

South Carolina Prepares for Pandemic Influenza: An Ethical Perspective

South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force September 2009



www.scdhec.gov

We promote and protect the health of the public and the environment.

South Carolina Prepares for Pandemic Influenza: An Ethical Perspective

Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force

September, 2009

Chairpersons:

Robert Ball, M.D., M.P.H., F.A.C.P Phil Schneider, Ph. D.

The Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force of the South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Coordinating Committee is an advisory body to the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control Public Health Emergency Preparedness Program. This report and the activities of the Task Force were supported by Cooperative Agreement Number 5 U90 TP 416976 from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control.

South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Task Force Members

Carol Apt, Ph.D. SC State University

Raymond Barteet SCDHEC Region 7

Eloise Y. Braught, United States Dept. of Agriculture- Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

LeeAnn Bundrick SC Board of Pharmacy

Dawn Clancy MD, MSCR, FACP

Lorraine A. Dillon, MS, CHES, LPN SCDHEC

M. Carmela Epright, Ph.D. Furman University

Jerry Gibson, MD SCDHEC

Deborah Gulledge, Ph.D. SCDHEC

Shirley Hollingsworth SCDHEC

Kendall Kretschmar SC Emergency Management Division

Eric Larson, MD Medical University of SC

Brenda Martin, RN SC Board of Nursing

Justin Mitchell, MD Palmetto Health / University of SC

Alonzo W. Nesmith Medical University of SC

Libba Patterson Univ. of SC School of Law

Paul Richter SC Hospital Association

Lance Scott, MD Medical University of SC

Mark Stewart 43rd Civil Support Team

Brenda Tolomea, MS SCDHEC Region 7 Ann Austin, RN SCDHEC Region 4

Ann Bell SCDHEC

P.D. Bullard, South Carolina Medical Association

Preston Callison, SC Hospital Association

George Clay, Ph.D. Clemson University

Tanis Duffie SCDHEC

Joanne Epley SCDHEC

Jerry Dell Gimarc

Lynn Hammond SC Department of Education

Greg Kitchens SCDHEC

Scott Lane SC Respiratory Care

Delorias Lenard, US Dept. of Agriculture

Lee Serralta McElveen SC Commission for Minority Affairs

Riyadh Muhammad, MD SCDHEC

Mary Helen Niemeyer, MD SCDHEC Region 5

Mike Patterson, CEM The Salvation Army-No. & So. Carolina

Robert Sade, MD Medical University of SC

Steve Shelton, MD SC College of Emergency Physicians

Johnny L. Thomas SC Emergency Management Division

Corporal Billy W. Tyler, MEP South Carolina Highway Patrol Joan Bainer, RN SC Board of Nursing

Linda J. Bell, M.D. DHEC

Eric Bullington Medical Reserve Corps

Lori Carnsew, MD Academy of Family Physicians

Deborah Derrick SCDHEC

Pam Dukes SCDHEC

Thomas E. Gibbons, MD Doctors Care

Betty Gore, RN SCDHEC Region 7

Roscia Hardee, RN SCDHEC

Rev. Brenda Kneece SC Christian Action Council

Randy Langston SCDHEC

Chaplain Capers Limehouse Roper St. Francis Hospital

Corey Meaux SCDHEC

Michelle L. Myer, MSN, RN, APRN, CPNP SC DHEC

William Owens, MD Palmetto Richland Memorial Hospital

Venaye Reece, DVM, US Dept. of Agriculture -Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

Cliff Satterwhite SC Baptist Convention

Covia L. Stanley, M.D., M Div SC DHEC Region 6

Judith Thompson SC Nurses Association

Lisa Waddell, MD, MPH SCDHEC

Pandemic Ethics Task Force Workgroups

Pandemic Ethics Task Force

Robert T. Ball, Jr, MD, MPH, FACP Taskforce Co-Chair

Phil Schneider, Ph.D. Department of Philosophy Coastal Carolina University

Workgroup Chairs

Stuart Sprague, Ph.D. AnMed Health

Clinical Practices:

George T. Fabian, MD, MPH SCDHEC

Richard Foster, MD SC Hospital Association

SCDHEC

Walter Limehouse, MD Medical University of South Carolina

Public Health Practices:

Harold Gabel, MD SCDHEC

Jane V. E. Richter, Dr.PH, MA, MSN, RN, CHES USC – Ctr. for Public Health Prep.

Legal:

Ethics:

Helen Bailey Appleton, RN JD Bailey Appleton, LLC

Matthew S. Penn, JD Staff Attorney, SCDHEC

Stephen P. Williams, J.D. Haynsworth Sinkler Boyd, PA

Public Risk Communications: SCDHEC Planning Staff:

Jim Beasley, Media Relations

Richard M. Learner, Ph.D. Phyllis Beasley W. Stewart Carter Donna Culbreath **Cathy Ferrell**

South Carolina Prepares for Pandemic Influenza: An Ethical Perspective

Table of Contents

I.		tive Summary	
		ndemic Influenza in South Carolina	
		e South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force	
II.	Introd	uction	. 5
	Α.	Background	. 5
		What would a severe pandemic mean to our state?	
		What preparations have been made in South Carolina for an influenza pandemic	?6
	В.	The Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force	. 7
	С.	Task Force Process	. 8
	D.	Purpose and Goals	. 9
Ш.	Assum	ptions	10
IV.	Ethica	Principles	13
	Int	roduction 13	
	Etł	nical Foundations	13
	Etł	nical Guidelines	15
v.	Pande	mic Planning Goals	17
		Workforce Continuity	
	В.	· · · · ·	
	C.	Allocation of Vaccines and Antiviral Medications and Other Countermeasures	
	-	1. Vaccines	
		2. Antiviral Medications	
	D.	 Triage	
	2.	1. Need for Pre-Hospital Triage	
		2. Planning for Pre-Hospital Triage	
		3. Potential Burdens of Triage	
		4. Primary Care's Role in Pandemic Triage	
		5. The Demand for Acute Care, The Role of Triage and The Allocation of Critical	
		Resources in the Hospital Setting	27
	F	Public Risk Communication Recommendations	
		Legal Recommendations: Limiting Liability in Pandemic Influenza	
	••	1. Medical Malpractice in Post Crisis Litigation	
		 Pandemic Influenza Guidelines and Statewide Implementation	
	G	Present Statutory Provisions	
		Notes on Public Response to Draft Report	
	п.	Regional Public Forums	
		State Summit	
1/1		State Summit	
VI.			33
	AP	PENDIX 1: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease	40
		Control and Prevention, Pandemic Influenza Severity Index	40

APPENDIX 2:	Vaccine Target Groups, Estimated Populations, and Tiers for Severe	,
Moderate a	and Less Severe Pandemics as Defined by the Pandemic Severity Inde	ex
(PSI)		41
APPENDIX 3: Se	ettings and Strategies for Antiviral Drug Use During an Influenza	
Pandemic a	nd Rationales	42
APPENDIX 4: C	apacity: Approaches to Optimizing Hospital Capacity	43
APPENDIX 5: S	pecific Clinical Practices	44
APPENDIX 5 a:	Adult Self-Assessment Tool	44
APPENDIX 5 b:	Potential Actions to Maintain Critical Primary Care Services by	
Pandemic F	Period	46
APPENDIX 5 c:	Primary Assessment Record – Adult	48
APPENDIX 5 d:	Secondary Assessment Orders for Hospital – Adult	54
APPENDIX 5 e:	SOFA Scoring Tool	65
APPENDIX 5 f:	SOFA Score by Date: Time	70
APPENDIX 5 g:	Multi-Principle Strategy for Ventilator Allocation	71
APPENDIX 5 h:	Multi-principle Patient Comparison Scoring	72
APPENDIX 5 i: /	Adult Palliative Care Orders	73
APPENDIX 5 j: /	Adult Continuous Analgesia and Dyspnea Opiod Therapy Orders – Er	ıd
of Life Patie	ents	77
APPENDIX 6: B	bibliography	78

South Carolina Prepares for Pandemic Influenza: An Ethical Perspective

I. Executive Summary

Pandemic Influenza in South Carolina

An outbreak of a new influenza virus occurs about three times a century. Its rapid spread worldwide causes a pandemic. A pandemic is a global outbreak of a new disease. On June 11, 2009, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared that a pandemic of a new influenza A (H1N1) virus has begun.

Planning for an influenza pandemic requires South Carolina's communities to be prepared to take care of themselves. Each community should be ready to identify and use local resources to last through many weeks of illness. It is estimated that up to 35% or nearly 1.3 million South Carolinians will become ill. All areas of the country will be affected at the same time.

The South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force

In October 2008, planners at the S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) met with doctors, university professors, members of professional organizations and ethics experts to form the South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force. This task force has been working to identify and address the difficult decisions that could arise in a severe influenza pandemic. The Task Force is a subcommittee of the state Pandemic Influenza Coordinating Council. The group serves as an advisory body to SCDHEC.

