes unlawful discrimination. Where to draw the line of acceptable risk must be based on an accurate assessment of the actual risk as established by current scientific evidence.

Cumulative data derived from prospective studies indicate that the risk of nosocomial transmission of HIV infection after percutaneous exposure to needles or sharp instruments contaminated with HIV-infected blood is approximately 0.3%. Despite anecdotal reports of seroconversion among health care workers after exposure of mucous membranes or non-intact skin to HIV-infected blood, prospective studies have failed to document HIV transmission via this route. This suggests that the risk of non-parenteral transmission is too small to quantify accurately. Moreover, it is estimated that 40% of the needlestick injuries and two-thirds of the non-parenteral exposures could have been prevented if infection-control guidelines promulgated by the
These risk data are derived primarily from a prospective national surveillance study conducted by the CDC of health care workers exposed to blood or body secretions of HIV-infected patients. The study found a 0.42% incidence of seroconversion after 860 needlestick injuries with HIV-infected blood. However, no instance of seroconversion occurred among any of the over 400 health care workers exposed to HIV-contaminated blood or body secretions as a result of contamination of an open wound or mucous membrane exposure. Over one-third of the exposures in this study were deemed preventable had infection-control guidelines been followed.

---


Combining data from all reported prospective studies, HIV infection was transmitted to six of 1948 health care workers who sustained 2042 percutaneous occupational injuries exposing them to HIV-infected blood (0.29%). Id. at 743-44. No documented transmissions occurred among over 1000 mucous membrane exposures. Id. at 744. However, attempts to calculate an overall risk are complicated by variability in the infectivity of source patients and in the type and severity of injuries sustained by individual health care workers. Most source patients in these prospective studies were in the late stages of HIV infection and thus highly infectious, no source patient was receiving anti-retroviral therapy and most injuries involved hollow bore needles which tend to transfer a larger volume of blood than do solid-bore (suture) needles. See note 111 infra.

65 Marcus & CDC Cooperative, supra note 64, at 1118.

66 Preventable injuries included those occurring during needle recapping (17%), im-
The CDC has developed infection-control guidelines to prevent transmission of HIV, hepatitis and other bloodborne infections in the health care setting. The term "universal precautions" refers to the use of infection-control precautions for all patients whenever a risk of exposure to blood or body fluids capable of transmitting HIV exists, irrespective of the perceived risk that a given patient carries the virus. Since clinical assessment of HIV status is unreliable, blood and certain body fluids of all patients are considered infectious and appropriate protective measures should be utilized. Universal precautions have been shown to be effective in reducing cutaneous and mucous membrane exposure of health care workers to blood and body fluids, however, a reduction in the occurrence of percutaneous injuries has not been demonstrated. Moreover, compliance

proper disposal of needles or sharp objects (14%) and contamination of open wounds (6%). Id. at 1119. The remaining unavoidable injuries occurred during needle manipulation (36%), performance of invasive procedures (8%), autopsies (25%) or other procedures (17%). Id.


68 Id. at 377-81.

69 Id. at 377. Gloves should be worn when contacting blood, body fluids, mucous membranes and contaminated surfaces and when drawing blood, starting intravenous devices or performing invasive procedures. Id. at 379-81. Gowns should be worn in situations where splashing may occur and masks and eye protection should also be worn where blood or body fluids may splash onto mucous membranes. Id. Procedures are provided for the safe handling and disposal of needles and sharp objects and recommendations are made regarding the performance of specific medical procedures, the use of resuscitative devices and the exclusion from patient care of health care workers with exuding lesions or weeping dermatitis. Id. In addition, standard infection control practices include hand washing after patient contact and require that instruments and other reusable equipment be disinfected and sterilized after use. Id. at 381-82.

70 See Barbara J. Fahey et al., Frequency of Nonparenteral Occupational Exposures to Blood and Body Fluids Before and After Universal Precautions Training, 90 Am. J. Med. 145, 145 (1991) (in a study comparing self-reported cutaneous exposures to blood and body fluids before and after training in universal precautions, the incidence of exposures decreased nearly 50%); Edward S. Wong et al., Are Universal Precautions Effective in Reducing the Number of Occupational Exposures Among Health Care Workers? A Prospective Study of Physicians on a Medical Service, 265 JAMA 1123, 1123 (1991) (implementation of universal precautions and a mandatory educational program increased barrier use nearly 50% and reduced the number of exposures per physician per patient-care-month from 5.97 to 2.66).

with universal precautions by physicians and health care facilities is shockingly poor.\textsuperscript{72} Educational efforts alone are not clearly effective in increasing compliance.\textsuperscript{73} However, a policy of

---

\textsuperscript{72} See Marsha F. Goldsmith, CDC Ponders New HIV Guidelines, 264 JAMA 1079, 1079 (1989) (nearly 50% of 700 health care workers surveyed did not follow universal precautions); Jeffrey S. Hammond et al., HIV, Trauma, and Infection Control: Universal Precautions are Universally Ignored, 30 J. TRAUMA 555 (1990) (compliance with universal precautions during trauma room resuscitations was 16%; reasons given for lack of compliance included lack of knowledge and the presence of emergency circumstances); Singh et al., supra note 36, at 605 (only 24% of 198 house officers practice universal precautions; over 50% recapped needles contrary to CDC guidelines); Carol M. Mangione et al., supra note 71, at 89 (one-third of medical housestaff were not wearing gloves when injured by a needlestick); Tim Friend, Most Doctors Want Required AIDS Testing, U.S.A. TODAY, July 17, 1991, at D1 (only 42% of 958 physicians surveyed wear gloves while taking blood).

\textsuperscript{73} See Kenneth R. Courington et al. Universal Precautions are not Universally Followed, 126 ARCHIVES SURGERY 93 (1991) (a one-time education program was ineffective in increasing compliance with universal precautions; more than 50% of all procedures and more than three-fourths of surgical procedures were not in compliance with recommended guidelines both before and after the educational program); David A. Talan & Larry J. Baraff, Effect of Education on the Use of Universal Precautions in a University Hospital Emergency Department, 19 ANNALS EMERGENCY MED. 1322 (1990) (an in-
mandatory compliance and employee accountability may prove effective in increasing compliance with universal precautions.\textsuperscript{74} The Occupational, Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has recently promulgated standards that give legal authority to universal precautions.\textsuperscript{75}

A. Risk to Physicians

The risk of nosocomial transmission of HIV from patient to health care professional can be estimated.\textsuperscript{76} The risk from a single procedure can be calculated as the product of (1) the risk of percutaneous injury during the procedure, (2) the risk of seroconversion after a single contaminated needlestick injury and (3) the prevalence of HIV infection in the patient population.\textsuperscript{77}
Cumulative risk is determined by the equation: $1-[1-w]^x$, where $w$ represents the probability of seroconversion after a single needlestick, $x$ represents the time period measured in years, $y$ represents the number of needlesticks per year, and $z$ represents the proportion of HIV-infected patients in the patient population. In order to calculate risk, one must estimate the prevalence of HIV in the patient population. Seroprevalence among patients varies widely; in high prevalence hospitals in San Francisco and New York City estimates range as high as 20% and 50% respectively. One must also ascertain the incidence of percutaneous injuries among physicians. Internists and general practitioners perform few invasive procedures and are at low risk for injury. Housestaff, surgeons and emergency room personnel are at substantially higher risk. The reported incidence of needlestick injuries among general surgeons ranges from 0.12-2.7 per 100 person-procedures. However, emergency room sur-

78 See notes 60-64 and accompanying text supra.


80 See Cooke & Sande, supra note 35, at 1335; Rosenthal, supra note 50, at A1. The New York Times has estimated that in 1987 the prevalence of HIV infection in New York's Bellevue Hospital patient population was nearly 50%. Id. More than five percent of patients who sought emergency-room treatment at a large metropolitan hospital in Baltimore were infected with HIV; seroprevalence rose to 14% among those with penetrating trauma. See Gabor D. Kelen et al., Unrecognized Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection in Emergency Department Patients, 318 NEW ENG. J. MED. 1645 (1988); Gabor D. Kelen et al., Human T-lymphotropic Virus (HTLV I-II) Infection Among Patients In An Inner-City Emergency Department, 113 ANNALS INTERNAL MED. 368 (1990).

81 Approximately 100,000 needlestick injuries are reported each year in the United States. Gerberding, supra note 53, at 66. See also McCormick et al., supra note 71, at 3B-301S (annual incidence of injuries by sharps among health care workers at the University of Wisconsin hospitals was 187 per 1000 health care workers); Joseph Thurn et al., Needlestick Injuries and Needle Disposal in Minnesota Physicians' Offices, 86 AM. J. MED. 575 (1989) (needlestick injuries occurred in 44% of private physicians' offices in Minnesota in a one-year period). See notes 84, 88 and accompanying text infra.

82 See Ezekiel J. Emanuel, Do Physicians Have an Obligation to Treat Patients with AIDS?, 318 NEW ENG. J. MED. 1686, 1688 (1988).

83 Id. See also note 88 infra.

84 Several recent prospective studies have attempted to determine the incidence of percutaneous injuries during the performance of surgery—a major determinant of the risk of HIV transmission. In a study performed by the CDC, 99 percutaneous injuries were observed during the performance of 1382 surgical procedures. Jerome Tokars et al.,
surgically may experience as many as forty needlestick or instru-

supra, note 33, at 83. Surgical accidents were more common in gynecologic and cardiac surgery. Id. At least one percutaneous injury to a surgical team member occurred in 6.9% of procedures. Id. The incidence of injury to individual surgeons was 2.3 to 2.7 injuries per 100 person-procedures. Id. (The number of person-procedures is calculated from the product of the number of procedures performed and the number of individuals participating in them. This calculation enables one to estimate the risk of injury to individual members of the surgical team.) The level of risk varied with the experience of the surgeon. Id. In only 29% of surgical accidents did the sharp object causing the injury to the surgeon recontaminate the patient's open wound. Id. Thus, in most surgical accidents the patient was not exposed to the surgeon's blood and was not placed at risk for transmission of HIV. See id. See also Adelisa L. Panlilio et al., Blood Contacts During Surgical Procedures, 265 JAMA 1533, 1533-36 (1991) (Ten percutaneous injuries were observed during 1828 operating room person-procedures. Injuries for an individual surgeon occurred at a rate of 0.12 per 100 procedures or 0.8 per 100 hours in the operating room. Risk factors for blood contact included emergency circumstances, trauma, burn and orthopedic procedures, increased blood loss and surgery lasting more than one hour). In another observational study performed at San Francisco General Hospital, the incidence of parenteral exposures was 1.7% (11 needlesticks, 6 lacerations, 4 mucous membrane exposures and 1 open wound contamination during 1307 surgical procedures). Increased risk was associated with major vascular and intra-abdominal gynecologic surgery, increased duration of procedures, greater blood loss and inexperience of the surgeon. Julie L. Gerberding et al., Risk of Exposure of Surgical Personnel to Patients' Blood During Surgery at San Francisco General Hospital, 322 New Eng. J. Med. 1788, 1788 (1989). See also Hammond et al., supra note 34, at 559 (incidence of needlestick injuries during surgery estimated to be 0.15-0.2% but higher in emergency procedures); S.A. Hussain et al., Risk to Surgeons: A Survey of Accidental Injuries During Operations, 75 Amer. J. Surgery 314 (1989) (Percutaneous injuries occurred in 5.6% of surgical procedures performed by 18 surgeons in Saudi Arabia and included 107 needlesticks and 4 cuts. The occurrence of surgical accidents correlated with the length of the procedure and inversely with the experience of the surgeon.); Leentvaar-Kuijpers et al., supra note 79, at 546-47 (overall incidence of percutaneous injuries was 0.37 per 100 person-operations and 0.82 among general surgeons who perform on average 500 operations per year); Lowenfels et al., supra note 79, at 1284 (eighty-six percent of 202 surgeons sustained at least one puncture injury in the preceding year with a median injury rate of 2 per year and 4.2 per 1000 operating room hours); McCormick et al., supra note 71, at 3B-305S (At the University of Wisconsin hospital, staff surgeons and surgical housestaff sustained on average six injuries per year.); G.G. McLeod, Needlestick Injuries at Operations for Trauma. Are Surgical Gloves an Effective Barrier?, 71-B J. Bone & Joint Surgery 489, 489 (1989) (glove punctures correlated with duration of surgery and inversely with the level of experience of the surgeon); Suzanne L. Popejoy & Donald E. Fry, Blood Contact and Exposure in the Operating Room, 172 Surgery, Gynecology & Obstetrics 480, 480 (1991) (Three percent of surgical procedures were complicated by percutaneous injuries. The risk correlated with the duration of surgery, blood loss and emergency circumstances); James G. Wright et al., Mechanisms of Glove Tears and Sharp Injuries Among Surgical Personnel, 266 JAMA 1668 (1991) (seventy injuries by sharps in 2292 surgical procedures).

The quality of the percutaneous injury is also an important determinant of risk of transmission. Superficial injuries carry a substantially lower risk. See note 11 infra. While Gerberding et al., supra, found all but 1 of 17 needlestick and laceration injuries to be superficial, Wright et al., supra, found that bleeding occurred in 85% of 70 sharp
If the prevalence of HIV infection among surgical patients is 5% (as in the emergency department of one medical center located in Baltimore), for a surgeon performing 500 operations per year and suffering 0.12 needlesticks per 100 operations, the annual risk is calculated as 0.009% and the risk of seroconversion after a single operation is one in 5.6 million. For a surgeon suffering 2.7 needlesticks per 100 operations, the annual risk of occupationally transmitted HIV infection is 0.20% and the risk from a single operation is one in 247,000. The calculated risk of operating on a single patient infected with HIV ranges from 1 in 12,000 to 1 in 278,000, depending on the assumed incidence of percutaneous surgical accidents. Medical housestaff have been estimated to experience on average 0.5-1 needlestick injuries per year, and in medical centers located in New York City, 7-14% of these injuries involve HIV-positive blood. The calculated an-

injuries, suggesting possible inoculation of the patient.

See Emanuel, supra note 82, at 1688.

See Kelen et al., supra note 80, at 1284.

The prevalence of HIV infection among surgical patients at San Francisco General Hospital is 29%. See Cooke & Sande, supra note 35, at 1336. See also note 80 and accompanying text. This prevalence of HIV infection would raise the risk of a single operation to 1 in 43,000 and would give rise to an annual risk of 1.17% if percutaneous injuries occurred at a rate of 2.7 per 100 person-procedures. However, at San Francisco General Hospital the rate of percutaneous injuries is only 1.3%. See Gerberding et al., supra note 84.

See Hayward & Shapiro, supra note 36, at 28 (Twenty-nine percent of 1745 senior medical residents in training programs nationwide have been exposed to a needlestick contaminated with blood from a known (9%) or suspected (20%) HIV-positive patient. This percentage rose to 48% in high prevalence hospitals. Seventy-two percent had received at least one blood-contaminated needlestick; 39% had received more than two.); Daniel B. Jones, Percutaneous Exposure of Medical Students to HIV, 284 JAMA 1188, 1188 (1990) (twenty-one percent of 42 medical students in New York City had been injured with a needle contaminated with HIV-infected blood; 50% would not report such injuries to the student health service); Link et al., supra note 16, at 456 (sixty-six of 250 housestaff reported a total of 96 needlestick exposures to HIV); Mangione et al., supra note 71, at 86-87, 90 (In San Francisco hospitals where 10-20% of patients are infected with HIV, 61% of 86 housestaff have sustained a needlestick injury during their medical career; 19% have been exposed to a needlestick contaminated with HIV-infected blood and an additional 36% were injured with a needle contaminated with blood from a patient at high risk. Fewer than one-third of the needlestick injuries were reported. On the basis of these data the authors estimated that one in 1000 medical interns will become infected.); Sanford M. Melzer et al., Needle Injuries Among Pediatric Housestaff Physicians in New York City, 84 Pediatrics 211, 211-12 (1989) (two hundred five of 294 house officers who had completed at least one year of training had stuck themselves with a blood contaminated needle—17% of needles were contaminated with suspected or docu-
annual risk of hospital-acquired infection among these trainees is 0.02%; the risk incurred over the course of their training is 0.07%.

It has been projected that the risk of at least one occupational seroconversion per year among health care workers will soon exceed 50% in many large urban medical centers and that one surgeon at San Francisco General Hospital will contract AIDS every eight years. These risks have been compared to the risk of death faced in other occupations. The annual risk of death among police and firefighters is approximately 0.2%. The estimated occupational risk of contracting AIDS faced by emergency room surgeons practicing in many large urban medical centers is as great or greater.

Forty health care workers in the United States are known to have acquired HIV infection through occupational exposure. In twenty-four cases seroconversion was documented by the absence of antibody in blood specimens obtained from injured workers shortly after injury. In the remaining sixteen health care workers seroconversion was not documented, however, occupational transmission was probable. Notwithstanding the alarming risk estimates just described, the prevalence of AIDS among health care workers is no greater than their overall representation in the United States labor force. Even in highly endemic areas where infection-control guidelines are not routinely

---


91 See Emanuel, supra note 82, at 1688.

92 See notes 85-89 and accompanying text supra.


94 Id. at 3B-295S. See note 61 supra.

95 Id.

96 As of 1988, health care workers constituted 5.7% of the United States labor force and accounted for 5.4% of all reported cases of AIDS. CDC, AIDS and HIV Update: Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome and Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection Among Health-Care Workers, 37 Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep. 229, 229 (1989).
followed, a disproportionate prevalence of HIV infection among health care workers has not been observed. However, it remains unexplained why the proportion of AIDS-infected health care workers having no identifiable nonoccupational risk factors is higher than in other occupational groups. In a cross-sectional study of over 1300 dentists and other dental care professionals, the prevalence of HIV was 0.08% among all those studied and 0.9% among dentists practicing in areas with a high prevalence of AIDS. These and other studies indicate a low seroprevalence among health care professionals, even among those at high risk for occupational exposure.

97 See Bosenge N'Galy et al., Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection Among Employees in an African Hospital, 319 NEW ENG. J. MED. 1123, 1123 (1988); Bosenge N'galy et al., Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection Among Employees in an African Hospital, 320 NEW ENG. J. MED. 1625, 1625 (1988) (letter to the editor).

98 Males and non-whites are over-represented among health care workers with AIDS having no identifiable risk factors. CDC, supra note 96, at 230. The CDC has suggested that this discrepancy may be explained by a failure of health care workers to report behavioral risk factors or by occupational risk. Id. Of the 41 health care workers with AIDS who could not be classified into a high-risk category after investigation, 17 reported needlestick injuries of mucous membrane exposures. Id. at 231. Seventy-five other health care workers are still under investigation and 20 others died prior to investigation or refused to cooperate. Id.

99 Robert S. Klein et al., Low Occupational Risk of Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection Among Dental Professionals, 318 NEW ENG. J. MED. 86 (1988). This study included 1132 dentists, 131 dental hygienists and 46 dental associates. Id. at 86. Fifty-one percent practiced in areas with a high prevalence of AIDS, 72% had treated patients with AIDS or at high risk, and 94% suffered accidental skin punctures with dental instruments. Id. The two infected dentists reported nonoccupational risk factors. Most of the dentists had suffered numerous accidental skin punctures and few adhered to infection-control guidelines. Id. at 88. The median number of punctures occurring within the preceding five years was 10. Id. See also CDC, Preliminary Analysis: HIV Sero Survey of Orthopedic Surgeons, 1991, 40 MORBIDITY & MORTALITY WKLY. REP. 309, 310 (1991) (The prevalence of HIV among orthopedists participating in a study designed to determine the seroprevalence of HIV in this group of physicians at high risk for occupational exposure was 0.06% (two of 3420 study participants). Both infected individuals reported nonoccupational risk factors. Nearly half of the orthopedists had operated on one or more patients known to be infected with HIV and nearly 40% had suffered a percutaneous injury in the preceding month with a sharp object contaminated with a patient's blood. Data derived from combining 13 studies performed between 1985 and 1988 which examined the seroprevalence of HIV among health care workers show a prevalence of 0.32% (21/6619); this prevalence is similar to that seen in the general population (0.12-0.80%). Gerberding, supra note 53, at 63.

100 Seroprevalence studies may seriously underestimate the prevalence of HIV infection if health care workers who already knew they were infected declined to participate.
B. Risk to the Patient

Five patients were infected with HIV that was transmitted during invasive dental procedures performed by a Florida dentist with AIDS.101 The strain of HIV that infected the dentist was closely related genetically to the strains infecting his patients and shared a unique amino acid sequence not found in any previously described HIV sequence.102 While the dentist did not consistently comply with recommended infection control guidelines, the precise mode of transmission has not been determined.103 Aside from this cluster in Florida, no other cases of transmission of HIV infection from health care provider to patient has been documented.104 "Look-back" studies that have identified and tested thousands of patients who underwent invasive procedures performed by HIV-infected physicians or dentists have failed to detect additional cases of HIV transmission.105 Nevertheless, currently available scientific data are

101 CDC, Update: Transmission of HIV Infection During Invasive Dental Procedures—Florida, 40Mor

102 Id. at 379.

103 Id. at 380. Barrier precautions were not always properly employed, gloves were occasionally reused after washing and sterilization techniques failed to comply with recommended guidelines. CDC, Update: Transmission of HIV Infection During an Invasive Dental Procedure—Florida, 40 Mor
didity & Mortality Wkly. Rep. 21, 25-27 (1991). However, transmission by use of contaminated instruments or dental equipment was considered less likely than direct blood to blood transfer in view of the fragility of the HIV virus in the environment. Id. at 27.

104 See note 105 infra.

inadequate to assess the precise risk of transmission from HIV-infected physician to patient.\textsuperscript{108}

Analogous to the methodology employed to calculate the risk of transmission to physicians, one can calculate the risk of sporadic transmission of HIV to patients undergoing an invasive surgical procedure performed by an HIV-infected physician.\textsuperscript{107} The CDC has performed such an analysis\textsuperscript{108} by calculating the product of the probability of injury to the HIV-infected surgeon (2.5%),\textsuperscript{109} the probability that the surgeon’s blood will recontact the patient’s open wound after an injury (32%),\textsuperscript{110} and the probability of transmission of HIV infection after an exposure to the surgeon’s blood (0.03-0.3%).\textsuperscript{111} The CDC model estimates that the risk of transmission from an HIV-infected surgeon performing an invasive procedure to his patient ranges from 0.0002

\textsuperscript{106} CDC, supra note 26, at 1.
\textsuperscript{107} The risk that a cluster of cases might arise due to transmission from a single infected practitioner to multiple patients defies quantification. Id. at 3-4.
\textsuperscript{109} See note 84 supra.
\textsuperscript{110} See Tokars et al., supra note 84.
\textsuperscript{111} See Bell et al., supra note 108. This calculation assumes that the probability of transmission of infection after exposure to the blood of an infected surgeon ranges from 0.03%-0.3%. The 0.3% figure is derived from prospective studies that examined transmission primarily after percutaneous injuries from hollow-bore needles contaminated with highly infectious blood from patients hospitalized with late stages of HIV infection. See note 64 and accompanying text supra. In fact, the risk of transmission after a percutaneous injury may vary widely. The principal determinant of risk is the infectivity of the blood contaminating the wound. S.T. Mast & Julie L. Gerberding, Factors Predicting Infectivity Following Needlestick Exposure to HIV: An In Vitro Model, 39 CLINICAL RES. 381A (1991) (abstract). Infectivity of blood varies with the stage of HIV infection of the source. Id. Viral titers in the blood increase dramatically as HIV infection progresses from the asymptomatic stage to full blown AIDS. David D. Ho et al., Quantitation of Human Immunodeficiency Virus Type 1 in the Blood of Infected Persons, 321 NEW ENG. J. MED. 1621 (1989). Other determinants of risk include the size of the blood inoculum (which may be higher after injury with a hollow-bore needle), the type and severity of injury (superficial versus deep penetrating wounds), and the protective barrier that use of gloves provide. The effect of anti-retroviral therapy on infectivity has not been ascertained. In an in-vitro needlestick model, the volume of blood transferred varied directly with needle size and the depth of penetration but was reduced by the presence of a glove barrier. Mast & Gerberding, supra. Moreover, gloves provided a more effective barrier to blood transmission from hollow than from solid-bore needles. Id. The 0.03% figure in the CDC model reflects an estimated tenfold reduction in risk of transmission attributed to such factors as glove use and the use of solid-bore suture needles in surgery.
to 0.002% (approximately 1 in 45,000 to 1 in 450,000). The cumulative risk that an HIV-infected surgeon will transmit the virus to a patient over his remaining “working life” was calculated as 0.81 to 8.1%. The CDC estimates that between 1980 and 1990, 12 to 129 patients may have been infected with HIV during invasive procedures performed by infected surgeons and dentists.

C. Guidelines for Preventing HIV Transmission in the Health Care Setting

The CDC has issued recommendations for preventing the transmission of HIV and hepatitis B virus to patients. While the guidelines are not legally binding, legislation recently passed by Congress, if enacted, would require that the states adopt these (or equivalent) guidelines and create enforcement mechanisms. The CDC guidelines state that health care workers who

112 Bell et al., supra note 108, at 37. For invasive dental procedures performed by an HIV-infected dentist the risk was estimated to be 1 in 263,000 to 1 in 2.6 million. Id. The CDC model has been criticized for failing to include the risk of HIV transmission through skin and mucous membrane exposures, contaminated instruments and bleeding into a patient’s wound. Nancy W. Dickey, Statement of the American Medical Association to the Centers for Disease Control Re: HIV Transmission During Invasive Procedures 4 (Feb. 21, 1991). Using slightly different assumptions, other investigators have calculated the risk of transmission from surgeon to patient as 1 chance in 21 million per hour of surgery (assuming the prevalence of HIV among surgeons to be 0.004). Albert B. Lowenfels & Gary Wormser, Risk of Transmission of HIV from Surgeon to Patient, 325 New Eng. J. Med. 888 (1991) (letter to the editor). The risk of transmission from a surgeon known to be infected with the HIV virus was calculated to range between 1 in 28,000 and 1 in 500,000 per hour of surgery. Id. at 889.

115 Bell et al., supra note 108, at 37. This calculation assumes that 3500 procedures would be performed during a remaining working life of seven years. Id.

116 Id.

117 CDC, supra note 26, at 5-7. Earlier guidelines issued by the CDC in 1987 recommended that HIV-infected health care workers, especially those performing invasive procedures, undergo individualized review by their personal physician and the personnel health service staff and medical directors of the employing institutions. CDC, Recommendations for Prevention of HIV Transmission in Health-Care Settings, 36 (Supp. 2S) Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep. 1S (1987). Review would determine whether an HIV-infected health care worker could adequately and safely continue to perform his or her patient care responsibilities or whether the duties of the infected worker should be restricted. Id.