The task force has sought opinion and input to battle shortages of resources and personnel that might arise in a pandemic. The task force developed recommendations to address difficult pandemic planning issues including:

- vaccines
- antiviral drugs
- hospital beds
- medical equipment such as ventilators
- healthcare provider manpower shortages
- the need to keep the public informed of the changing situation.

Most people have never faced a serious pandemic in their lives. There is a great amount of uncertainty surrounding the influenza pandemic. That is why SCDHEC needs and values input from the public. The people of South Carolina can be better prepared and respond more

effectively if they understand the threats posed by a pandemic—and participate in designing strategies to address these threats.

Ethical Principles

The task force identified four basic ethical principles that have been a guide for all of its work. They are individual liberty, community solidarity, trust and professionalism. Using these principles as a foundation, the task force has developed a set of policy recommendations to serve as guidance during a pandemic. The group measured the recommendations against ethical guidelines to ensure:

- 1) that the language used is clear to all who might be affected;
- 2) that the recommendations are reasonable and based on the best available scientific evidence;
- 3) that there is a procedure to monitor the recommendations; and
- 4) that the benefits and responsibilities of each policy recommendation are shared equally among any individual or group that might be affected by it.

The task force recognizes that the rights of individuals should be respected. Some rights might be restricted during a pandemic in order to protect the well being of the entire community. This is the charge of public health and that is why SCDHEC, the state's public health agency, is leading the effort to ethically plan for a pandemic influenza.

Workforce Recommendations:

- Businesses should develop plans that will help them continue to function while up to 40% of their employees are absent. These plans should include directions for controlling the disease in their workplaces.
- Healthcare employers should plan to provide counseling for workers who suffer from stress and anxiety as a result of lengthy duty during a pandemic.
- Healthcare employers should purchase antiviral medications for their workers to use as prevention against the disease. These medicines can also be used to treat workers who become ill.
- SCDHEC and the S.C. Hospital Association should encourage the development of private antiviral stockpiles to protect all healthcare workers who will have direct contact with pandemic influenza patients.
- Healthcare employers should make sure that their workers have masks, gloves and other protective equipment and training to help them stay well during the pandemic.

- SCDHEC should work with healthcare employers to determine which job functions are most important for patient care. Those employers should train other workers to perform those functions to ensure their offices can continue to operate.
- Healthcare employers should talk with their employees about the need to continue to provide care for sick persons during the pandemic. These employees should know the penalties that could be enforced if they refuse to care for the sick.
- Healthcare employers should make plans to help each other during a pandemic.

Disease Containment Recommendations:

- SCDHEC should consider discouraging nonessential gatherings of people, in order to prevent the spread of the disease.
- SCDHEC should use voluntary isolation and quarantine procedures at the beginning of a pandemic outbreak to try to control the first outbreaks of the disease.
- SCDHEC should inform people of the benefits and drawbacks of isolation and quarantine, before isolation and quarantine are used.
- SCDHEC should provide clear written information to all health care facilities, public health officials and law enforcement about their roles and responsibilities in imposing isolation and quarantine.
- South Carolina should follow the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention priorities for the use of limited vaccine supplies.
- If the federal government allows it, then SCDHEC should consider reviewing and adjusting the priorities for the use of vaccine supplies based on scientific evidence.
- Guidelines should be developed to help the public decide whether they need hospital care or can be cared for at home.
- South Carolina should establish ways to provide care for large numbers of sick people in places other than traditional hospitals or clinics.

Hospital Care Recommendations:

- Healthcare entities should plan for a system to decide which patients should have the limited available medicines and treatment equipment.
- Hospitals should designate employees called triage officers to make the decisions about who will receive the limited medicines and equipment. These employees will be rotated and will not provide direct patient care while serving as the decision-making officer.

- Hospitals should plan in advance on how they will care for the large number of patients who become ill during a pandemic.
- If, because of a shortage of equipment, personnel or supplies, someone is not able or eligible to receive a certain treatment, then they or their family members should receive an explanation as to why they will not receive this treatment.

Legal Recommendations:

- The South Carolina Board of Medical Examiners under the Medical Practice Act should recommend and approve the South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force Report as the clinical guidelines for implementation during a Pandemic Influenza Public Health Emergency.
- The South Carolina Board of Nursing under the Nurse Practice Act should recommend and approve the South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force Report as the clinical and nursing guidelines for implementation during a Pandemic Influenza Public Health Emergency.
- DHEC and licensed healthcare providers should endeavor to obtain a state-wide consensus on the use of these PFGs and assessment tools among licensed healthcare providers, professional groups and regulatory boards.

Public Information Recommendations:

- SCDHEC should provide adequate public information about influenza prevention and influenza care at home.
- Messages about how people can protect themselves from the influenza pandemic should be stated by public health and healthcare providers consistently throughout the pandemic.
- SCDHEC will not be able to control the information flow during a pandemic, but should guard against and address rumors and misinformation.
- SCDHEC must respond to the need for information by the public in a timely manner, using all communication tools available, such as the Health Alert Network, the 2-1-1 phone system and other available tools. All information should be shared with the public through the media.

II. Introduction

A. Background

On June 11, 2009, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared that a pandemic of a novel influenza A (H1N1) virus has begun. Historically, about every 30 years, or three times a century, an outbreak of influenza occurs with a new virus that results in rapid worldwide spread of the disease, causing a pandemic. Planning for a pandemic requires that South Carolina's communities prepare to be self-sufficient, to identify and use local resources to last throughout many weeks of the spread of the disease. In a pandemic, all areas of the country will be affected at the same time. There may be few federal resources on which to count and it is estimated that up to 35%, or over 1,512,207 of South Carolina's citizens would become ill (based on the South Carolina 2006 population estimate of 4, 320,593).

Until recently, it was believed that the next pandemic would evolve from the highly pathogenic strain of avian influenza that appeared in humans in Hong Kong in 1997. At that time, South Carolina began developing a draft response plan for pandemic influenza. The state emergency operations plan for pandemic influenza was published in November 2004. In November 2005, the national pandemic influenza plan was released and preparedness efforts intensified across the country. In South Carolina, state and local planning summits have been held to draw attention to the critical and comprehensive preparedness plans needed for a pandemic. Regional and county pandemic influenza plans have been drafted and exercised.

By necessity, pandemic planning prepares for the worst and hopes for the "best", or the least pathogenic strain of novel virus. In Spring of 2009, years after pandemic planning had begun in South Carolina and months after the development of the Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force, the novel H1N1 influenza was reported in Mexico and soon after, appeared in the United States. South Carolina confirmed its first cases of novel H1N1 influenza in late April 2009. In June 2009, the World Health Organization officially declared a pandemic.

As of May 11, 2009, WHO estimates that the secondary attack rate of the novel virus ranges from 22% to 33% making it more contagious than seasonal influenza. In the last few years, pandemic planning has assumed that a severe influenza pandemic could strike between 15% and 35% of the population (See Appendix 1, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention "Pandemic Influenza Severity Index.") If 35% of South Carolina's population were made ill by the novel influenza, it is estimated that approximately 750,000 would seek outpatient medical assistance and up to 16,000 would need hospital care. Depending on the severity of the novel strain, there could be from about 1,300 deaths to over 25,000 deaths, if the disease severity increases. The seasonal flu kills an average of between 700 and 900 South Carolina citizens per year. The effects of a pandemic wave may last six weeks or more in a community. Although novel H1N1 currently has a low pandemic severity level and a mortality rate that is similar to seasonal flu, health officials are watching its

spread around the world and carefully monitoring the virus' effects for signs of mutations that could cause this virus to become more deadly to humans.

What would a severe pandemic mean to our state?

During a severe pandemic, our already overburdened healthcare system might not be able to handle the enormous influx of people seeking medical care and needing hospitalization. Hospitals may not have enough beds, ventilators, or other medical supplies to care for the ill.

The federal government has estimated that 40% of staff within government entities and private sectors may be absent from work for about two weeks at various times during the height of a pandemic. Employees may be out of work because they are sick, caring for sick family members or for children who are out of school, or they may be under quarantine. Consider the implications of this rate of absenteeism on the ability of businesses and governmental entities, such as public works, fire, police, and emergency medical services to continue to provide essential services. Absenteeism may affect public utilities such as water and electricity, medical care and public health services, education, and care for special needs populations. Food supply (as well as other goods) may be affected due to the unavailability of truck drivers to drive for one to two weeks.

Prevention of the close gathering of large groups of people may be one way that the state may attempt to contain the disease. In a pandemic, it may become necessary for local governments to close schools to prevent the spread of the disease. Depending on the severity of the pandemic, school closures might last for several weeks. Because the novel H1N1 influenza in South Carolina did not appear to be highly virulent in the spring 2009 outbreak, only a small number of schools with cases were closed. If, however, the virus becomes more severe and schools are closed more widely, then child care centers must also close in order to contain the disease. Employees will need to stay home to care for their children. Other steps to contain the spread of the disease might include canceling public events such as sporting events or concerts, closing public recreation facilities, and closing office buildings and shopping centers. Because of the highly contagious nature of a pandemic, religious institutions may need to provide means other than normal religious services and locations to provide spiritual guidance to their congregations. Large numbers of deaths may present special challenges to these institutions and to the state's coroners and funeral homes.