118 These guidelines may, however, establish a professional standard of care to which defendants may be held in negligence actions for failing to adhere to recommended practices. Larry Gostin, Hospitals, Health Care Professionals, and AIDS: The “Right” to Know the Health Status of Professionals and Patients, 48 Md. L. Rev. 12, 26 (1989). See also notes 130-32 and accompanying text infra (congressional mandate).
do not perform invasive procedures and who adhere to universal precautions pose no risk of transmission of HIV to patients.\(^{117}\) While the risk of transmission of HIV infection from an infected health care worker to patients during the performance of invasive procedures is small, the CDC nevertheless concluded that adequate scientific data to define the risk precisely are not yet available.\(^{118}\)

In developing guidelines to prevent transmission of HIV to patients, the CDC analyzed published and unpublished reports of transmission of hepatitis B virus to patients during invasive procedures\(^ {119}\) and data it obtained from a prospective study of percutaneous injuries during surgical procedures.\(^ {120}\) The CDC defined "exposure-prone procedures" as those procedures associated with the transmission of hepatitis B virus despite adherence to universal precautions.\(^ {121}\) These procedures involved "digital palpation of a needle tip in a body cavity or the simultaneous presence of the [surgeon's] . . . fingers and a needle or other sharp instrument or object in a poorly visualized or highly confined anatomic site."\(^ {122}\) Exposure-prone procedures are associated with a risk that the surgeon will suffer a percutaneous injury and that his or her blood will contact the patient's wound, body cavity or mucous membranes.\(^ {123}\) Invasive procedures that lack the characteristics of exposure-prone procedures

\(^{117}\) See CDC, supra note 26, at 1.

\(^{118}\) Id.

\(^{119}\) Id. at 2-4. The mode of transmission of hepatitis B virus is similar to that of HIV but much more efficient. Id. at 3. Insight into factors that facilitate the transmission of hepatitis B provide valuable information about factors that may enhance HIV transmission. In eight of 20 reported episodes, transmission of hepatitis B virus from an infected health care worker to patients occurred despite routine use of gloves; five of these clusters involved obstetricians or gynecologists and three involved cardiovascular surgeons. Id. at 2. Nine of the remaining clusters involved dentists or oral surgeons. Id. In each case, transmission was associated with either lack of adherence to infection control practices or an injury to the infected worker. Id. at 3. Of the seven health care workers who resumed performing invasive procedures after modifying procedural techniques and adopting infection control measures, two (an obstetrician/gynecologist and an oral surgeon) were involved in additional episodes of transmission. Id.

\(^{120}\) See Tokars et al., supra note 84, at 83.

\(^{121}\) See CDC, supra note 26, at 4. The characteristics of exposure-prone procedures were identified in a prospective study of surgical accidents. See Tokars et al., supra note 84, at 83.

\(^{122}\) CDC, supra note 26, at 4. Certain oral, cardiothoracic, colorectal and obstetric/gynecologic procedures were identified as exposure-prone. Id.

\(^{123}\) Id.
pose a "substantially lower risk, if any" of transmission of HIV.124

The CDC guidelines recommend that all health care workers adhere to universal precautions and follow established guidelines for disinfection and sterilization of instruments and other reusable devices.125 The CDC concluded that current scientific knowledge does not support the imposition of practice restrictions on HIV-infected physicians who perform invasive procedures not identified as exposure-prone if they practice recommended techniques, adhere to universal precautions and follow recommended sterilization and disinfection procedures.126 However, the guidelines do recommend that health care workers who perform exposure-prone procedures know their HIV status and that HIV-infected workers refrain from performing exposure-prone procedures "unless they have sought counsel from an expert review panel and been advised under what circumstances, if any, they may continue to perform [exposure-prone] . . . procedures."127 In addition, HIV-infected physicians must notify potential patients of their seropositivity before performing any exposure-prone procedure permitted by the expert panel.128

124 Id.
125 Id. at 2.
126 Id. at 5. The guidelines recommend that medical, surgical and dental organizations and local health care facilities identify exposure-prone procedures. Id. The CDC convened a panel of experts in November 1991 to develop a list of exposure-prone procedures. However, most national medical and public health organizations declined to cooperate with the CDC in these efforts in the belief that the risk is so small that it would be impossible to develop such a list. Steve Taravella, OSHA, CDC Issue Rules on Infection Control, MODERN HEALTHCARE, Dec. 9, 1991, at 3. Moreover, many organizations believe that the remote risk does not justify practice restrictions. Lawrence K. Altman, Unexpected Defiance Greets AIDS Guidelines, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 15, 1991, at C3.

127 CDC, supra note 26, at 5. Expert review panels are to be established at a local level by individual medical facilities for their employees and by local and state public health officials for health care workers in other settings. Id. An emergency room physician with AIDS was forced to resign his position at a hospital in New York State after the local expert panel compiled a list of restricted procedures that included suturing wounds. Craig Wolff, Doctors with AIDS Virus Evokes Anger and Pathos, N.Y. TIMES, July 29, 1991, at B1.

128 CDC, supra note 26, at 6. The CDC guidelines recommend that the decision whether or not to notify patients who have previously undergone exposure-prone procedures performed by an HIV-infected physician should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Id.

The American Medical Association (AMA) has stated that HIV-infected physicians have an "ethical obligation not to engage in any professional activity which has an identifiable risk of transmission . . . [of HIV] to the patient." AMA Statement on HIV In-
The transmission of HIV infection from an infected Florida dentist to five of his patients has had an extraordinary impact on health care delivery in the United States. While the risk of transmission of HIV from infected patients to physicians has received some measure of attention from politicians, the news media and the public, the reaction elicited by the Florida incident has been extraordinary. Largely in response to this incident, Congress passed legislation which if enacted would require state public health officials to certify to the Secretary of Health and Human Services that they have instituted the CDC or "equivalent" guidelines. The term "equivalent" was not defined with specificity in the legislation. The director of the CDC would determine whether state guidelines that differ from those of the CDC are indeed equivalent. Congress intended that this legislation not compromise protections afforded HIV-infected health care workers under the ADA. Employers of health care workers whose professional responsibilities are limited pursuant to CDC or equivalent guidelines must make reasonable accommodations to "promote the continued use of the . . . worker's knowledge and skills."

Adoption of CDC guidelines by state health departments pursuant to congressional mandate would have a chilling effect

---

129 CDC, supra note 101.

130 Amendment No. 781 to H.R. 2622, Treasury, Postal Service, Executive Office of the President, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 1992, 102d Cong., 1st Sess. (1991). States must also establish enforcement mechanisms that subject health care workers who fail to comply to disciplinary procedures. Id. States that fail to comply within one year face loss of funding under the Public Health Service Act. Id.


132 Id.

133 Id.
on the medical community—heightening concerns among physicians over occupational transmission of HIV. The threat of loss of livelihood will exaggerate already existing fears of loss of health and eventual loss of life.\textsuperscript{134}

In addition, HIV-infected physicians who treat infected patients may be restricted in their practice of medicine, worsening the already critical shortage of providers.\textsuperscript{135} If implemented, these guidelines would encourage many physicians to be even more vigorous in their avoidance of HIV-infected patients. In addition, these guidelines conflict with the "significant risk" standard adopted by the ADA which was designed to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities, including those with HIV infection.\textsuperscript{138} Courts relying on CDC guidelines could sustain exclusion of HIV-infected health care professionals from performing exposure-prone procedures on the ground that the health care worker poses a "significant risk" of transmission of HIV infection to patients. Such a holding would necessarily acknowledge that reasonable accommodations, including the use of universal precautions and modifications in surgical techniques, cannot totally eliminate the risk of surgical accidents and percutaneous injuries. Since an invasive procedure performed by an HIV-infected surgeon exposes a patient to a risk of HIV transmission estimated at 1 in 45,000 to 1 in 450,000,\textsuperscript{137} this level of risk would constitute "significant risk" within the meaning of the ADA in order to justify the imposition of practice limitations on HIV-infected surgeons. Since the risk of transmission of HIV from infected patient to physician is as great or greater, physicians in turn may argue that HIV-infected

\textsuperscript{134} But see Dickey, supra note 112, at 5-6 (the AMA does not believe that physicians who treat HIV-infected patients will be deterred by the threat of loss of livelihood or the chance of devastating health consequences).

\textsuperscript{135} It is not known whether transmission of HIV from an infected physician to an already infected patient would exacerbate the progression of disease in the latter. Lawrence K. Altman, AIDS-Infected Doctors and Dentists Are Urged To Warn Patients or Quit, N.Y. Times, Jan. 18, 1991, at A18.

\textsuperscript{136} See note 174 infra.

\textsuperscript{137} See note 112 and accompanying text supra. This risk estimate is calculated from assumptions derived from studies of injuries sustained during both exposure-prone and nonexposure-prone surgical procedures. See notes 60-66 and accompanying text supra. The CDC guidelines recommend practice restrictions only for HIV-infected physicians performing exposure-prone procedures. CDC, supra note 26. The risk to the patient from an exposure-prone procedure would necessarily be greater due to a greater risk that the surgeon's blood will contact the patient.
patients pose a "significant risk" to them during the performance of exposure-prone procedures so as to justify refusal to provide care.\textsuperscript{138}

The New York State Health Department has rejected the CDC guidelines and has instead proposed that HIV-infected physicians may continue to perform surgical and other invasive medical procedures without informing patients of their seropositive status provided they adhere to infection control practices and do not suffer from a functional impairment that would interfere with job performance.\textsuperscript{139} The New York proposal also recommends that state-appointed review panels be established to determine whether imposition of practice restrictions on individual HIV-infected health care professionals is necessary to protect patients.\textsuperscript{140} The evaluation process would consider physical and mental impairments that interfere with the health care worker's ability to provide quality care, the susceptibility of the health care worker to infectious diseases, the presence of exposed, exuding or weeping lesions, the worker's history of compliance with infection control guidelines and the type of invasive procedures performed by the infected worker.\textsuperscript{141} This individualized evaluation of HIV-infected health professionals would be voluntary.\textsuperscript{142} It is clear, however, that many HIV-infected health care professionals will not voluntarily subject themselves to any risk of practice restrictions.\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{138} See note 185 and accompanying text infra.

\textsuperscript{139} New York State Dep't of Health, Policy Statement and Action Plan to Prevent Transmission of HIV Through Medical/Dental Procedures (Oct. 8, 1991). Michigan's Department of Public Health would also allow infected health care workers to continue to practice absent "clear evidence" of risk. Phillip J. Hilts, Congress Urges that Doctors be Tested for AIDS, N.Y. Times, Oct. 4, 1991, at A18. The National Institute of Health has also opposed practice limitations on HIV-infected health care workers who perform invasive procedures on the ground that scientific data indicate that the risk is remote and fail to justify practice restrictions. Marlene Cimons, Don't Bar Doctors with HIV, NIH Says; Health: Federal Researchers Join AIDS Activists and Others Who Oppose Restrictions. The Chance of Infecting a Patient is Seen as Remote, L.A. Times, June 11, 1991, at A22. See also Barnes et al., supra note 21, at 311-12 (numerous medical organizations have issued policy statements opposing practice restrictions for HIV-infected physicians).

\textsuperscript{140} See New York State Dep't of Health, supra note 139, at 3. The policy proposal also recommends passage of legislation which would require that all health care professionals who perform invasive procedures undergo training in infection-control techniques. Id. at 2.

\textsuperscript{141} Id. at 3.

\textsuperscript{142} Id.

\textsuperscript{143} See notes 225-26 and accompanying text infra.
III. Federal Remedies Available to HIV-Infected Patients and Health Care Workers

A. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973

Refusal of a physician to care for an HIV-infected patient or the imposition of practice restrictions on an infected physician may violate section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 where the defendant is a recipient of, or is employed by, an organization that receives “Federal financial assistance.” The Act provides that recipients of federal funds may not discriminate against “otherwise qualified” handicapped individuals on the basis of their handicap. Regulations promulgated by the Department of Health and Human Services under this statute define a handicapped individual as a person who:

(i) has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more of such person’s major life activities,
(ii) has a record of such an impairment, or
(iii) is regarded as having such an impairment.