What preparations have been made in South Carolina for an influenza pandemic?

As the public health agency for the state of South Carolina, SCDHEC prepares for a pandemic by planning for public health response and by working with and assisting other agencies and businesses in their planning efforts. A pandemic influenza annex was added to the State Emergency Operations Plan.

To oversee a coordinated response among government agencies, nonprofit organizations and the citizenry, South Carolina formed a Pandemic Influenza Coordinating Council that assessed current preparedness and developed strategies to deal with a pandemic influenza. To date, SCDHEC, with the acknowledgement and support of the Pandemic Influenza Coordinating Council has implemented the following strategies to mitigate the effects of a pandemic influenza:

- Conducted extensive state, regional and local planning, including a state-level pandemic influenza plan and eight regional-level plans, with support provided to local governments in the development of county plans;
- Held Information sharing meetings to promote awareness and preparedness;
- Developed a multi-media public awareness campaign, including brochures, videos aired on SCETV and public service announcements aired on commercial television stations;
- Stockpiled antivirals, supplies and equipment for treatment of infected persons and for use by public health first responders;
- Developed detailed planning for medical surge and mass fatalities; and
- Expanded disease surveillance and laboratory capabilities.

B. The Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force

In October 2008, pandemic planners at SCDHEC, hospitals, universities and ethics experts met and formed the South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force. This Task Force has been working to identify and address the difficult decision making issues that will arise in a severe pandemic. The Task Force is a subcommittee of the Pandemic Influenza Coordinating Council, and is an advisory body to SCDHEC. It was charged with the development of this document and the presentation and explanation of this document to the citizens of South Carolina.

The Task Force solicited public opinion and input for further development of decision making policies related to the shortage of resources and personnel that will arise in a pandemic. This document addresses the following issues:

- What is the current situation regarding pandemic influenza preparedness and what are the present plans and future directions?
- What will the health care system look like during a severe pandemic, based on planning assumptions and models?
- What will be the health care system response, including home care recommendations, public information on when to seek physician's care, antiviral medicines, and hospital care?

- What are the decision points for deciding who needs and who receives specific treatments? Questions posed in the discussion include:
 - Who decides?
 - How do they decide?
 - Who gets home care? Physician care? Prehospital triage? Care at alternate sites? At hospitals?
 - Will the health care system look radically different?
 - Who is cared for at home? Who do they call for help? Where do they go for care?

C. Task Force Process

At the initial October 2008 meeting, a Steering Committee of the Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force met to determine the process and the issues that would be addressed in the document to be produced by the larger Ethics Task Force. Membership of the Steering Committee included representatives of South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, SCDHEC Region 6 Ethics Pandemic Influenza Panel, the South Carolina Board of Medical Examiners, the University of South Carolina School of Medicine, the South Carolina Hospital Association, the Medical University of South Carolina, the South Carolina Board of Nursing, The University of South Carolina Center for Public Health Preparedness, Anderson Medical Center, Coastal Carolina University, the South Carolina Nurses Association and legal representation.

The Steering Committee then invited additional representatives to begin the development of this paper. Invitations to participate in this Task Force were sent to:

- Anderson Area Medical Center
- South Carolina State University
- Furman University
- American Red Cross of Central South Carolina
- University of South Carolina School of Law
- SC Bar Association, Health Law Section
- South Carolina Association for Justice
- SC Board of Pharmacy
- South Carolina Home Care Association
- South Carolina Academy of Family Medicine Physicians
- South Carolina Christian Action Council
- Southern Baptist Convention
- SC Primary Health Care Association
- South Carolina Office of Rural Health
- South Carolina College of Emergency Physicians
- South Carolina Home Care Association

- Members of National Medical Associations
- American Lung Association in South Carolina
- South Carolina Society for Respiratory Care
- South Carolina Funeral Directors Association
- South Carolina Coroner's Association
- American Civil Liberties Union
- Media Associations
- Palmetto Project
- Harvest Hope Harvest Hope Food Bank
- Municipal Association of South Carolina
- South Carolina Association of Counties
- South Carolina Chamber of Commerce
- Contingency Planning Association of the Carolinas
- South Carolina Department of Education
- Members of the South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Coordinating Council

D. Purpose and Goals

Since November 2008, the Task Force met monthly in work groups to discuss and develop statements of the pandemic issues and recommendations related to general ethical guidelines for decision making in public health and clinical practice.

The intent of this Task Force was to ensure that the South Carolina public has an opportunity to hear and understand the difficult decisions that may need to be made by both public health practitioners and health care providers in the private sector. The Task Force sought to provide this information and solicit comments and recommendations from the general public in a series of public hearings held throughout the state. The Task Force compiled the comments received from the public and addressed these comments in a revised version of the paper to effect recommended changes in state and local pandemic influenza plans. Final public comments based on the first draft of the paper were sought and included at the State Summit at which the first draft of the paper was presented on July 15, 2009.

The work of the Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force will continue through the Disease Control Subcommittee of the SC Pandemic Influenza Coordinating Council.

III. Assumptions

The assumptions cited in this document are the assumptions that have been used by medical personnel and planners since pandemic planning began in earnest several years ago.

There are several assumptions about the disease process that must be considered in planning a response. Because a pandemic will be a novel virus, that is, a virus that is a new strain, susceptibility to the virus will be nearly universal. Based on the course of previous pandemics, the projected peak transmission period for the initial pandemic influenza outbreak will be six (6) to eight (8) weeks. At least two pandemic disease waves are likely. And following the pandemic, the new viral subtype is likely to continue circulating and to contribute to seasonal influenza. Information about the current H1N1 pandemic is still evolving. Pandemic plans must address all levels of pandemic severity in order for responses to be effective for all levels.

It is estimated that, on average, infected persons will transmit infection to approximately two other people.

The Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provides states with disease forecasting software to assist in developing planning assumptions. The 2006 South Carolina population estimates show a statewide population of 4,320,593. Of that, there are 1,165,847 school-aged children (0-19 years), 2,602,006 working adults (20-64 years) and 552,740 retirees (65+ years). Planning is conducted using attack rates of 15% (minimum), 25% (most likely), and 35% (maximum). Plans are made to prepare for the most widespread attack rate of 35%. Based on these planning assumptions for a severe disease strain, South Carolina could anticipate between 350,000 (15% attack rate) and 750,000 (35% attack rate) of outpatient visits to physician offices. South Carolina anticipates between 7,000 (15% attack rate) and 16,000 (35%) attack rate) hospitalizations due to novel or pandemic-strain influenza. These figures are counted in addition to normal seasonal influenza outpatient visits and hospitalizations.

The demand for hospital resources will peak at week five (5) during an eight-week pandemic "wave." During this week, an expected surge due to the additional burden statewide caused by pandemic influenza-related cases would be an increase of an estimated 433 hospital admissions per day, an additional estimated 2,114 persons requiring hospitalization, an additional estimated 612 requiring the use of an ICU bed, and an additional estimated 306 requiring mechanical ventilation. There are currently a total of 1,284 ventilators in hospitals throughout the state.

Because of the shortage of hospital resources, health care may not be delivered in the usual manner. To meet this demand, providers will have to use resources in the most effective manner to save the most lives.

Pandemic planning estimates show that South Carolina may experience a range of deaths from 1,296 for the least severe pandemic to over 25,924 deaths in a pandemic with a

severity level similar to the pandemic of 1918. These deaths are counted in addition to the deaths that will occur from seasonal influenza. Just as hospitals and healthcare workers will be overwhelmed by the number of persons seeking medical care, the funeral industry, comprised of both public and private agencies, may not be able to process remains in the usual amount of time in which funerals and burials normally occur.

Though a vaccine targeted specifically to the novel strain of virus would be the most effective pharmaceutical tool to combat the disease, the development of influenza vaccines is a time-consuming process. From the time a specific strain of influenza virus is identified, it takes about seven months until a vaccine to target this specific virus is ready for worldwide distribution. In past pandemic planning it was assumed that the demand for a vaccine targeted for the pandemic strain of virus will greatly exceed the supplies initially available. Therefore, we expect that rationing of available vaccine will be necessary. In periods of limited vaccine supply, public health clinics will be the predominant locations for influenza vaccine administration and a reduction or cessation of other public health programs may be necessary in order to provide supplemental personnel for specific immunization job actions. In the case of the release of the H1N1 vaccine, currently scheduled for Fall 2009, it appears that the vaccine may be available in more abundant supply than originally considered in pandemic plans.

Limited antiviral medicines will be targeted for treatment of individuals with the infection.

Due to the anticipated delay in vaccine availability for possibly the initial four to six months of a pandemic and the limited availability of antiviral medications, nonmedical interventions such as isolation and quarantine, closure of schools and discouragement of public gatherings may be necessary.

Absenteeism among the workforce is projected by the federal government to be approximately 40%. Workers in society's critical infrastructure, including healthcare workers, may fear being exposed to the pandemic strain of virus and may choose to be absent from work. Staff levels may be significantly reduced due to high levels of illness and hospitalization and many may be lost due to significant mortality associated with the disease. The remaining workers may be psychologically affected by disease, family concerns, concerns about economic loss, or fear. Staff may also be reduced by the need for some workers to attend to family illness or to children remaining at home due to school closures. Health care facilities must plan for adequate infection control supplies to protect workers as they carry out their healthcare duties.

Key Assumptions:

- There will be little or no immunity to a pandemic influenza
- One wave of a pandemic influenza outbreak will last six (6) to eight (8) weeks, with two or three expected waves of the disease.

- The demand for healthcare will exceed resources.
- Rationing of scarce medical resources will be necessary.
- The public will expect health care to be delivered in the usual manner.
- Absenteeism from work will be exacerbated by the need for the public to stay home to care for ill family members or from fear of contracting the disease.
- Once the specific strain of virus is identified, it will take approximately seven (7) months for a vaccine to be developed.
- Due to limited and delayed supplies of vaccines and antivirals, nonpharmaceutical interventions will be employed to reduce the risk of infections.

IV. Ethical Principles

Introduction

Recent large scale disasters, such as the destruction of the World Trade Center twin towers, Hurricane Katrina, the Asian tsunami, and the SARS epidemic, have received extensive attention in the media. They have reminded us of the fragile bonds that hold human communities together and of the interdependence of all peoples and nations.

Two factors play an important role in mitigating the harmful effects of large scale disasters among the people most directly impacted: the care with which responses are planned and the existence of a shared ethical foundation on which to base public policy. These factors largely determine whether efforts to deal with disasters are likely to succeed.

The outbreak of pandemic influenza poses a challenge to public health planners. A window of opportunity is open for publicly stating the required ethical foundations and to construct detailed plans for mitigating the harmful effects of pandemic influenza.

This document states the ethical foundations for plans made by the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control and other partners in the event of pandemic influenza, and provides ethical guidelines for policy development. The precise extent and severity of such a pandemic cannot be known in advance, and may evolve with the disease, but clearly stated ethical bases on which to make policy and to act will serve our state well in the planning process. Well-conceived plans will give public health officials and other professionals confidence that their actions will likely achieve the desired results and be supported by a public that shares their values.

Ethical Foundations

Our society has a long-standing tradition of placing priority on certain values. Individuals have drawn upon our founding documents, their own religious traditions, and other sources for moral guidance. Despite the diverse sources, we agree that certain values are critical points of reference when we, as a people, face difficult circumstances such as an influenza pandemic.

Individual Liberty

Individuals should be given the maximum amount of liberty consistent with a like liberty for others. This should include self-determination in matters affecting their own welfare. It should also include freedom of movement and respect for personal privacy. Disasters produce circumstances in which certain liberties may be limited to protect the safety of others.

Solidarity

Individuals live within communities and cannot flourish without the support of others. This mutual dependence means that the interests of the community must be considered in all decisions that affect the group. *Inclusiveness* ensures that all groups and interests are considered when decisions affecting the community must be made. *Respect for equality* means that every individual is of equal worth and deserving of consideration. Communities depend on *reciprocity*, and individuals should see working for the interests of others as contributing to their own well-being. Solidarity also requires the group to protect the most vulnerable members of the community.

Trust

Trust in public servants and public institutions is essential to the maintenance of a strong sense of community. It is built by consistent observation of standards for public service. *Transparency* builds confidence by making clear to all what decisions are made and the bases on which they are founded. *Accountability* ensures that all who are charged with making decisions for the community will be held responsible for the consequences of their decisions. *Responsiveness* to all engenders trust, even if not all desires can be fulfilled. *Proportionality* is crucial for trust so that burdens will not fall unduly on particular individuals or groups.

Professionalism

Communities elect, appoint, and provide licenses to certain individuals in the expectation that they will serve the interests of all in discharging their duties. Health care and public service are the professions most directly involved in public health emergencies, such as pandemic influenza. Among the standards that apply to professionals in such circumstances is an obligation to provide care, even in the face of personal risks. Care should be rendered without regard to ability to pay and without discrimination based on criteria, such as race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. Communities must be able to trust professionals to steward resources in the most efficient manner to ensure maximal benefit for all. Furthermore, distribution of resources should be guided by the best scientific evidence available. Palliative care should be given to those for whom treatments are not available or are ineffective.

We endorse the following principles when making decisions:

- A principle of <u>fairness</u> suggests that all persons who are in a similar situation will have similar access to the medication that is available from public sector stockpiles. Availability of treatment will not be based on gender, race, ethnicity, citizenship, or ability to pay.
- A principle of <u>autonomy</u> allows organizations, businesses, and individuals to take steps toward pandemic influenza preparedness, including purchase and stockpiling of antiviral drugs. Promoting autonomy contributes to overall national preparedness, resiliency, and can increase the amount of antiviral drugs available potentially leading to

community benefits. While autonomy may result in unequal access to antiviral prophylaxis, public sector stockpiles are targeted to provide a safety-net for all Americans to receive treatment in a fair and equal manner.

- <u>Minimizing the harms</u> of an influenza pandemic may require targeting resources to specific groups that protect health and safety and provide essential community services. We believe that targeting limited resources to protect societal interests is ethically appropriate.
- A principle of <u>reciprocity</u> means that workers who assume increased risks due to their occupation and who provide benefits broadly to society such as healthcare workers, firefighters, and emergency medical services personnel should be protected, if possible.
- <u>Flexibility</u>, defined as the ability to modify recommendations before the pandemic as more information becomes available and at the time of a pandemic when the characteristics of disease are known, also is important.

These principles are consistent with the values expressed in several public engagement and stakeholder meetings that were held. When asked to rate the importance of potential program goals, participants rated most highly the goals of protecting those who contribute to a pandemic response, who provide care for people with pandemic illness, who maintain essential community services, and who are at increased risk of infection because of their job.

Ethical Guidelines

The foundations of ethics can seem straightforward and uncontroversial. At the same time, implementing ethics can be complicated and controversial, especially when guidelines are needed in emergencies or time sensitive tasks, such as responding to a pandemic. Guidelines can conflict, so that adhering to one leads to violation of another. Principles are often difficult to express in specific rules to guide real situations.

Nevertheless, guidelines can be useful in formulating and executing policy. No list can be satisfactory to all, but we recommend that the following guidelines be used to measure policies and actions against the ethical framework described above:

- 1. Policies for responding to pandemic influenza should be developed in advance of an outbreak.
- 2. Policy development should be open and transparent, and should include participation at some level by individuals and groups that will be subject to the policies.
- 3. Any proposed policy or action should:

- be stated in language that is clear to all whose interests are affected;
- be based on reasonableness and the best available scientific evidence;
- include procedures to ensure accountability;
- ensure that the benefits and burdens of any policy or action are shared equitably among affected individuals and groups
- 4. In developing a policy or proposing an action, individual liberties should be respected, but when others are likely to be adversely affected by an individual's actions or lack of action, the interests of the entire community should take priority over competing interests.
- 5. Advance planning should include a mechanism for continuously evaluating the effectiveness of policies and actions in the event of a pandemic, and a mechanism for reformulating policies based on these evaluations.

V. Pandemic Planning Goals

There are three overarching goals in the event of an influenza pandemic. All decisions are based on the goal of wanting as few South Carolinians as possible to get influenza, enabling as many South Carolinians as possible who do get influenza to survive the pandemic, and continuing essential life-maintaining functions of all sectors of South Carolina's infrastructure – public safety, healthcare, and commerce.

In pursuing these desired goals during a pandemic, every citizen should have the opportunity to be informed of the reasons for the actions taken by governments at all levels. Most importantly from an ethical point of view, we must strive to insure that every citizen recognizes that governmental actions that affect them are being administered with extreme attention to a fundamental and real sense of fairness. Unfortunately, there is the realization that, in situations of limited healthcare resources such as influenza vaccines, antiviral medications, and medical equipment, essential fairness will not always mean essential equality – this is the ethical burden of the need to ration scarce resources to achieve the overall public interest goals.

The discussion and recommendations below are based on the planning that was needed to prepare South Carolina for a severe pandemic. It is unknown which or how many of these recommendations may need to be incorporated for the response to the novel H1N1 pandemic, or future pandemics with unknown severity levels.

A. Workforce Continuity

Maintaining continuity of the healthcare workforce needed to provide for the health and safety of communities during an influenza pandemic will be challenged by high rates of absenteeism due to illness, competing responsibilities for family needs, and concerns for personal safety. Of particular importance will be the professional ethics and values that healthcare personnel apply to the decision to remain on duty in the face of these competing demands and concerns.

The South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Plan incorporates the generally accepted ethical constructs of duty to care and professional values while acknowledging the extreme working conditions and personal circumstances that must be reconciled at the personal and institutional levels in order to assure continuity of essential services during a pandemic event. The South Carolina Emergency Health Powers Act holds healthcare workers accountable for the duty to care principle without provision of exceptions for extenuating conditions by penalizing noncompliant workers with loss of professional license, certification, or vocational privilege.