The statute defines an impairment as “any physiological disorder or condition . . . affecting one or more . . . body systems . . . [including] . . . hemic and lymphatic.” Only individuals who are “otherwise qualified” for the position, benefit, program or activity offered by the recipient of federal financial assistance are protected by the provisions of the Act. Qualified individuals are those who can meet the essential requirements of a program or position with or without “reasonable accommodation” on the part of the covered entity. Furthermore, the covered

---

145 Id. For the purposes of the Rehabilitation Act, federal financial assistance includes Medicare and Medicaid payments to the provider. United States v. Baylor Univ. Med. Ctr., 735 F.2d 1039 (5th Cir. 1984) (Medicare and Medicaid constitute “Federal financial assistance” for purposes of the Rehabilitation Act); Glanz v. Vernick, 756 F. Supp. 632 (D. Mass. 1991) (Medicare and Medicaid payments made to hospital clinic qualified the clinic as a recipient of federal funds even though Medicaid did not cover the particular elective surgical procedure the plaintiff desired).
146 29 U.S.C. § 794 (“No otherwise qualified handicapped individual . . . shall, solely by reason of his handicap . . . be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance . . . .”).
147 Id. § 706(7)(B); 34 C.F.R. § 104.3(j) (1989).
148 34 C.F.R. § 104.3(i)(A).
150 34 C.F.R. § 104.3(k)(1).
entity has an affirmative duty to make "reasonable accommoda-
tion[s]" that will enable a disabled applicant to meet the re-
quirements of the program, benefit or position offered.151

The United States Supreme Court in School Board of Nas-
sau County, Florida v. Arline152 examined the scope of section
504 with respect to contagious diseases. The appellant, Arline,
was dismissed from her position as an elementary school teacher
after her third relapse of pulmonary tuberculosis.153 The Court
affirmed the Eleventh Circuit's reversal of the district court's
holding that Congress did not intend section 504 to include per-
sons with contagious diseases.154 The Court held that persons
with contagious diseases are not excluded from protection under
section 504 and that contagiousness alone did not justify dis-
charge of an employee.155 However, the Court stated that an in-
dividual who poses a "significant risk" of infecting others in the
workplace is not "otherwise qualified" for her position if the risk
cannot be eliminated through reasonable accommodations made
by the employer.156 The Court went on to instruct district courts
to base their determinations of whether or not a "significant
risk" of contagion exists and whether or not reasonable accom-
modations could eliminate the risk on "'reasonable medical
judgments given the state of medical knowledge . . .'"157 The

151 Id. § 104.12(a). Accommodations are not reasonable where they impose "undue
financial and administrative burdens" on the recipient of federal financial assistance,
Southeastern Community College v. Davis, 442 U.S. 397, 412 (1979), or require a "fundam-
ental alteration in the nature of [the] program," id. at 410. See 45 C.F.R. § 84.12
(1987) (factors to be considered in determining whether an accommodation causes undue
hardship).


153 Id. at 276.

154 Id. at 277.

155 Id. at 286, 289. The Court was not faced with the issue of whether a carrier of
AIDS is handicapped within the meaning of the Rehabilitation Act. Id. at 281 n.7.

156 Id. at 288. This holding has been codified in the Civil Rights Restoration Act
which excludes from the definition of "individuals with handicaps" persons with conta-
gious diseases who "constitute a direct threat to the health or safety of other individuals

Factors to be considered in determining whether a person with a contagious disease
poses a significant risk of infecting others and whether this risk can be eliminated by
reasonable accommodations were enumerated by the Court:

(a) the nature of the risk (how the disease is transmitted),
(b) the duration of the risk (how long is the carrier infectious),
(c) the severity of the risk (what is the potential harm to third parties) and
(d) the probabilities the disease will be transmitted and will cause varying
Court remanded the case for determination of whether Arline was “otherwise qualified” for employment as a school teacher and whether reasonable accommodations could be made to eliminate any risk of contagion she might pose to students and workers.\footnote{158}

Post-Arline decisions have held that HIV infection, whether symptomatic or asymptomatic, is a handicap under section 504 and that HIV-infected persons must be “reasonably accommodated” to allow such individuals to participate or derive benefit from activities receiving federal funds.\footnote{159} A symptomatic HIV-infected individual is included within the first two prongs of the definition of the term handicapped because the infected person has a physical impairment—dysfunction of the hematologic and immune (lymphatic) systems—that substantially limits one or more major life activities including procreation and intimate sexual relationships.\footnote{160}

In \textit{Chalk v. United States District Court Central District of California}\footnote{161} the Ninth Circuit held that a teacher with AIDS was handicapped within the meaning of section 504 and was “otherwise qualified” for employment.\footnote{162} The court found that the district court had failed to follow the standard articulated in \textit{Arline} and had placed an “impossible burden of proof on the petitioner” to demonstrate that he posed no “significant risk” of contagion.\footnote{163} The court observed that the plaintiff is not “required to disprove] every theoretical possibility of harm . . . .”\footnote{164} The court went on to find that the district court had

\footnote{158} \textit{Arline}, 480 U.S. at 290. On remand the district court found that Arline posed no threat of communicating tuberculosis in the classroom and that she was otherwise qualified to teach and entitled to reinstatement. \textit{Arline v. School Bd.}, 692 F. Supp. 1286 (M.D. Fla. 1988).

\footnote{159} \textit{See} notes 161-72 and accompanying text \textit{infra}.

\footnote{160} \textit{See} 29 U.S.C. § 706(7)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 104.3(j)(i)(ii) & § 104.3(2)(i). \textit{See also} notes 147-48 and accompanying text \textit{supra}.

\footnote{161} 840 F.2d 701 (9th Cir. 1988).

\footnote{162} \textit{Id}.

\footnote{163} \textit{Id} at 707.

\footnote{164} \textit{Id} at 709 (“Little in science can be proved with absolute certainty and Section
relied on unsupported speculation and had "rejected the overwhelming consensus of medical opinion" which had concluded that casual contact as might occur in a classroom setting did not present a significant risk of contagion.\textsuperscript{165} The Ninth Circuit stated that a transfer of the plaintiff from the classroom was not justified unless the individual posed a direct threat to the health and safety of other employees and reasonable accommodation would not eliminate the risk.\textsuperscript{166} Similarly, other courts have held that children with AIDS are handicapped under section 504 and are "otherwise qualified" to attend public school.\textsuperscript{167}

The issue of whether an asymptomatic\textsuperscript{168} person infected with HIV is handicapped under section 504, i.e., whether that individual has an impairment which substantially limits major life activities, was addressed by a New York trial court in \textit{District 27 Community School Board v. Board of Education of New York}.\textsuperscript{169} The petitioner sought to enjoin the Board of Education's policy that prevented dismissal of HIV-infected children in the absence of an individual determination of the necessity of such action.\textsuperscript{170} The court held that HIV-positive but asymptomatic school children were handicapped under section 504 because the children had physical impairments of the hematologic and lymphatic systems.\textsuperscript{171} Similarly, the Rehabilitation Act has been

\textsuperscript{165} \textit{Id.} at 708. In rejecting the consensus of medical opinion, the district court had ignored the instructions of the Supreme Court in \textit{Arline} to "defer to the reasonable medical judgments of public health officials." \textit{Id.} (quoting \textit{Arline}, 408 U.S. at 288). \textit{See} note \textsuperscript{157} and accompanying text \textit{supra}.

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{Chalk}, 840 F.2d at 707-08.


\textsuperscript{168} \textit{See} note \textsuperscript{61} \textit{supra}.

\textsuperscript{169} 130 Misc. 2d 398, 502 N.Y.S.2d 325 (Sup. Ct. Queens County 1986).

\textsuperscript{170} \textit{Id.} at 401, 502 N.Y.S.2d at 328.

\textsuperscript{171} HIV-infected children also qualify as handicapped under the third prong of the definition, insofar as their pursuit of an education is limited by a perceived impairment
held to encompass asymptomatic HIV-infected patients and employees. Thus, both symptomatic and asymptomatic HIV-infected individuals are handicapped under the Rehabilitation Act and are protected by its provisions.

B. The Americans with Disabilities Act

The recently enacted Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) extends to disabled individuals comprehensive rights, including protections and remedies aimed at eliminating discrimination against individuals with disabilities in the private as well as public sectors. The ADA does not limit the rights or remedies available to the disabled under pre-existing federal, state or municipal legislation and mandates that agencies responsible for enforcement coordinate their efforts. Although the ADA does not supplant the Rehabilitation Act, it provides comprehensive protections for HIV-infected persons and is the preferred federal remedy.

Persons with AIDS, as well as asymptomatic individuals infected with the HIV virus, are disabled within the meaning of the ADA and are thus entitled to all the protections it affords.
The ADA defines a disabled individual as one who manifests:

(a) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of such individual;
(b) a record of such impairment; or
(c) being regarded as having such an impairment.\textsuperscript{178}

This definition parallels that adopted by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.\textsuperscript{179} A patient with AIDS or an asymptomatic HIV-infected individual is included within the first prong of the definition of a disabled individual because of physical impairments of the hematologic and immunologic (lymphatic) systems that substantially limit major life activities including procreation and intimate sexual relationships.\textsuperscript{180} Patients with AIDS may, in addition, suffer impairment of multiple organ systems and manifest limitations in other major life activities.

1. The HIV-Infected Patient

Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act bars discrimination in public accommodations such as municipal, state and Veterans Administration hospitals.\textsuperscript{181} Moreover, private and voluntary hospitals and the professional offices of private health care providers are also "public accommodations" for the purposes of Title III if their operations affect commerce, as virtually

\textsuperscript{179} See note 147 and accompanying text supra.
\textsuperscript{180} People with HIV disease are individuals who have any condition along the full spectrum of HIV infection—asymptomatic HIV infection, symptomatic HIV infection or full blown AIDS. These individuals are covered under the first prong of the definition of disability in the Americans with Disabilities Act, as individuals who have a physical impairment that substantially limits a major life activity. Although the major life activity that is affected at any point in the spectrum of the HIV infection may be different, there is substantial limitation of some major life activity from the onset of HIV infection.
all do. The ADA prohibits discrimination based on 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 who owns . . . or operates a place of public accommodation." The ADA provides that no individual shall be denied, on the basis of disability, the opportunity to participate in or benefit from a covered entity nor shall he or she be afforded a service or accommodation that is unequal, different or separate. Thus, the provisions of Title III unequivocally prohibit the denial of health care services to a seropositive individual solely on the basis of HIV infection. Title III, however, does not prohibit exclusion of disabled individuals who pose a "significant risk" in the form of a "direct threat to the health and safety of others."

The ADA requires that a health care provider make "reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures" to accommodate disabled individuals where such modifications are necessary to enable the disabled individual to participate or benefit from the services offered by the provider. Failure to make these modifications constitutes discrimination unless the modifications would "fundamentally alter the nature of . . . [the] services [offered] . . . ." In general, treatment of HIV-infected patients does not require any accommodation whatsoever. CDC guidelines do not require any modifications in practices or procedures by health care providers in caring for an HIV-infected patient. These guidelines recommend instituting universal precautions where there exists a risk of parenteral, mucous membrane or cutaneous exposure to blood or certain body fluids from any patient, irrespective of the perceived risk of HIV infection. Attempts to predict HIV status on the basis of risk fac-

---

185 § 302(b)(3).
186 § 302(b)(2)(A)(iii).
187 Id.
188 See notes 67-75 and accompanying text supra.
189 See notes 67-75 and accompanying text supra.
tor assessment are unreliable; restricting infection-control precautions to those perceived to be at high risk will miss many cases. Thus, no additional precautions, procedures or modifications in waste disposal practices are required to accommodate individuals known to be HIV-infected.

An important area of potential litigation under the ADA involves the making of referrals by physicians. The legislative history of the ADA clearly indicates that Congress did not intend to "prohibit a physician from referring an individual with a disability to another physician . . . if the disability itself creates specialized complications for the patient's health which the physician lacks the experience or knowledge to address." A family practitioner, general practitioner, general internist or pediatrician may in some cases refer patients with AIDS to infectious disease specialists or to tertiary health care facilities when the doctor lacks the specialized knowledge and expertise necessary to provide care. In contrast, HIV-infected patients with nor-

---

180 Kelen et al., supra note 80, at 1647-48.
181 Id. at 1648.
182 While the AMA states that physicians have an ethical duty to treat HIV-infected patients, it has nonetheless indicated that "[p]hysicians who are unable to provide the services required by AIDS patients should make referrals to those physicians or facilities equipped to provide such services." Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs, Ethical Issues Involved in the Growing AIDS Crisis, 259 JAMA 1380, 1381 (1988). The American College of Physicians and the Infectious Diseases Society of America have indicated that an ethically responsible physician who "feels inadequate or incapable of providing [the best care possible] . . . is ethically bound to refer the patient to a competent colleague . . . ." Health & Pub. Policy Comm., Am. College of Physicians & The Infectious Diseases Soc'y of Am., The Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) and Infections with the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV), 108 ANNALS INTERNAL MED. 460, 462 (1988); see also Quentin R. Stiles et al., The Society of Thoracic Surgeons Ad Hoc Committee on AIDS. Report to Membership, 47 ANNALS THORACIC SURGERY 946, 948 (1989) ("A physician may decline to treat a patient because he or she feels that the requirements for treatment lie outside his or her area of expertise.").
184 When the number of helper T-lymphocytes in the blood fall below 500 per milliliter, the HIV-infected patient will benefit from anti-retroviral drug therapy which may require specialized knowledge on the part of the medical practitioner administering these agents. See The Medical Management of AIDS, supra note 9, at xv. When helper T-lymphocyte counts fall further, prophylactic treatment to prevent opportunistic infections is also indicated. Id. In addition, the patient with AIDS is susceptible to a host of opportunistic infections of the lung, eye, gastrointestinal tract and other organ systems whose diagnosis and treatment will likely be beyond the ken of the general practitioner. Id. at 209-90, 316-38. These infections, while commonly observed among patients with AIDS, are otherwise extremely rare. Id. General internists and family practitioners may
mal numbers of helper T-lymphocytes in their blood arguably do not require specialized care and may not be referred solely on the basis of their seropositivity.†95 In addition, the ADA does not preclude a physician-specialist from referring HIV-infected patients with disorders that lie outside the doctor's field of specialization.†98 On the other hand, a surgeon, interventional radiologist or dentist called on to perform "routine" operative, radiologic or dental procedures on a HIV-positive patient could not refer on the ground that he or she was unable to provide necessary services due to inadequate knowledge or experience. The patient's HIV status does not significantly add to the complexity or difficulty of these invasive yet routine procedures.