The duty to care, in normal and disaster situations, is inherent in the professional codes of ethics of most health care professions. American Medical Association (AMA) principles of medical ethics state that, in providing patient care, <u>except in emergencies</u>, a physician may choose whom to serve. In emergencies such as pandemic influenza, physicians also have the

responsibility "to participate in activities contributing to the improvement of the community and the betterment of public health". The AMA Declaration of Professional Responsibility commits physicians to "apply our knowledge and skills when needed, though doing so may put us at risk." This obligation is also reflected in the American Nursing Association <u>Code of Ethics</u> which stresses collaboration with other healthcare professionals and the public in promoting community efforts to meet health needs.

In choosing a profession, healthcare workers voluntarily accept the associated risks and enter into a social contract to be available during emergency situations. Historically many professional codes of ethics had explicitly addressed the obligation of duty to care during highrisk infectious disease epidemics. Perhaps due to the rarity of infectious disease epidemics in modern times, the specific language has disappeared from most professional codes though the inherent ethical principles remain.

The duty to care imposes a reciprocal duty for institutions and society to support and protect healthcare workers from the health, safety, and economic risks associated with continuing to provide essential services in an infectious disease epidemic. In order to maximize the continuity of the healthcare workforce in an infectious disease epidemic, continuity of operations plans must balance ethical and social obligations with the competing and legitimate concerns of healthcare workers for the safety and security of themselves and their families.

To help health care workers meet these duties, healthcare institutions have an equal obligation to provide appropriate emergency and infection control training. Front-line clinicians should be provided personal protective equipment, post-exposure antiviral prophylaxis when indicated, and priority to receive vaccination. Health care workers should also be provided supportive services such as counseling when necessary, liberal family and sick leave, and other family support such as child care. Surveys of clinicians find that availability of institutional resources and worker protection facilitates workplace continuity.

Clinicians and facilities should negotiate and plan how best to cover the expected surge in demand for clinical services before events occur and determine if workplace sanctions for noncompliance with expected responsibilities should be implemented. Examples may include deferral of routine visits or elective surgical procedures, providing telephone services in lieu of office visits, and prescribing more than one-month's supply of routine medications.

Developing and implementing a continuity of operations plan (COOP) in all healthcare settings regardless of size or scope is the essential first step in assuring that expectations for workforce continuity are supported by mutually reciprocal principles of ethics and fairness. COOPs should clearly define expectations for workers by identifying essential job functions and services that must be maintained in a pandemic. The development of procedures and assurance of resources needed to provide maximum protection for workers and their families are also fundamental to operational continuity planning. SCDHEC will assist healthcare organizations with the process needed to identify and designate clinical and non-clinical healthcare workers deemed to be critically necessary during pandemic, clarify use of quarantine or isolation, and help define responsibilities of vital but non-clinical employees. The Emergency System for Advance Registration of Volunteer Health Professionals and the Medical Reserve Corps may provide supplemental volunteer personnel to support clinical and public health practices when available. SCDHEC will assist healthcare organizations and facilities in developing fair and responsive policies.

B. Disease Containment Measures

The approach of Public Health to a crisis is to look at the public as a whole, not focusing upon the individual other than his role as a member of the public who may benefit from or be harmed by a public health action. It is the role of Public Health to be concerned with the prevention, spread and mitigation of illness, in as fair a way as possible, for the community as a whole.

The use of non-pharmaceutical community containment interventions by public health will be necessary to control the spread of pandemic influenza. Among them are the use of social distancing and isolation and guarantine measures to prevent disease transmission. Social distancing discourages or prevents large, non-essential social gatherings when necessary to prevent exposures of large numbers of people. It may not be feasible to suspend all large gatherings. Appropriate recommendations will be given for disease containment measures for events like mass immunization clinics, blood drives, funeral services, etc. Isolation guarantine measures use isolation to seclude an individual with a contagious disease, and guarantine to seclude an individual who has or who may have been exposed to a contagious disease and who may later develop the disease and become contagious. Isolation and guarantine measures will enhance other disease control strategies. Isolation and quarantine measures have been used traditionally to prevent the transmission of communicable diseases and the evidence that these interventions are likely to be effective in limiting disease transmission are drawn from the effectiveness of the measures in controlling the spread of disease in previous pandemics, during the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) outbreak and with other communicable diseases in hospital settings.

Pandemic Influenza assumptions related to isolation and quarantine measures affecting the public health are: 1) non-medical interventions will be necessary due to the anticipated delay in vaccine availability for possibly the initial four to six months of a pandemic. Additionally, limited antiviral supplies will be targeted for individuals who are either at highest risk of exposure to disease, or who are at high risk of complications from infection; 2) public health has authority under the Emergency Health Powers Act to use isolation and quarantine as a disease control measure; 3) isolation measures may involve both health care facilities and home settings; quarantine measures will be largely in-home settings but may also involve work or other settings and will rely heavily on voluntary cooperation due to limited resources for enforcement. The primary goal for implementing isolation and quarantine is to minimize transmission. Isolation and quarantine measures are intended to delay the peak of the epidemic therefore allowing the development and implementation of other countermeasures. Limiting disease transmission will also decrease overall illness and death rates and thereby the overall impact of the epidemic on the population.

Isolation and quarantine measures will be used primarily during early pandemic influenza transmission in South Carolina. The trigger will be the identification of the first cases of the pandemic flu strain in South Carolina or the surrounding geographic area. Isolation and quarantine measures will be less effective once disease becomes widespread because maintaining the intervention will quickly exhaust limited public health resources.

South Carolina relies on voluntary cooperation with isolation and quarantine measures. Most individuals are willing to comply with voluntary measures and understand the value for limiting the spread of the disease. Mandatory orders are issued only in the rare cases where individuals do not comply and pose a significant health threat to others.

By definition, public health has the obligation to assure the health of the "whole." Individual rights may be limited if they risk endangerment of the public health. The ethical value of individual rights is balanced by the obligation to protect public health by limiting the spread of disease. Although individuals who are ill or possibly incubating disease will be disadvantaged if they are placed under isolation or quarantine, these interventions are fairly applied to the population because the intervention is based on disease state alone and not any other societal considerations. Some individuals, however, will be more disadvantaged by these restrictions. For example, those who do not have paid leave, or those that serve as the primary provider for a household will suffer a greater economic burden from isolation and quarantine measures. The decision to impose these restrictions on individuals in order to prevent individuals from transmitting disease, thus hampering initial public health efforts to slow the spread of pandemic influenza, must be balanced against individual rights and the potential disruption disease containment measures may cause.

How can burdens of this approach be minimized? Disagreement with or potential rejection of isolation and quarantine measures can be diminished by advance communication of goals and potential benefits and drawbacks to the general public. The communication plan should be developed to reach disadvantaged and non-English speaking populations. Public Health is primarily responsible for framing and disseminating information about the potential for isolation and quarantine measures to slow the spread of disease and the mechanism by which isolation and quarantine will be implemented through public health orders. Personal liberties will be affected with the implementation of isolation and quarantine and other disease containment measures. Mechanisms do exist for judicial review for mandatory public health orders are subject to judicial review in the South Carolina court system. SCDHEC assumes the responsibility of assuring that the basic needs of individuals placed under mandatory isolation or quarantine orders are met.

Disseminating guidance to all entities where individuals may be isolated is also needed to address the joint role that health care facilities, public health and law enforcement may have in imposing isolation and quarantine. The possibility of the need to quarantine individuals in certain high-risk occupations should also be communicated in advance.

C. Allocation of Vaccines and Antiviral Medications and Other Countermeasures

In pursuing the three previously mentioned over-arching goals during a pandemic, it is important that every citizen has the opportunity to be informed of the reasons for the actions taken by governments at all levels. Most importantly from an ethical point of view, government and health care providers must strive to ensure that every citizen recognizes that actions that affect them are being administered with extreme attention to a fundamental and real sense of fairness. Unfortunately, in situations of limited healthcare resources such as influenza vaccine and antiviral medication, essential fairness will not always mean essential equality – this is the ethical burden of the need to ration scarce resources to achieve the overall public interest goals.

1. Vaccines

Within the context of the goals and ethical principles outlined above, the South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Task Force supports five important objectives:

- * protecting those who are essential to the pandemic response;
- * providing care for persons who are ill;
- * protecting those who maintain essential community services;
- * protecting children and other vulnerable populations; and
- * protecting workers who are at greater risk of infection due to their jobs.

Given the high likelihood that vaccine supplies will be limited at best in influenza pandemic, priorities must be set for the distribution of vaccine. At the time of the development of this document, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has recommended such priorities (See Appendix 4, "Table 1. Vaccination target groups, estimated populations, and tiers for severe, moderate, and less severe pandemics as defined by the Pandemic Severity Index PSI") and we endorse them for South Carolina. The Table describes the members (tiers) of each component of the population and briefly describes the rationale for the priority assigned. A system of tiers is a necessary method for determining distribution of scarce resources, even though the tiers may change, depending on the characteristics of the pandemic.