The ADA prohibits a private entity offering public accommodations or services from establishing eligibility criteria (tests, selection guidelines, or qualification standards) "unless such criteria can be shown to be necessary for the provision of the . . . services . . . being offered."†97 In the health care setting, this

argue that they lack the expertise to deal with these "specialized" therapies.

On the other hand, in many communities primary care physicians routinely provide care for patients with HIV-infection and AIDS. Gerson et al., supra note 7, at 1103, 1106. AIDS is part of most primary care practices in New York City. Id. at 1106. Of 473 primary care providers surveyed in New York City, 71% have cared for patients with AIDS. Id. at 1103. Moreover, 32% of family practitioners in communities with fewer than 2500 residents have dealt with HIV infection. Bredfeldt et al., supra note 8. See also Green et al., supra note 8 (program for community-based care for HIV-infected patients by primary care providers in Virginia); Gerbert et al., supra note 16, at 2837 (seventy-five percent of 1121 primary care physicians nationwide have treated one or more HIV-infected patients; 23% have treated more than 10).

Many primary care physicians believe they lack sufficient knowledge about the care of HIV-infected patients. Id. To meet this challenge, New York State has distributed educational materials to primary care providers to instruct them in the evaluation and management of HIV-infected patients. NEW YORK STATE DEPT OF HEALTH, AIDS INST, HIV MEDICAL EVALUATION & PRIMARY CARE (March 1991). Included were protocols on the use of anti-retroviral therapy and the prophylaxis of opportunistic infections and information on AIDS-related resources available to the practitioner. Id. In addition, the state has allocated over $1,000,000 to fund training grants to educate physicians in the care of HIV-infected patients.

†95 See note 194 supra.

†96 "Nothing in this legislation is intended to prohibit . . . [a physician who has developed an area of specialization] from referring a patient with a disability . . . if that patient is seeking treatment outside the doctor's specialization and if the doctor would make a similar referral for an individual without that disability." H.R. REP. NO. 485, 101st Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 2, at 105-06 (1990), reprinted in 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 303, 388-89.

provision prevents a health care provider from requiring that a prospective patient undergo HIV testing as a means of screening for infected individuals.\(^{198}\) While knowledge of a patient's HIV treatment to suppress their immune function that may be detrimental to individuals infected with HIV. In contrast, "a drug rehabilitation clinic . . . could not refuse to treat a person who was a drug addict simply because the patient tests positive for HIV." H.R. Rep. No. 485, 101st Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 2, at 106 (1990), reprinted in 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 303, 389.

\(^{198}\) Theoretically, knowledge of a patient's HIV status might reduce the exposure of health care workers to infected blood and body fluids by motivating strict compliance with universal precautions and encouraging changes in surgical procedures or techniques that reduce exposure but that are not practical for all patients. However, modifications in practice that unduly increase intraoperative time or lead to the refusal to perform elective procedures may themselves be discriminatory.

Moreover, data fail to confirm that knowledge of a patient's HIV status decreases the risk to health care workers. Julie L. Gerberding, Does Knowledge of Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection Decrease the Frequency of Occupational Exposure to Blood?, 91 Am. J. Med. 3B-308S (1991). No study has provided objective evidence that identifying infected patients decreases exposure frequency. Id. at 3B-311S ("Available literature does not establish a benefit from routine HIV testing or labeling of patients for infection control purposes."). See also Julie L. Gerberding et al., Risk of Exposure of Surgical Personnel to Patients' Blood During Surgery at San Francisco General Hospital, 322 New Eng. J. Med. 1788 (1990) (in a medical center with a high prevalence of HIV infection, intraoperative exposure to blood and body fluids was not influenced by knowledge or perception that the patient was seropositive); Tokars et al., supra note 84, at 83 (rate of percutaneous injuries to surgical personnel not significantly reduced when they perceived or had actual knowledge that patients were infected with HIV (percutaneous injury rate 6.9% versus 3.1%, p value not significant)); CDC, Recommendations for Preventing Transmission of Infection with Human T-Lymphotrophic Virus Type III/Lymphadenopathy-Associated Virus During Invasive Procedures, 35 Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep. 221, 223 (1986) ("Routine serologic testing . . . is not necessary for . . . patients undergoing invasive procedures . . . Results of such routine testing would not . . . supplement . . . [universal] precautions . . . in further reducing the negligible risk of transmission during . . . invasive procedures."); CDC, Recommendations for Preventing Transmission of Infection with Human T-Lymphotrophic Virus Type III/Lymphadenopathy-Associated Virus in the Workplace, 34 Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep. 681, 684 (1985) ("Routine testing of all patients . . . is not recommended to prevent transmission of . . . [HIV] infection in the workplace. Results of such testing are unlikely to further reduce the risk of transmission, which, even with documented needlesticks, is already extremely low. Furthermore, the risk . . . can be reduced by . . . implementing . . . infection-control precautions . . . "); CDC, Update: Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infections in Health-Care Workers Exposed to Blood of Infected Patients, 36 Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep. 285, 289 (1987) ("It has not been established that knowledge of a patient's [HIV] status increases the compliance of health-care workers with recommended precautions.").

The CDC has recently proposed guidelines recommending that patients in acute care hospitals be tested for HIV after informed consent is obtained and the patient counseled. CDC, Review of Draft Guidelines for HIV Testing Services for Patients in Acute-Care Hospitals, 40 Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep. 646 (1991). However, the purpose of testing would not be to protect the physician but to obtain for the patient the
status may be required for proper diagnosis and treatment, serologic screening is prohibited as a prerequisite for delivery of health care.

Sexual orientation is not a cognizable factor in determining disability under the ADA. Homosexuality and bisexuality are specifically excluded from the definition of "impairment." Current use of illegal drugs is also expressly rejected as a disability. However, refusal to provide health care to homosexual or bisexual males or intravenous drug users may violate Title III of the ADA if the refusal is based on perceived risk of HIV infection. Individuals engaged in high-risk behavioral activities, if perceived to be infected with HIV, are disabled within the meaning of the ADA. The third prong of the definition of disability set forth in the ADA includes "being regarded as having . . . [a physical or mental] impairment" that substantially limits a major life activity. This prong covers homosexual and bisexual males and intravenous drug users who are denied health care on the basis of perceived high risk of HIV infection, whether or not the individual is actually infected and thus disabled under the first or second prongs of the definition. Arguably, sexual health benefits that result from early diagnosis and treatment. Id.

§ 511(a), 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. (104 Stat.) at 375 (to be codified at 42 U.S.C. § 12211) ("For purposes of the definition of 'disability' . . . homosexuality and bisexuality are not impairments and as such are not disabilities under this Act.").

§ 510(a), 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. (104 Stat.) at 375 (to be codified at 42 U.S.C. § 12212) ("[T]he term 'individual with a disability' does not include an individual who is currently engaging in the illegal use of drugs, when the covered entity acts on the basis of such use.").

Individuals who are homosexual or bisexual and are discriminated against because they have a disability, such as infection with the Human Immunodeficiency Virus, . . . are protected under the [ADA]." H.R. Rep. No. 485, 101st Cong., 2d Sess., pt. 3, at 75 (1990), reprinted in 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 303, 498.

This perception may be based on the prevalence of HIV infection in these populations. Thirty to seventy percent of intravenous drug users in New York City, 50% of homosexual males in San Francisco and 50% of male homosexual prostitutes in New York City are infected with HIV. See CDC, AIDS and Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection in the United States: 1988 Update, 38(s-4) Morbidity & Mortality Wkly. Rep. 1, 17-23 (1989).


partners of intravenous drug users may similarly be disabled within the meaning of the ADA if denied health care on the basis of perceived HIV infection—whether or not they or their sexual partners are actually infected.\textsuperscript{205}

A physician who does not perform exposure-prone procedures and who refuses to care for an HIV-infected patient on the basis of the patient's serostatus violates Title III of the ADA. A plaintiff-patient must first establish a handicap within the meaning of the Act. Both asymptomatic HIV-infected persons and persons with AIDS have a substantial limitation of major life activities including procreation and intimate sexual activity and are therefore disabled for the purposes of the Act.\textsuperscript{208} Moreover, denial of access to health care services due to the perception of contagiousness satisfies the third prong of the ADA's definition of a handicapped individual.\textsuperscript{207} The defendant-physician may in turn argue that the HIV-infected patient poses a significant risk of contagion to the physician which cannot be eliminated by reasonable accommodation.\textsuperscript{208} However, these arguments will fail. The Supreme Court has held that contagiousness alone cannot be used to exclude the patient.\textsuperscript{209} The defendant-physician will be unable to demonstrate that a "significant risk" of contagion exists which cannot be eliminated by reasonable accommodations. The risk of HIV transmission to the health care worker during nonexposure-prone encounters is small and can be further reduced by adherence to infection-control guidelines.\textsuperscript{210} National organizations of health care professionals have universally decreed that the level of personal risk associated with caring for AIDS patients is small and does not abrogate the duty of a health care professional to care for an HIV-infected

the ground that they were members of a group perceived by the defendant as being infected with HIV).

\textsuperscript{205} In New York City, 23-50% of sexual partners of HIV-infected persons are also infected. CDC, supra note 202, at 23. The ADA provides that "[i]t shall be discriminatory to exclude or otherwise deny equal... services... to an individual... because of the known disability of an individual whom the individual... is known to have a relationship or association." § 302(b)(1)(E), 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. (104 Stat.) at 356 (to be codified at 42 U.S.C. § 12182).

\textsuperscript{206} See note 180 and accompanying text supra.

\textsuperscript{207} See note 178 and accompanying text supra.

\textsuperscript{208} See note 185 and accompanying text supra.


\textsuperscript{210} See notes 26, 117, 126 and accompanying text supra.
patient.  

However, a physician who refuses to perform an exposure-prone procedure on an HIV-infected patient may offer more cogent arguments to support the contention that the patient poses a significant risk of contagion. If the courts deem the risk of HIV transmission from infected physician to patient during exposure-prone procedures to be “significant,” justifying the imposition of practice restrictions pursuant to CDC guidelines, then the risk of transmission from infected patient to physician must also be “significant,” justifying refusal to treat. Nevertheless, this argument will likely fail in light of the ethical obligations inherent in the practice of medicine which arguably subject physicians to a higher standard. Moreover, policy considerations will likely preclude courts from upholding exclusion of HIV-infected persons, even from exposure-prone procedures.

Physicians have employed numerous other arguments to justify their refusal to treat HIV-infected patients. In Glanz v. Vernick an HIV-infected patient alleged discrimination in violation of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act by a physician who refused to perform elective ear surgery. The defendant claimed that the plaintiff was not “otherwise qualified” to undergo the surgical procedure because of an increased susceptibility to post-operative infections. The court denied summary judgment to the defendant-physician and indicated that there existed a material issue of fact as to whether the patient was “otherwise qualified” for the surgery. The court stated that physicians may take into account “risks imposed—both on the patient and on themselves” in order to determine whether the patient is “otherwise qualified” to undergo surgery. If physicians properly conclude that there are risks, they must also consider whether it is possible to make reasonable accommodations to enable the patient to undergo surgery despite those risks. However, the defendant-physician's contention—that the patient was not “otherwise qualified” to undergo elective ear surgery on the ground that the procedure posed a “significant risk” to the patient—is not tenable. No medical au-

211 See note 14 supra.
213 Id. at 638.
214 Id.
authority recognizes HIV infection in its early asymptomatic stages to be a medical contraindication to elective surgical procedures. In fact, during discovery the defendant acknowledged that HIV seropositivity alone is not a disqualifying factor for surgery.\textsuperscript{215}

In \textit{Doe v. Kahala Dental Group}\textsuperscript{216} the plaintiff alleged that the defendant dental group violated Hawaii’s anti-discrimination statute\textsuperscript{217} by refusing to perform dental work because the plaintiff declined to reveal his HIV status. The court held that the defendant’s refusal to treat was not based on the plaintiff’s handicap but on the patient’s refusal to furnish medical information that was pertinent to the treatment to be rendered. The defendant argued that since the proposed dental procedures\textsuperscript{218} might expose him to the patient’s blood, additional precautions would be required if the plaintiff were infected with HIV, or alternatively the patient would be referred to another clinic which was “properly equipped” to treat HIV-infected patients. In accepting this argument, the court ignored CDC guidelines which recommend that universal precautions be employed when treating all patients regardless of actual or perceived HIV status.\textsuperscript{219} Thus, no additional precautions or procedures are required to treat an HIV-infected patient.\textsuperscript{220} The court’s holding is clearly not in accord with current medical opinion. As discussed earlier, a claim by the dental group that the proposed exposure-prone procedure would expose them to a “significant risk” of contagion, while tenable, should also fail. It is unlikely that courts will authorize discriminatory exclusion under the rubric of “significant risk.”

2. The HIV-Infected Physician

Six thousand four hundred and thirty-six health care workers suffer from AIDS in the United States, including 171 dentists and dental hygienists, 703 physicians, 47 surgeons and 1355 nurses.\textsuperscript{221} It is estimated that 50,000 health care workers, includ-

\textsuperscript{215} Id. Organ transplantation is contraindicated if the potential organ donor or arguably the potential recipient is infected with HIV. See note 197 supra.
\textsuperscript{216} 808 P.2d 1276 (Haw. 1991).
\textsuperscript{217} HAW. REV. STAT. § 489 (1991).
\textsuperscript{218} The procedures were root canal or crown work. 808 P.2d at 1277.
\textsuperscript{219} See notes 67-69 and accompanying text supra.
\textsuperscript{220} See notes 67-69 and accompanying text supra.
\textsuperscript{221} Elaine S. Povich, \textit{U.S. Senate Backs AIDS Tests in Health Care}, CHI. TRIB., July
ing 7000 physicians, carry the HIV virus and that more than 300
surgeons and 1200 dentists have practiced their profession while
infected with the HIV virus.\textsuperscript{222} Many HIV-infected physicians
will not voluntarily disclose their serologic status, consult peer
review panels as recommended by CDC guidelines or refrain
from performing exposure-prone procedures.\textsuperscript{223} The news media
has carried numerous accounts of HIV-infected physicians and
dentists who have knowingly continued to perform invasive pro-
cedures until their deaths.\textsuperscript{224} Health care workers infected with
HIV are reluctant to inform their patients or employers of their
serostatus because they fear loss of employment or restrictions
on their practice of invasive procedures.\textsuperscript{225} As a result, health
care workers at risk avoid being tested.\textsuperscript{223}

The Americans with Disabilities Act affords HIV-infected
physicians protection against employment discrimination based
on their seropositivity. However, conflict arises between the
rights of HIV-infected physicians to be free from discrimination
based on their disability and their interests in performing inva-
sive procedures as part of the practice of their profession, on the
one hand, and the rights of patients to make informed decisions
with respect to the HIV status of their physicians and the inter-
est of society in protecting patients from nosocomial risks, on
the other. While the risk of transmission of HIV from physician
to patient during an exposure-prone procedure is no greater
than other risks tolerated in the health care setting,\textsuperscript{227} this risk

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19} There are approximately seven million health care workers in the United
States. Press Conference, Centers for Disease Control and Others, Federal News Service
(Aug. 29, 1991) (statement of M. Roy Schwartz). The total number of physicians in the
United States is estimated at nearly 700,000, including 85,000 house officers. \textit{Id.}
\item \textsuperscript{222} Lawrence K. Altman, \textit{Health Units Defy U.S. on AIDS Rules}, \textit{N.Y. Times}, Aug.
\item \textsuperscript{223} Jean L. Griffin, \textit{Dental Student Has HIV, Patients Told}, \textit{Chi. Trib.}, July 24,
1991, at C1; \textit{HIV Infected Health Workers Fear Losing Jobs, Study Finds}, \textit{Newsday},
\item \textsuperscript{224} Griffin, supra note 223.
\item \textsuperscript{225} \textit{See HIV Infected Health Workers, supra note 223.}
\item \textsuperscript{226} In a survey of 196 health care workers infected with HIV or at high risk, nearly
15\% indicated that they were dismissed or denied promotions because they were in-
fected or perceived to be infected with HIV. More than half of those at high risk but not
yet tested believed that CDC guidelines have threatened their livelihood and increased
their reluctance to undergo testing. \textit{See HIV Infected Health Workers, supra note 223.}
\item \textsuperscript{227} The risk has been compared to the risk of a fatal automobile accident en route to
the hospital. \textit{See} Lowenfels & Wormser, \textit{supra} note 112, at 889.
\end{itemize}
has been held to justify exclusion of a physician from the practice of these procedures. Whether a health care professional poses a "significant risk" must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Generalizations and speculative or remote risks are not cognizable. HIV-infected health care workers should be evaluated on the basis of the types of procedures they perform, their record of adherence to infection control practices, their technical skill and expertise and the possibility that reasonable modifications in procedural techniques may accommodate their disability. While CDC guidelines advocate such an individualized inquiry, the danger exists that courts will focus solely on the nature of the procedures performed.

Whether a hospital may exclude a surgeon with AIDS from performing invasive procedures was at issue in Behringer v. Medical Center at Princeton. The estate of the surgeon, who had practiced otolaryngology and facial plastic surgery, claimed that the defendant medical center engaged in discriminatory practices in violation of the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination when it effectively terminated the physician's surgical privileges after he had been diagnosed with AIDS. On learning of Behringer's diagnosis, the hospital immediately suspended his surgical procedures pending a review by hospital officials. Ultimately, the hospital adopted a policy which stated that a physician "with known HIV seropositivity will continue to treat patients . . . but will not perform procedures that pose any risk of virus transmission to the patient." This requirement effectively barred the plaintiff from performing surgery. In addition, the hospital retained an earlier imposed requirement that the physician reveal his serologic status and obtain written informed

230 Id.
231 See notes 232-56 and accompanying text infra.
234 The New Jersey Law Against Discrimination would permit a hospital to restrict the practice of a physician who posed a "reasonable probability of substantial harm to others." Id. In contrast, the ADA and the Rehabilitation Act apply a "significant risk" standard. See notes 156, 185 and accompanying text supra.
235 Behringer, 592 A.2d at 1259.
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consent from potential patients before performing invasive procedures. The court held that the hospital’s temporary suspension and ultimate restriction of the plaintiff’s surgical privileges was justified because Behringer’s continued unrestricted practice of surgery posed “a reasonable probability of substantial harm” to potential patients. While recognizing that the risk of transmission of HIV infection from physician to patient was small, the court emphasized the fatal consequences. The court also noted that scientific studies have not yet precisely defined the risk of transmission from physician to patient. Moreover, the court observed that the cumulative risk that an HIV-infected physician will infect one of his or her patients increases in direct proportion to the number of procedures performed.

The court also rejected the argument that the risk of HIV transmission was too remote to require informed consent of the patient and countered that the risk of transmission of HIV was not the sole risk to which the patient is exposed. The court observed that a surgical accident that results in percutaneous injury to an HIV-infected surgeon would raise the specter of HIV

236 The court stated that the requirement for informed consent was not superfluous despite the restrictions placed on Behringer’s surgical privileges. The court reasoned that medical authorities might determine that certain surgical procedures may be safely performed by HIV-infected physicians (see notes 106-28 and accompanying text supra). In that event, the informed consent requirement would serve to protect patients from physicians’ self-interest. The court observed that physicians have an inherent conflict of interest when making policy decisions involving practice restrictions and also noted that physicians disagree as to which procedures may be safely performed by HIV-infected physicians. 592 A.2d at 1278.

237 Id. at 1276.

238 Id. “The doctor stands in a position of trust . . . in relation to the patient. A small but palpable risk of transmission of a lethal disease to the patient gives the doctor an ethical responsibility to perform only procedures that pose no risk of transmission.” Id. at 1282. The court also observed that the practice of otolaryngology includes surgery in the ear and oral cavity where visualization is impaired and where a surgical accident would be associated with enhanced risk of transmission due to contact with the patient’s mucous membranes which provide a reduced barrier to infection. Id. at 244-47.

239 Id. at 1279. “The last word has not been spoken on the issue. . . . Facts accepted at one point in time are no longer accurate as more is learned about the disease and its transmission.” Id. at 1280-81. Arguably, this analysis skirts but does not violate the standards for interpretation of scientific data articulated in Arline. See note 157 and accompanying text supra. The CDC itself has concluded that, while the risk is small, scientific data do not exist to assess precisely the risk of transmission from infected physician to patient. See CDC, supra note 26.

240 592 A.2d at 1280.

241 Id.
transmission, even where transmission did not occur.\textsuperscript{242} The surgical accident would subject the patient to repeated HIV testing and require major lifestyle changes over the ensuing months.\textsuperscript{243} The mere possibility of HIV transmission would also engender tremendous anxiety and mental anguish.\textsuperscript{244} While the risk of a surgical accident may be reduced by adherence to universal precautions, it cannot be eliminated.\textsuperscript{245} The court held that these risks were sufficient to "meet the standard of probability of harm" and required disclosure and informed consent.\textsuperscript{246}

The \textit{Behringer} court in effect adopted a "no risk" standard. The court stated that,

\begin{quote}

at a minimum, the physician must withdraw from performing any invasive procedure which would pose a risk to the patient. Where the ultimate harm is death, even the presence of a low [risk] of transmission justifies the adoption of a policy which precludes invasive procedures when there is 'any' risk of transmission. . . . The ultimate risk to the patient is so absolute—so devastating—that [it] is untenable to argue against informed consent combined with a restriction on procedures which present 'any risk' to the patient.”
\end{quote}

The "no risk" standard articulated by the court is untenable; it advocates imposition of practice restrictions that cannot be justified under CDC guidelines and violates guarantees against discrimination afforded by the ADA. Restrictions on the practice of HIV-infected physicians that seek to eliminate all risk of transmission are clearly incompatible with the "signifi-

\textsuperscript{242} Id.

\textsuperscript{243} CDC guidelines recommend that following a surgical accident which exposes a patient to the blood of an HIV-infected health care worker, the patient should be informed and should undergo periodic HIV testing over at least a 1 year period (a baseline determination followed by repeat testing at 6 weeks and at 3, 6 and 12 months). CDC, \textit{Recommendations for Preventing Transmission of Infection with Human T-Lymphotropic Virus Type III/Lymphadenopathy Virus During Invasive Procedures}, 35 MORTALITY \\& MORBIDITY Wkly. Rep. 221, 222 (1986); CDC, \textit{Recommendations for Preventing Transmission of Infection with Human T-Lymphotropic Virus Type III/Lymphadenopathy-Associated Virus in the Workplace}, 34 MORTALITY \\& MORBIDITY Wkly. Rep. 681 (1985). See also note 61 supra. The patient should also undergo counseling as to modes of HIV transmission and should follow recommendations to prevent transmission pending a final determination of whether seroconversion has occurred. These recommendations include major lifestyle changes (e.g. alterations in sexual practices and childbearing decisions). See note 61 supra.

\textsuperscript{244} See note 285 infra (whether the mere fear of contracting AIDS is compensable).

\textsuperscript{245} 592 A.2d at 1281.

\textsuperscript{246} Id. at 1283.

\textsuperscript{247} Id.
cant risk" standard articulated in *Arline* and adopted in the ADA. A "no risk" standard precludes the individualized determination demanded by the ADA of whether a physician poses a "significant risk" to patients. In addition, a "no risk" standard is impossible to achieve.248

By failing to address the comparable risks to the patient from possible physician substance abuse, fatigue, inexperience, medical or psychiatric illness, etc., the *Behringer* court with its "no risk of HIV transmission" standard effectively applied a double standard in violation of the Rehabilitation Act and the ADA.249 This point was illustrated in *Strathie v. Department of Transportation*.250 In *Strathie* the plaintiff challenged state regulations that prohibited persons who require hearing aids from driving school buses. The court found that disabilities which posed similar or greater risks (e.g., the need for eyeglasses) had not been addressed in a similar manner by the state regulations.251 The court held that where a risk which is comparable to other risks tolerated in the workplace is accorded special attention or exclusion, this double standard may constitute unlawful discrimination in violation of the Rehabilitation Act when the reasons put forth by the state do not advance the essential purpose of the program.252 Disabilities of similar magnitude must be treated in a similar manner.253 The position of the *Behringer* court fails to meet this standard because it singles out the risk of HIV transmission to the exclusion of other comparable risks and precludes an individualized evaluation of whether an HIV-infected health care worker poses a significant risk.

Other courts have emphasized that the small risk of trans-

---

248 Adoption of a "no risk" standard for surgery would expand the informed consent doctrine to require disclosure of the surgeon's hepatitis B surface antigen status, use of alcohol or illicit drugs and use of prescription medications and their potential adverse side-effects. In addition, the surgeon would have to reveal any coronary artery disease or other medical or psychiatric illnesses, how many hours he or she slept the previous evening, the mortality rate of the surgeon's patients and whether their post-operative wound infection rate exceeds the hospital average, ad infinitum. There is no doubt that these risks may ultimately result in the death of the patient and are arguably more "significant" than the extremely low risk of transmission of HIV infection.

249 See notes 250-52 and accompanying text infra.

250 716 F.2d 227 (3rd Cir. 1983).

251 Id. at 232.

252 Id.

253 Id.
mission that accompanies an individual surgical procedure by an HIV-infected surgeon may reach significance when aggregated over the total number of patients subjected to the same small risk. The court in In re: Application of Hershey Medical Center\(^\text{254}\) permitted selective disclosure of the identity of an obstetric-gynecology resident who tested positive for HIV after a surgical accident.\(^\text{255}\) The court held that the risk of transmission of HIV infection to former patients during surgery constituted a compelling need for disclosure which outweighed the physician’s interest in confidentiality. “[W]hen individuals visit their doctors, they do not expect to confront a risk of illness different from that which they already suffer.”\(^\text{256}\) While the court acknowledged that the risk of transmission of HIV infection during surgery is small, it emphasized that “the potential [for transmission] is nevertheless there. When one . . . calculate[s] how many individuals may be subjected to the same risk by the same medical worker, multiplied by the aggregate of infected health care professionals, the numbers become staggering.”\(^\text{257}\)

The extent of practice restrictions that a hospital may impose on an HIV-infected physician was at issue in Doe v. Cook County.\(^\text{258}\) A neurologist suffering from AIDS brought suit


\(^{255}\) The accident occurred during an invasive procedure in which the patient was exposed to the surgeon’s blood. Id. at 1291. Disclosure was limited to medical professionals who were engaged in identifying and notifying patients who had potentially been exposed to the physician’s blood during the performance of invasive procedures. Id. at 1294.

\(^{256}\) Id. at 1296.

\(^{257}\) Id.