Among groups targeted for vaccination are workers with critical skills, experience, or licensure status whose absence would create bottlenecks or collapse of critical functions, and to protect workers who are at especially high occupational risk. In general, all groups

designated for vaccination within a tier have equal priority for vaccination. Vaccine allocation within a tier will be proportional to the populations of the groups in the tier, though changes in this allocation scheme at the time of the pandemic may occur based on vaccine supply, the impacts of the pandemic, and the specific needs identified at that time. It is expected that further national guidance will become available to more specifically define critical occupations and population groups whose members should receive early vaccination and to provide guidelines to employers on the proportion of their workforce that may be prioritized for vaccination.

While vaccination priorities reflect the primary ethical value of essential fairness, it should be noted that the tiers are not "equal" since the scarcity of vaccine, especially in the early waves of the influenza pandemic, would mean that those in lower tiers may not receive vaccine and will go unprotected until those in higher tiers have been vaccinated.

During the period of imminent threat of a pandemic and especially during the first pandemic wave, SCDHEC will need to continuously examine and adjust vaccine priority tiers and sub-tiers to reflect the severity of the pandemic and to maximize survivability and minimize infection rates among <u>all</u> groups in South Carolina. The Task Force specifically recommends that there be flexibility in adjusting vaccination priorities if allowed by the federal government. To maintain every citizen's sense of essential fairness, the reasons for any adjustment of the established vaccination priorities should be fully communicated to the general public.

2. Antiviral Medications

Antiviral medications can be used to treat the sick or to prophylax, or prevent illness in, people who have been exposed but are not yet sick.

For H1N1 influenza, early treatment (within the first two to three days of the appearance of symptoms) with an antiviral medication is effective in decreasing the symptoms of the disease and decreasing the risk of pneumonia. Early treatment has been shown to decrease hospitalization by about half, and may also decrease mortality. Treating earlier after the onset of disease is most effective in decreasing the risk of complications and shortening illness duration. The use of antivirals as post-exposure prophylaxis to prevent infection is a means to effect disease containment and to protect healthcare workers and others. A pre-exposure prophylaxis strategy would require continuous administration of antiviral medication throughout the first pandemic wave. This strategy increases the risk of side effects or the occurrence of drug resistance and could more quickly exhaust limited resources. For these reasons, pre-exposure prophylaxis is not generally recommended.

Persons who will have close and recurrent exposure to pandemic illness (e.g., healthcare workers or emergency responders who have very high or high exposure occupations) should use personal protective equipment. Appropriate personal protective equipment may be particularly useful for increasing worker confidence and may discourage unnecessary absenteeism due to fear of becoming ill. In healthcare and emergency service sectors, workers

who provide direct patient care or have high-risk exposure must be identified, and plans must be made for providing personal protective equipment and rapidly identifying unprotected exposures in order to initiate post exposure prophylaxis rapidly to prevent illness.

The primary public source of antiviral drugs for a pandemic treatment response will be the public supply of antiviral drugs that have been stockpiled through the state and the federal Strategic National Stockpile. These stockpiles can be used only for treatment. The ethical principle underlying the treatment strategy assumes that public sector stockpiles should be prioritized for treatment because it represents the most efficient use of a limited drug supply, because prophylaxis for some while others are denied treatment would not be perceived as equitable, and because other mitigation measures can be implemented to protect workers and reduce the risk of exposure and infection. The CDC has determined that post-exposure prophylaxis, while reasonable and desirable, will have to be funded by private sector employers, including health care institutions. Given the high likelihood that antiviral drug supplies will be limited at best in an influenza pandemic, priorities must be set for the distribution of such drugs. A principle of fairness suggests that all persons who are in a similar situation will have similar access to the medication that is available from public sector stockpiles. Availability of treatment will not be based on gender, race, ethnicity, citizenship, or ability to pay. (See also Appendix 3, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Guidance on Antiviral Drug Use during an Influenza Pandemic", Table: Settings and strategies for antiviral drug use during an influenza pandemic.)

The ethical principle of autonomy calls for organizations and businesses to take steps toward pandemic influenza preparedness, including purchase and stockpiling of antiviral drugs where appropriate. Promoting autonomy contributes to overall national preparedness, resiliency, and can increase the amount of antiviral drugs available potentially leading to community benefits. While autonomy may result in unequal access to public sector stockpiles are targeted to provide a safety-net for all Americans to receive treatment. Unlike vaccines, where each tier would be protected in turn as more vaccine is produced, for antiviral medications, the number of priority groups that can be covered theoretically would be known at the start of the pandemic based on the amount of drug that is stockpiled. Additional supply that would become available during the pandemic could provide some flexibility.

Although, ultimately, it is the responsibility of health care employers to stockpile antivirals for employee and personal protective equipment, the Task Force further recommends that the SCDHEC and the SC Hospital Association establish a joint working group to identify and encourage the development of antiviral stockpiles and funding necessary to implement this recommendation.

In lieu of funding availability, healthcare facilities should support solidarity by adopting mutual assistance agreements among themselves and community providers to share institutional resources.

This recommendation is consistent with our main goals of pandemic influenza response: minimizing influenza rates, while at the same time contributing to the essential healthcare component of South Carolina's critical infrastructure. While this recommendation could conceivably lead to other South Carolina citizens not receiving antiviral medications that are in short supply, the maximum availability of health care workers during a pandemic will contribute in the fairest manner to the interests of all citizens who seek health care during that critical period.

D. Triage

An important consideration in the ethical decision making process is the determination of which influenza patients will receive care with the limited hospital resources. Triage, or the "sorting" of patients based on severity of illness combined with likelihood of survival, will be done on two levels: pre-hospital, or prior to hospital admission, and in-hospital triage.

Pre-hospital triage includes the process of identifying resources for care for individuals who do not need hospital care, identification of other resources to care for individuals when hospital resources are exhausted, and provision of health education to the public to assist them in making decisions about their own care.

Pre-hospital triage also provides guidelines for out-patient and emergency healthcare workers on treatment, resources, stewardship and handling difficult ethical issues when they arise. Current public expectations about access to care and the levels of health care that may be provided in a pandemic must change to reflect the realities of a public health crisis.

The implementation of pre-hospital triage in a pandemic significantly differs from traditional, daily, hospital triage in that, the triage, or sorting, is being done by the individuals themselves, who have no professional ethical obligations related to their own care.

1. Need for Pre-Hospital Triage

Pre-pandemic planning indicates that the number of hospital beds available to manage the consequences of an influenza pandemic will be inadequate. Given the scarcity of hospitalbased resources, clarity regarding the goals of pre-hospital triage is essential in the preservation of public trust, and possibly even public order.

Triage begins with an explanation of options to those in the public and the healthcare fields who are doing the sorting. Pre-hospital triage activities should provide accurate and timely information to the public regarding disease prevention measures necessary to reduce disease transmission. They should include home care information and resources for community-based provision of care. Planning for pre-hospital triage should strive to assure that allocations of treatment resources are made with the goal of reducing illness, hospitalization and death. Additionally, healthcare planners must develop and implement standardized pre-

hospital triage procedures to assure that those seeking treatment are sent to an appropriate care location.

Since the first "sorting" is done by the ill or those caring for them in the community, it is critical that the public receives sufficient information to perform self-triage activities. Options for care that may be considered by the public or chosen by healthcare providers may include:

- Self-care,
- No care,
- Outpatient/primary care,
- Care in the Emergency Room,
- In-patient care,
- Care in an off-site non-traditional facility, or
- Palliative (hospice-type) care.

Assignment to any of these venues or systems will imply varying outcomes to those being sorted, and may be seen as having varying values. An equitable system assures that the capacities and levels of care available from these systems are clearly explained and understood by all those who may be sorting themselves or others to these options.

2. Planning for Pre-Hospital Triage

Pre-hospital triage procedures, in order to be accepted and successful, must be developed and adopted well in advance of a pandemic. The first task is to develop and disseminate public information in a timely manner. Pandemic planners assume stewardship of knowledge resources as they identify appropriate public information materials (disease prevention messages, home care information) and methods to disseminate information to the public.

A second critical step in planning for pre-hospital triage is to identify systems of care. This includes identification of appropriate traditional and non-traditional healthcare facilities (alternate care sites, community care centers/shelters) to treat those with influenza, as well as defining and assigning roles to relevant partners for the operation of the above facilities.

Development of pre-hospital triage systems well in advance increases the likelihood of adherence to the ethical frameworks outlined by this taskforce. Public engagement and involvement in advance are essential to building public good will and trust, as planners support the principle of collaboration. Consistency in application of "sorting" standards, and basing the triage procedures on sound scientific evidence supports the principles of equity, fairness and reciprocity. Non-traditional healthcare facilities with defined goals, admission criteria, management standards and regulatory criteria support the principles of collaboration and stewardship.