\(^{258}\) Doe v. Cook County, No. 87-C 6888 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 24, 1988) (Consent Decree) [hereinafter Consent Decree]. Accord Doe v. Attorney Gen. United States, 941 F.2d 780 (9th Cir. 1991) (The physician plaintiff alleged that the Federal Bureau of Investigation violated section 504 by discriminating against him because he was perceived to be infected with AIDS. The FBI suspended its practice of referring its agents to the plaintiff for pre-employment and annual physical examinations after learning the plaintiff suffered from Kaposi’s Sarcoma (a malignancy associated with AIDS in homosexual men). The plaintiff declined to reveal whether he suffered from AIDS but assured the FBI that he adhered to universal precautions and that his examinations posed no risk to its agents.); Lisa Foderaro, HIV-Positive Pharmacist Fights Job Limits, N.Y. Times, Aug. 19, 1991, at B1 (An administrative law judge in a ruling for the Department of Health and Human Services found that the Westchester County Medical Center violated section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act by making employment of an HIV-infected pharmacist contingent on restrictions that prevented him from preparing solutions for intravenous use where the risk to patients was “so small as not to be measureable.”). In a subsequent enforcement proceeding, the hospital was ordered to comply with the original ruling or
against Cook County Hospital whose Board of Commissioners had suspended his clinical privileges. The neurologist claimed that the hospital had discriminated against him on the basis of his disability in violation of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. In a consent decree that restored the neurologist's hospital privileges and removed unreasonable practice restrictions, the physician was required to refrain from performing certain invasive procedures and was required to double glove when he performed other invasive procedures or examined body cavities. The hospital was required to "reasonably accommodate [the neurologist's] . . . physical and mental limitations by modifying . . . his duties and responsibilities . . . to permit him to continue to engage in as many of his job duties as he can competently perform.

The risk of transmission of HIV infection from health care worker to patient was addressed by a Louisiana district court in Leckelt v. Board of Commissioners of Hospital District No. 1. The plaintiff was discharged from employment as a licensed practical nurse in part because he refused to submit results of an HIV test to his employing hospital after it became known that the plaintiff's roommate had contracted AIDS. The court in-
interpreted then existing CDC guidelines to indicate that a risk of transmission of HIV infection from health care worker to patient exists during invasive procedures and certain other situations where blood from infected staff may contact patients. The court determined that Leckelt's duties as a floor nurse, which included starting intravenous lines, performing catheterizations, changing wound dressings and administering enemas, constituted invasive procedures under CDC guidelines. The court emphasized the fatal consequences of transmission in concluding that Leckelt would pose a significant risk to patients if he were infected, notwithstanding the court's acknowledgment that the probability of transmission was extremely low and would be further reduced by adherence to universal precautions.

The risk of contagion in the health care setting was deemed sufficient to justify the hospital's monitoring of Leckelt's exposure to HIV and to create "a substantial and compelling state interest" in preventing spread of HIV infection to patients and co-workers. The court held that the plaintiff did not meet the Rehabilitation Act's threshold requirement that he show he was an individual with a handicap, since he failed to establish that the defendant-hospital perceived him to be sero-positive and thus handicapped under the third prong of the definition.

The court went on to find that, even if the plaintiff were handicapped, he was not "otherwise qualified" for employment due to his refusal to comply with reasonable hospital infection-control policies. In determining that Leckelt's duties might place patients at significant risk of contagion if he were infected with HIV, the court interpreted, whether correctly or not, CDC

---

204 Id. at 1387-88.
205 Id. at 1381. The court acknowledged that an asymptomatic HIV-infected health care worker "presented a relatively slight risk to patients, coworkers and himself, and may require relatively little accommodation . . . ." Id. at 1387.
206 Id. at 1391. Cf. Glover v. Eastern Neb. Comm. Office of Retardation, 867 F.2d 461 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 932 (1989) (HIV testing to screen staff of a residential facility for the mentally handicapped not justified where the staff was engaged in custodial care and did not perform invasive procedures. HIV screening constituted an unreasonable search and seizure where the risk of transmission of HIV infection from staff to residents was "extremely low and approaches zero.").
207 Leckelt, 714 F. Supp. at 1386. See note 147 and accompanying text supra.
208 714 F. Supp. at 1387.
AIDS AND THE ADA guidelines that have subsequently been revised. Such a conclusion is clearly not justified under current CDC guidelines since Leckelt did not perform exposure-prone procedures. He therefore did not pose a significant risk to patients and the hospital had no interest in monitoring his HIV status. Moreover, the hospital acted in a discriminatory manner by singling out Leckelt for HIV testing from among its other employees who performed invasive procedures. Leckelt was required to submit to testing solely on the basis of his sexual preference and the perception that he was a member of a group at high risk for infection. Such conduct is clearly discriminatory under the ADA.

A more difficult question is whether the ADA would permit a hospital to use compulsory testing to monitor the HIV status of an employee who performs exposure-prone procedures on the ground that HIV testing is a job-related medical examination. The Leckelt court concluded that where a health care worker poses a sufficient risk of transmission of HIV to patients, an employing hospital acquires an interest in monitoring the HIV status of that worker and the state acquires a “substantial and compelling” interest in preventing the spread of infection. In this regard, the ADA permits the use of eligibility criteria to screen for HIV-infected health care professionals if “such criteria can be shown to be necessary for the provision of the . . . services . . . being offered.” If the health care worker who performs exposure-prone procedures poses a “significant risk” of transmitting HIV to patients, then compulsory HIV testing of that worker would not violate the ADA. The CDC has not recommended compulsory testing of health care workers who perform exposure-prone procedures. However, CDC guidelines do recommend that health care workers who perform exposure-prone procedures know their HIV status and the guidelines permit the imposition of practice restrictions on infected workers.

266 See notes 125-28 and accompanying text supra.
267 See CDC, supra note 26; notes 125-28 and accompanying text supra.
269 714 F. Supp. at 1391.
272 Numerous complex legal and medical issues that are beyond the scope of this Note arise in the debate over HIV testing of health care workers.
273 See CDC, supra note 26.
who perform exposure-prone procedures. The question of whether or not compulsory HIV testing of health care workers who perform exposure-prone procedures violates the ADA rests on the courts' determination of whether the level of risk they pose to patients constitutes "significant risk." The CDC guidelines may be interpreted to support the contention that HIV-infected workers who perform exposure-prone procedures may pose a significant risk of contagion.

The patient may also have a say in determining the level of risk of contagion to which he or she may be exposed during the performance of exposure-prone procedures. This issue is closely linked to the question of whether HIV-infected physicians pose a cognizable risk under the doctrine of informed consent. The informed consent doctrine does not require disclosure to the patient of all risks of proposed diagnostic or therapeutic medical interventions. The duty of a physician to inform his or her patients about a potential risk associated with a medical therapy is

[a] function not only of the severity of the injury, but also of the likelihood that it will occur. Regardless of the severity . . . if the probability . . . is so small as to be practically nonexistent, then the possibility of that injury occurring cannot be considered a material factor in a rational assessment of whether to engage in the activity

Whether information about a particular possible injury is material to an informed decision by the patient on whether to undergo a procedure is a function of "the product of the risk and its chance of occurring. A severe consequence . . . would not require disclosure if the chance of [it] occurring was so remote as to be negligible." The CDC has indicated that HIV-infected physicians who do not perform invasive procedures and who ad-
here to universal precautions do not pose a measurable risk. Thus, disclosure of the serostatus of these physicians is not required.

On the other hand, CDC guidelines indicate that an HIV-infected surgeon who performs an exposure-prone procedure poses a risk of sufficient magnitude to justify review by an expert panel with the possible imposition of practice restrictions. Where an expert panel has determined that an infected practitioner may "safely" perform exposure-prone procedures, the physician's serostatus would nonetheless be material to an informed decision by the patient as to whether or not to undergo the procedure. This is true because of the uncertainty and debate among medical authorities on which procedures may safely be performed by an infected physician. In contrast to CDC guidelines, the policy statement issued by the New York State Department of Health would allow unrestricted practice by HIV-infected physicians and would not require that serostatus be disclosed and informed consent obtained from patients. This policy can only be sustained if the courts fail to concur with the inescapable implication of the CDC guidelines that the risk posed by an infected physician during the performance of exposure-prone procedures is not so remote as to be immaterial. Certainly, if the courts deem the risk to be "significant" within the meaning of the ADA to justify practice restrictions, it follows that a physician's serostatus is a fact material to an informed decision whether to undergo an exposure-prone procedure performed by the physician.

---

280 See CDC, supra note 26.
281 Id.
282 Id.; see also note 127 and accompanying text supra.
283 See note 126 supra.
284 See notes 139-42 and accompanying text supra.
285 Actions based on the fear of contracting AIDS have been brought against physicians and their employers by patients who underwent invasive procedures performed by HIV-infected physicians without informed consent. See Michelle Salcedo, Patients' Anxious Wait: Tests to Determine if Dentist Gave Them AIDS Virus, NEWSDAY, July 28, 1991, at 7. In Rossi v. Almaraz, 59 U.S.L.W. 2748 (Md. Cir. Ct. May 23, 1991), the court held that the fear of contracting HIV from an infected surgeon was not actionable absent proof of exposure. The court observed that since the plaintiff tested negative for HIV more than six months after potential exposure during surgery, it was "substantially likely 'to a high degree of medical certainty' that she was not exposed to AIDS in the first place." Id. Moreover, she failed to allege any surgical accident exposing her to the surgeon's blood nor did she allege a failure to use barrier techniques. The court cited
IV. RIGHTS, PROTECTIONS AND REMEDIES AVAILABLE TO SALARIED HEALTH CARE WORKERS

The epidemiology of HIV infection is changing. As the disease moves from the homosexual/bisexual population to economically disadvantaged segments of society, including intravenous drug users and their sexual partners and children, much of the "burden" of care for patients with AIDS has shifted to public municipal hospitals which are staffed primarily by physicians-in-training. Attemps to secure quality health care for HIV-infected persons must acknowledge the attitudes and rights of housestaff as current providers of health services and as the future generation of practitioners. Housestaff are employed by hospitals to perform patient care functions and may at the same time be trainees in academic programs administered by affiliated universities. Thus, the collegial environment in which housestaff training occurs may at times be at odds with the employer-employee relationship that exists between the hospital and the trainee. Health and disability insurance coverage provided by

with approval Burk v. Sage Prods. Inc., 747 F. Supp. 285 (E.D. Pa. 1990), where a paramedic who had been injured by a needle protruding from a disposal container was denied recovery for the fear of contracting AIDS absent proof of exposure to the virus. Burk had failed to establish that the needle which injured him was contaminated with HIV-infected blood. The Burk court observed:

The cases which have allowed recovery for fear of disease have done so when the plaintiffs were faced only with the question of whether they would contract the disease in the future; the plaintiff [here] . . . faces the additional question of whether he has been exposed to the AIDS virus in the first place. . . .

. . . [W]hile injuries stemming from a fear of contracting illness after exposure to a disease-causing agent may present compensable damages, injuries stemming from fear of the initial exposure do not.

Id. at 287-88. The Rossi court characterized the plaintiff's claim as "the fear that something that did not happen could have happened." 59 U.S.L.W. at 2748. See also Hare v. New York, 173 A.D.2d 573, 570 N.Y.S.2d 125 (2nd Dep't 1991) (medical technician denied recovery for emotional distress resulting from fear of contracting AIDS from the bite of an inmate where the plaintiff offered no proof that the inmate was infected with HIV and where the technician tested HIV negative); Mosele v. Bures, 139 Misc. 2d 409, 528 N.Y.S.2d 976 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1988) (plaintiff precluded from alleging that medical malpractice and resultant blood transfusion caused her to develop a fear of possible exposure to AIDS where plaintiff had not undergone HIV testing). But see Kashne v. Schmidt, 472 N.W.2d 247 (Wis. Ct. App. 1991) (jury may consider plaintiff's claim for damages based on the fear of contracting AIDS from transfusion of unscreened blood from the time he was notified of the risk until the time he tested HIV negative two years later).

See notes 34-35 and accompanying text supra.

See note 39 and accompanying text supra.
the hospital are frequently inadequate and place housestaff in a financially vulnerable position in the event of occupational transmission of catastrophic illnesses such as HIV. Continued benefits may depend on contract renewal and continued employment.

In most states, worker’s compensation statutes govern compensation for nosocomial transmission of HIV infection to salaried employees, such as housestaff, nurses, laboratory technicians and custodial and transport workers. Medical students are not employees of the hospital and are therefore not protected by worker’s compensation when caring for infected patients during clinical rotations. Workers’ compensation benefits are based on current earnings and do not account for the anticipated large increase in income of housestaff immediately on completion of training. No compensation is available for pain and suffering. Moreover, causation may be contested by an employer who alleges that infection was contracted outside the scope of employment. In previous instances where health

---


289 The duration of employment of housestaff is limited to the length of their training period, generally three years, after which time the HIV-infected house officer would have no prospects of obtaining insurance. See Dunne et al., supra note 288, at 1392. See also Aoun, supra note 39, at 1334-39 (benefits of house officer who contracted AIDS at the workplace withdrawn when employment contract not renewed).


291 It is not uncommon in some hospitals for medical students to perform a substantial proportion of the phlebotomy (blood drawing) procedures. See Jones, supra note 83, at 1188. Since medical students and unpaid externs are not covered by workers’ compensation statutes, they may sue in tort for negligence. See Prego v. City of New York, 147 A.D.2d 165, 541 N.Y.S.2d 995 (2d Dep’t 1989).

292 See N.Y. Work. Comp. Law § 14(1)-(2) (McKinney 1965); Becker et al., supra note 290, at 655; Brennan, supra note 15, at 592.

293 See Becker et al., supra note 290, at 655; Brennan, supra note 16, at 582.

294 See Prego, 147 A.D.2d at 165, 541 N.Y.S.2d at 995; Aoun, supra note 39, at 695. A health care worker may establish causation for purposes of workers’ compensation or
care workers have claimed they acquired AIDS through identifiable occupational exposures, hospital administrators have refused to acknowledge occupational transmission. Moreover, because of exclusivity clauses in most state worker’s compensation statutes, tort actions are generally barred. Thus, health care workers are justified in believing that their remedies are inadequate in the event of occupational HIV transmission, and this perception contributes significantly to their reluctance to care for HIV-infected patients.

Under the Occupational Safety and Health Act, OSHA is responsible for ensuring that health care employers maintain a “safe and healthful” workplace. The agency recently promulgated regulations that are designed to protect health care workers from occupational transmission of bloodborne pathogens. The OSHA standard gives legal authority to universal precautions and requires that health care employers institute engineering and work practice controls, provide medical surveillance and training in infection control practices and provide adequate protective clothing and equipment.

disability insurance claims or tort actions by following CDC guidelines which recommend HIV testing immediately after an identifiable exposure to blood or blood-containing body fluids. See note 243 supra. By documenting negative baseline serology, adherence to these guidelines establishes causation in the event of subsequent seroconversion. See Cooke & Sande, supra note 35, at 1336. However, the vast majority of physicians who have experienced identifiable percutaneous injuries with HIV-infected blood have not submitted to testing. See Lowenfels et al., supra note 79, at 1286; Melzer et al., supra note 88, at 213; See also Jones, supra note 88 (fifty percent of 42 medical students in New York City would not report needlestick injuries to the student health service); Mangione et al., supra note 71 (fewer than one-third of needlesticks sustained by housestaff in San Francisco were reported). This apparently incongruous response may reflect fear of alienation by colleagues and fear of loss of patients, employment and livelihood. Moreover, in view of the long incubation period of HIV infection (see note 61 supra), adherence to current guidelines does not impact on health care workers who have sustained needlestick injuries with HIV-infected blood over the past decade.

See Prego, 147 A.D.2d at 165, 541 N.Y.S.2d at 995; Aoun, supra note 39, at 695; Exclusivity clauses bar tort actions except in cases of intentional torts. See Brennan, supra note 15, at 582.


299 The OSHA standard requires employers to establish written exposure control plans that identify workers at risk of exposure to bloodborne pathogens and that outline protective measures and training programs. Id. Employers must provide puncture resistant containers for disposal of needles and sharp instruments, handwashing facilities and adequate personal protective equipment such as gloves, gowns and masks. Id. Employers must also provide post-exposure medical evaluation, prophylaxis, counseling and follow-
A. Legislative Proposals

If public policy makers are truly committed to responding to the crisis in health care for HIV-infected persons, they must acknowledge that enactment of anti-discrimination legislation is not a panacea. Legislators must mandate that employers provide adequate life, disability and health insurance coverage for health care workers. Benefits available to health care workers under worker's compensation statutes are grossly inadequate in the event they contract HIV infection through patient contact. While workers' compensation statutes should be restructured to accommodate the impact of the HIV epidemic on the workplace, such modifications would not obviate the need for adequate disability and health insurance coverage.

In addition, worker's compensation statutes and disability insurance coverage should recognize that HIV infection may impair the capacity of a physician to earn a living before actual physical or mental disability. Due to the long latency period of the disease, HIV infection may not lead to physical disability for many years during which time a health care worker may be barred from performing exposure-prone procedures under CDC guidelines or may face discrimination that leads to loss of medical practice or inability to obtain employment in his or her profession. Absent actual physical disability and notwithstanding provisions of the ADA that protect HIV-infected health care workers from employment discrimination, perceived or actual contagiousness may prevent HIV-infected physicians from engaging in their profession. Thus, for the purposes of determining disablement, the New York workers' compensation statute should expressly recognize that HIV infection may limit em-

up for employees exposed on the job. The regulations also establish hazard communication, medical recordkeeping and housekeeping requirements. The housekeeping requirements include proper procedures for decontamination of equipment, cleaning, and for storage, handling and disposal of medical wastes, needles and sharp instruments. These standards will be enforced through inspections and the imposition of fines ranging up to $70,000 and imprisonment in some cases. OSHA estimates that employers will spend $821,000,000 annually to comply. The estimated average cost for a physician's office is $1100 per year. Id. See note 288 supra.

See note 47 supra.
See notes 47 & 61 supra.
See note 47 supra.
ployability long before physical disability.\(^{304}\)

Similarly, disability insurance benefits are not payable under standard policies until physical or mental impairment results in disability.\(^{305}\) A physician-sponsored insurance carrier has recently addressed this problem and will offer disability insurance of up to five hundred thousand dollars payable as a lump sum or otherwise to physicians infected with HIV who must leave or modify their practice.\(^{306}\) Benefits are payable on seroconversion; a showing of disability is not required.\(^{307}\) A physician would thus be compensated in the asymptomatic phase of HIV infection for loss of income.\(^{308}\) Government must mandate that hospitals provide similar benefits to employees who acquire HIV at the workplace.

In another area, New York State should not require that consent be obtained to ascertain the HIV status of a source patient in the event a health care worker or patient sustains a needlestick or other injury exposing him or her to blood or blood-containing body fluids capable of transmitting HIV.\(^{309}\) Twenty-eight other states have enacted “AIDS right-to-know” legislation that authorize testing where a physician suffers an accidental parenteral exposure capable of transmitting HIV.\(^{310}\) Health care workers compelled by the ADA to care for HIV-in-

---

\(^{304}\) N.Y. WORK. COMP. LAW § 37 (McKinney 1965).


\(^{306}\) Id. Medical students will be able to obtain insurance for lesser amounts. Id. The underwriter’s professional liability coverage excludes transmission of communicable diseases to patients where the physician knows he or she is infected but fails to follow infection-control guidelines. Id.

\(^{307}\) Id.

\(^{308}\) Id. Other insurance companies plan to introduce similar coverage. Id.

\(^{309}\) See N.Y. PUB. HEALTH LAW § 2781(b) (McKinney Supp. 1992) (subject’s consent required for HIV-related testing except in three situations).

\(^{310}\) See Terese Hudson, AIDS: Debate on Infection Control Guidelines Shift to Congress, 65 J. AM. HOSP. ASS’N 30 (1991). Three states (Oregon, West Virginia and Virginia) have given patients this right. Id. The American College of Physicians and the Infectious Diseases Society of America also urge legislation providing for mandatory testing where a health care worker has suffered accidental parenteral exposure to the blood of an individual of unknown HIV status. In one study, the consent requirement prevented assessment of HIV status of the source patient in one-third of 184 instances where health care workers sustained a precutaneous injury or were otherwise exposed to blood or body fluids. Patti J. Miller & Barry M. Farr, Study of the Rate of Post Exposure Human Immunodeficiency Virus Testing in a Hospital Requiring Written Informed Consent, 31 J. OCCUP. MED. 524 (1989).
ected patients are entitled to mandatory testing of the source patient. While a negative test will not exclude HIV infection in the source individual and may give the health care worker a false sense of security, a positive result may influence the worker's decision whether to undergo prophylactic treatment with anti-retroviral drugs.\footnote{11}

Inadequate Medicaid reimbursement creates a strong financial disincentive for private providers to participate in the care of HIV-infected persons. The low rates of reimbursement for office-based care by primary care physicians encourages referrals to infectious disease specialists and public hospital clinics.\footnote{12} State legislatures interested in securing health care for AIDS-infected persons must set reasonable Medicaid reimbursement rates.\footnote{13}

The 1991 report of the National Commission on AIDS addressed numerous health care financing issues and made recommendations designed to secure access to health care for all HIV-infected persons.\footnote{14} The Commission urged government to guar-

\footnote{11} The patient may test negative but still be infected with HIV because of the window period that precedes seroconversion. See note 61 supra.

\footnote{12} Jesse Green & Peter S. Arno, The 'Medicaidization of AIDS. Trends in the Financing of HIV-Related Medical Care, 264 JAMA 1261 (1990). Reimbursement by private insurance for a bronchoscopy is $775 as compared to $60 from Medicaid, for a bone marrow biopsy $173 versus $12, for a follow-up hospital visit $83 versus $8 and for an intermediate care office visit $84 versus $11. Id. at 1264. Some physicians have observed that "the few dollars at stake ... [are] not worth the time and paperwork to bill the Medicaid program." NATIONAL COMM’N ON AIDS, supra note 7, at 33. AIDS patients covered by Medicaid are over five times more likely to be admitted to a public hospital than those with private insurance and are more likely to be admitted through the emergency room. Green & Arno, supra, at 1264. Between 1983 and 1988, the percent of AIDS-related hospitalizations paid by New York’s Medicaid program increased by over one-third to 55%. Id. at 1261. During this same period, the percentage of African-American and Hispanic AIDS patients in New York City covered by Medicaid rose from 58 to 67%. Id. at 1263. The rapid spread of HIV infection among economically disadvantaged minority groups will further increase the number of AIDS patients whose medical care is paid by Medicaid. See also note 34 supra.

\footnote{13} New York State has recently addressed this issue. See Mireya Navarro, New York Will Raise Fees to Doctors for AIDS Patients, N.Y. TIMES, Aug 20, 1991, at B1. The state announced that it will increase by up to threefold the reimbursement paid by Medicaid to private physicians for AIDS-related primary care services. Id. Despite this increase in the fee schedule, total Medicaid costs are not expected to rise as a result of savings anticipated due to early diagnosis and treatment and preventive care. Id. In the past, increased rates of Medicaid reimbursement have helped encourage the proposal of new nursing home beds devoted to AIDS patients and the establishment of state-designated centers specializing in the care of AIDS patients. Id.

\footnote{14} REPORT OF THE NAT’L COMM’N ON ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME,
antee medical care to all Americans infected with HIV.\textsuperscript{315} Currently many HIV-infected persons do not qualify for Medicaid.\textsuperscript{316} Eligibility may be limited by income or disability requirements.\textsuperscript{317} For instance, HIV-infected individuals who have not yet developed AIDS may not meet disability requirements.\textsuperscript{318} The Commission recommended that Medicaid cover the medical care costs of all low income persons with AIDS.\textsuperscript{319} This would be accomplished by eliminating the disability requirement for HIV-infected persons and liberalizing income eligibility requirements.\textsuperscript{320} Recognizing that inadequate reimbursement to physicians who care for HIV-infected patients covered by Medicaid provides a strong economic disincentive,\textsuperscript{321} the Commission recommended that Medicaid payment rates to providers be increased to encourage physician participation.\textsuperscript{322} Currently, HIV-infected persons who are disabled and are beneficiaries of Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) must wait two years before they are permitted to purchase Medicare insurance coverage.\textsuperscript{323} The Commission recommended that HIV-infected persons should be allowed to purchase Medicare coverage immediately after becoming eligible for SSDI and that Medicaid pay Medicare premiums for low-income SSDI beneficiaries.\textsuperscript{324} The Commission also recommended that government subsidize health insurance premiums for low-income, HIV-infected persons who have left their jobs and qualify for extension of private health insurance coverage under the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act but cannot afford to pay the premiums.\textsuperscript{325}

---

\textsuperscript{315} Id.
\textsuperscript{316} Id. at 76.
\textsuperscript{317} Id.
\textsuperscript{318} Id.
\textsuperscript{319} Id.
\textsuperscript{320} Id. at 77.
\textsuperscript{321} Id. at 75. See also note 312 and accompanying text supra.
\textsuperscript{322} REPORT OF THE NAT'L COMM'N, supra note 314, at 78.
\textsuperscript{323} Id. at 73.
\textsuperscript{324} Id. at 74, 80.
\textsuperscript{325} Id. at 79.
CONCLUSION

It is unreasonable to expect that the Americans with Disabilities Act, by expressly prohibiting discrimination against HIV-infected persons, will, in and of itself, remedy the critical shortage of health care professionals willing to care for HIV-infected patients. Effective legal remedies will no doubt compel some physicians to provide care; however, anti-discrimination legislation alone will not ensure quality health care in the private sector to HIV-infected persons.

Insufficient attention has been directed toward influencing the attitudes of future generations of physicians. Physicians-in-training develop an adversarial attitude toward HIV-infected patients to deal with actual or perceived risk of contagion which translates into the formulation of career plans designed to avoid these patients in the future. Unless these trends are reversed, legal remedies alone will prove grossly inadequate. Moreover, adoption of CDC guidelines to permit the placement of practice restrictions on HIV-infected physicians will have a chilling effect on the medical community and worsen the already critical shortage of providers.

Health care workers are entitled to be adequately protected from the risk of acquiring HIV infection at the workplace and to receive adequate compensation in the event of nosocomial HIV transmission. Health care institutions must be compelled to provide appropriate infection control devices and to provide adequate training, counseling and catastrophic health and disability insurance coverage to health care workers. OSHA must be vigorous in the enforcement of its regulations to protect health care workers from contracting bloodborne infections at the workplace. Government must subsidize health care insurance coverage for low-income, HIV-infected individuals and provide reasonable reimbursement to health care providers. Finally, state legislators should allow mandatory HIV testing of the source individual following a needlestick injury to a health care worker or patient. The anti-discrimination provisions and enforcement remedies embodied in the Americans with Disabilities Act do
not alone provide a solution to the crisis in health care for HIV-infected individuals.
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