3. Potential Burdens of Triage

While equality and fairness are core ethical values, it is recognized that these may not be present in a public health crisis. It can be assumed that not all persons will have access to appropriate education or public information materials and needed resources. This handicaps the ability of these persons to "sort" themselves or their loved ones appropriately into the best model of care.

The principle of fairness in pre-hospital and hospital triage demands that individuals receive explanations about why they or their family members are not eligible for certain treatments. It is understood that receiving an explanation does not always lead to acceptance, but is does assure that the same standards are applied to all those seeking care, when the explanations are standardized.

The potential burdens of triage can be minimized if the public is engaged in development of public educational materials prior to a pandemic. This collaboration may enhance the stewardship of resources in a time of crisis. Planners must assure involvement of "hard to reach" populations in development of materials and resources and the methods to distribute information concerning influenza prevention, treatment and pre-hospital triage.

Those making "sorting" decisions in a time of crisis must be provided with accurate information in an efficient and timely manner (real time) during Pre-Pandemic, Pandemic and Post-Pandemic times. To this end, development of a pre-hospital triage tool is needed; it must be based first on those clinical and epidemiological factors related to controlling the spread of, and lessening the impact of, the disease on the unaffected population.

Public Health and key healthcare partners would be expected to take the lead in guiding the establishment and management of non-traditional healthcare facilities in which individuals may be sorted prior to any hospital treatment. The goals of these facilities include (1) provision of care for persons who cannot provide care for themselves, and (2) provision of care to those whose illness exceeds the capacity of their caregivers in the home. It is expected that public health and key health care partners will set aside self-interest and territoriality to promote collaboration to achieve these goals.

Finally, it is recognized that inequitable distribution of resources may be a part of assuring that the healthcare system is best prepared to respond to a prolonged event. For example, workers providing certain key services, such as laboratory workers, vaccine or antiviral producers, healthcare providers and law enforcement personnel who have critical roles to play in the control and impact of this disease may be "sorted" to higher priority groups for treatment, or prophylaxis, etc. The "good" of public order may be valued more than the "good" of free will in a time of crisis.

4. Primary Care's Role in Pandemic Triage

Primary care provider settings include physician's office, community health centers, outpatient clinics, urgent care centers and other community health care providers. If a member of the public, self-triages to a physician's office, community health center or clinic, then the primary care provider must determine the triage status of that person.

A major primary care responsibility is assessment and referral of influenza-like illness by category. An adult self-assessment tool (Appendix 5a, Clinical Practices: Adult Self-Assessment Tool) may be used to facilitate this process. If the tool identifies no influenza-like illness, the patient needs no treatment, but receives educational material on influenza. If the patient needs additional assessment for diagnosis, clinicians should consider starting treatment and referral for further diagnosis (x-ray or lab testing). If the patient has identifiable influenza-like illness, clinicians start treatment and assess for discharge home (alone or with community supports) or referral to surge center; sufficiently ill or vulnerable patients require follow-up in 24 to 48 hours to assess status. If the patient has identifiable influenza-like illness with high risk criteria, clinicians should arrange transfer to hospital for additional assessment or admission.

The pediatric patient population may require additional assessment based upon physical examination, co-morbid conditions, individual risk factors, and the effect of the pandemic virus in this population.

5. The Demand for Acute Care, The Role of Triage and The Allocation of Critical Resources in the Hospital Setting

Most patients presenting to the hospital emergency departments may encounter a triage screening process utilizing the primary screening tool. Based upon that assessment, patients may be triaged home, into an alternate care site, or into the emergency department for further assessment or hospital admission.

Based upon FluAid/FluSurge, the forecasting models developed by the CDC, pandemic influenza infection (attack) rates may approach 35% of the general population. The FluSurge forecast assumes each hospitalized influenza patient requires an average of either 5 (non-Intensive Care Unit) or 10 (Intensive Care Unit) days of hospital care with 100% using an acute bed for 5 days, 15% using ICU beds for 10 days, and 7.5% using ventilator support for 10 days. Many hospitals currently operate at full capacity with very little capability to expand their abilities to care for a surge in patients (surge capacity). Pandemic influenza easily will overwhelm hospital resources.

Impact of Pandemic with 25% Attack Rate on Hospital Resources: Additional Resources Required in Week 5										
Location	Population	Total Licensed Hospital Beds	Licensed	Additional Hospital Admissions Per Day in Week 5 Only	Additional Admissions Needing ICU Beds Per Day in Week 5 Only	Additional Mechanical Ventilator Needs Per Day in Week 5 Only				
Statewide	4,320,593	11,764	1,176	433	612	306				
Region 1	467,598	1,141	70	49	69	34				
Region 2	884,891	2,682	273	88	125	63				
Region 3	845,496	2,437	276	91	129	65				
Region 4	552,667	1,799	187	55	78	39				
Region 5	307,362	653	57	31	44	22				
Region 6	334,792	751	71	36	51	26				
Region 7	603,178	1,771	203	58	82	41				
Region 8	224,589	530	39	24	34	17				

The South Carolina populations that are at high risk for seasonal influenza include:

- 1) people of all ages with heart conditions and chronic lung conditions, such as cystic fibrosis, asthma or emphysema;
- 2) residents of long-term care or other chronic care facilities, due to their environmental exposure regardless of their age or chronic conditions;
- 3) people with compromised immune systems, such as diabetes, other metabolic diseases, cancer, renal disease, anemia, HIV, or sickle cell anemia;
- 4) children on aspirin for conditions like juvenile rheumatoid arthritis because of Reye's syndrome risk;
- 5) children less than two years old , all of whom have a general lack of immunity;
- 6) pregnant women in the second and third trimester due to their increased risk of cardiorespiratory diseases and stillbirths;
- 7) healthy people aged sixty-five years and older because of moderately increased risk of respiratory complications.

During pandemic influenza, an unknown proportion of other people within South Carolina will develop health complications. This will depends upon pandemic strain characteristics and susceptibility of the population. Although the current H1N1 pandemic is a lower severity, planning must address a high severity pandemic. This planning assumes that, with the FluSurge estimate for a 35% attack rate, admitted patients will immediately affect ICUs and rapidly increase pressure on the acute bed supply. By the end of week one influenza patients may require 37% of ICU bed and 16% of acute care bed capacity. To meet pandemic demands, hospitals must develop phased surge capacity. (See Appendix 4, Capacity: Approaches to Optimizing Hospital Capacity.) Gaining surge capacity will require deferral of the care of non-influenza patients and dynamic use of influenza triage, with admission and discharge criteria constantly adjusted to hospital capacity. This may also utilize nontraditional alternate care sites, such as ambulatory care centers, surgery centers, dialysis units, or increased use of monitored home care.

These approaches to optimum hospital utilization affect physical capacity, hospital staffing, and clinical practices phased to pandemic stages. Despite these efforts the most critical shortages will be shortages of respiratory support, including ventilators and critical care beds.

Triage reflects responsible allocation of resources and occurs daily in the health care environment. Routine triage focuses on how best to serve individual patients. Clinicians direct all available needed resources to care for each patient, giving priority to the most severely ill and treating everyone equally as possible within categories of severity.

Disaster triage shifts focus from preserving one life toward preserving as many lives possible with available resources. This occurs because using limited curative resources on one person with expected high probability of dying may cost the lives of several others. Similar triage happens in community settings experiencing small scale disasters whenever immediate needs overwhelm available resources. When pandemic influenza exhausts hospital surge capacity and usual health system resources in South Carolina, the Governor may invoke the Emergency Health Powers Act and signal clinicians to start community–focused triage statewide. (The declaration of the Emergency Health Powers Act may occur in a severe pandemic, or may not be declared, depending on many factors, including pandemic severity level and demand for resources.)

Disaster or community-focused triage ensures fair and equitable allocation of scarce resources and maximizes benefit to the population at large. This approach reflects federal and state goals for pandemic influenza to minimize serious illness and overall deaths. During community focused triage, designated triage officers will use pre-determined clinical decision rules to make allocation decisions, with separate medical personnel rendering treatment. Hospitals will designate personnel to serve in the role of triage officer. Triage officers will not provide direct patient care while serving in this role, but will rotate into treatment roles to limit bias in triage decisions. Adoption of the clinical decision rules for use in community-focused triage requires transparency and public endorsement. (See Appendix 5, "Specific Clinical Practice Guidelines.")

Community- focused triage for critical care does not challenge or contravene ethical doctrine but is a practical application of ethics. Use of a clinical decision tool ensures fairness and justice. Under circumstances which may expose vulnerable people to inequitable treatment, clearly defined and transparent criteria protect such individuals from inequities. Community-focused critical care triage does not deny care, because all patients receive care. Every human life has value, and every human being deserves respect, caring and compassion. Patients triaged from critical care will receive out-patient treatment, non-critical acute care, or palliative care.

In the United States an overwhelming crisis, such as pandemic influenza, justifies community-focused triage ethically, legally and morally, when all resources approach or risk exhaustion. This protocol is not a first step toward resource rationing under ordinary circumstances.

Triage officers require training for outpatient and hospital settings. Standardized outpatient evaluation will identify patients who need hospitalization and who should receive treatment at home or in outpatient facilities (see Prehospital Triage). Admission orders, following initial surge center or emergency department evaluations, may include non-invasive ventilatory support; however, triage officers will determine who may received critical care, specifically ventilator support, based upon Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) as a decision rule. See a more detailed description of SOFA in Appendices 5e and 5f.

The SOFA score triage tool uses general physiologic parameters. SOFA applies to a wide range of critical patient conditions and is not a disease-specific scoring system. Although not ordinarily used to ration critical care resources, under pandemic conditions SOFA design permits such allocation, particularly use of ventilators. Critical ventilator decisions will include both withholding access and withdrawing ventilator support. Greater pandemic severity will require more frequent SOFA scoring. As the pandemic evolves, local hospitals' ethics committees and consultants periodically should review triage criteria and clinical decisions to ensure fairness.

In the rare case that a triage officer and/or the attending intensivist may believe an initial assessment of mortality risk does not match a particular patient, a committee or process should be established to review the case.

SOFA-based triage offers prognosis for short-term survival to "save the most lives." However, during severe pandemics ventilator allocation may require choosing between patients with equal SOFA scores. In these cases other ethical criteria may apply, for example, maximizing the number of "life-years" saved and prioritizing younger patients to offer opportunities to live through life's stages. Appendix 5g "Specific Clinical Practice Guidelines, Multi-principle strategy for ventilator allocation", illustrates this multi-principle strategy for ventilator allocation.

Severely ill people, ineligible for critical care including ventilator support will be triaged into palliation. They will receive care to relieve the suffering caused by life-limiting illnesses and to maximize quality of remaining life. Severe pandemic influenza will impose pressures of overcrowding, limited resources, and large numbers of dying adults and children; the need for palliative care will expand. However, palliative care deliberately neither hastens nor postpones death. By providing relief from pain and other distressing symptoms, palliative care affirms life and regards dying as a normal process. When deaths occur, palliative care helps as possible with family bereavement. The need for end of life palliative care will be widespread during a pandemic and such care will be needed in multiple health care locations ranging from hospitals to non-traditional off site settings and even to patients' homes. Because no comprehensive
pandemic palliative care plans currently exist in South Carolina, the task force urges DHEC and the SC Hospital and Pharmacy Associations, to convene a Work Group to develop such plans, including medicinal protocols.

E. Public Risk Communication Recommendations

A pandemic virus is, by its nature, a new virus. Because of this, there will be very little known about it severity and ability to cause illness during the early stages of a pandemic. In order to remain as transparent as possible SCDHEC and its partners must educate the public on this lack of information, why so little is known about the virus, what is being done to learn more, and what people can do protect themselves. These protective messages must be consistently stated throughout the pandemic.

The public's response to the threat posed by the 2009 outbreak of H1N1 in South Carolina was very helpful in preventing the rapid spread of the illness. Those who were asked to either voluntarily quarantine or isolate themselves did so without resistance, thereby assisting public health's efforts to slow the spread. Similarly, the media frequently stressed the simple protective steps that anyone could employ --- covering your cough, washing your hands, staying home when sick, staying away from others who appear to be sick, and living a healthy lifestyle through diet, rest and exercise. Without a doubt, this cooperative spirit among the media and public helped prevent a potential growth in the number of cases.

Public health will not control the information flow during a pandemic. Technology will enable a much faster flow than during any previous pandemic period. Very little information will be available early in the outbreak. It becomes necessary to attempt to guard against the spread of rumor and disinformation. With many viruses typically named for the animal of origin (e.g. "swine flu" and "bird flu"), information must reflect the safety of the nation's food chain through the use of biosecurity measures on U.S. farms. Without such information, those industries could be falsely stigmatized or economically damaged by the public's refusal to eat their products.

The public will rely heavily on their healthcare provider to sort through the array of facts and myths to provide the most accurate information possible. Public health must respond with accurate information in a timely manner by way of the state's Health Alert Network and other available channels. Subsequently, that information should be shared with the public through the media in the continued effort to remain transparent.

F. Legal Recommendations: Limiting Liability in Pandemic Influenza

The Task Force believes it is important to address the potential tort liability of licensed health care providers (LHCP) during a Pandemic Influenza Public Health Event (PIPHE). We begin with a brief review of tort liability and how clinical practice guidelines, described elsewhere in this report, relate to a medical malpractice lawsuit. Various professional,

regulatory, and state statutes may also provide an avenue of potential tort immunity for LCHP. Public policy reasons are also discussed as to why LHCP should be protected from tort liability in a PIPHE.

1. Medical Malpractice in Post Crisis Litigation

Tort liability is a serious issue affecting our contemporary health care system when a patient suffers harm or dies during the delivery of health care services or procedures. Medical malpractice claims are generally based on negligence theories which focus of the breach of duty of care to patients. In South Carolina, any LHCP can be sued, but in order to be successfully sued, the injured party must prove: 1) the LHCP owed a duty of care to the injured party; 2) the LHCP breached the duty of care; 3) the breach of the duty caused the injury; and 4) the injured party suffered damages.

In medical malpractice cases, the duty of care is the degree of care observed by a competent practitioner acting in the same or similar circumstances.¹ A breach of that duty is the failure to do what an ordinarily careful doctor in the defendant's field of medicine would have done under the same or similar circumstances or the doing of something that an ordinarily careful doctor would not have done under the same or similar circumstances.²

To determine what "an ordinarily careful doctor" should have done in a particular setting, the fact finder looks to the "generally accepted medical practices and procedures." ³ Generally accepted medical practices evolve from various resources and are known as clinical and medical practice guidelines. They are "statements describing specific diagnostic or therapeutic maneuvers that should or should not be performed in certain specific clinical circumstances."⁴ In malpractice lawsuits, the parties and medical experts may disagree on which is the "generally accepted practice or procedure" in certain specific clinical circumstances.

One way to address the concerns that LHCP have about potential liability is to obtain a statewide consensus of the LHCP and their professional groups regarding any pandemic influenza clinical and medical practices (pandemic flu guidelines – PFGs) developed specifically

(www.charlestonbar.org/CM/ArchivedNewsletters/CivilCharges.doc#_Toc83807102]. (accessed 8.4.09)

¹ <u>King v. Williams</u>, 276 S.C. 478, 482, 279 S.E.2d 618, 620 (1981).

² Medical Malpractice Civil Jury Charges citing <u>Clark v Ross</u>, 284 S.C. 543, 328 S.E. 2d 91 (Ct. App. 1985). Charleston Bar Website.

[[]www.charlestonbar.org/CM/ArchivedNewsletters/CivilCharges.doc#_Toc83807102] (accessed 8.4.09)

³ Medical Malpractice Civil Jury Charges citing <u>Durham v. Vinson</u>, Op. No. 25872 (S.C. Sup. Ct. filed Sept 13, 2004); <u>Bessinger v. Deloach</u>, 230 S.C. 1, 94 S.E.2d 3 (1956); <u>Jernigan v. King</u>, 312 S.C. 331, 440 S.E.2d 379 (Ct. App. 1993). Charleston Bar Website

⁴ Chassin, M.R. Standards of Care in Medicine, Inquiry, 25 (1988): 438.

for pan flu triage and treatment. These groups include, but are not limited to, the South Carolina Hospital Association, the South Carolina Medical Association, the South Carolina Nurses Association, the South Carolina Academy of Family Physicians, the South Carolina Chapter of the American College of Physicians, the South Carolina College of Emergency Physicians, the South Carolina Society for Respiratory Care, and the state medical and nursing licensing boards. The practical effect of such a consensus would be that the PFGs become the *de facto* appropriate clinical and medical practices and procedures during a PIPHE in South Carolina. In any subsequent medical malpractice law suit, then, the question would not be whether the LHCP followed appropriate guidelines (the PFGs), but whether the LHCP followed the PFGs appropriately. The LCHP potential tort liability in a PIPHE is no more and no less than what it is normally and is a question of fact to be determined by the fact finder. The Task Force supports the PFGs described in Appendices 8 and 9 of this report.

Recommendations:

- 1. The South Carolina Board of Medical Examiners under the Medical Practice Act should recommend and approve the South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force Report as the clinical guidelines for implementation during a PIPHE
- 2. The South Carolina Board of Nursing under the Nurse Practice Act should recommend and approve the South Carolina Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force Report as the clinical and nursing guidelines for implementation during a PIPHE.
- DHEC and LHCP should endeavor to obtain a state-wide consensus on the use of these PFGs and assessment tools among LHCP, professional groups and regulatory boards.

2. Pandemic Influenza Guidelines and Statewide Implementation

Although consensus by LHCP and professional organizations on the PFGs may aid in successfully defending a medical malpractice lawsuit after the pandemic ends, LHCP have raised concerns about the adherence by other LCHP regarding implementation of the PFGs in a preconsensus situation. These concerns stem from several issues: 1) the extent to which the PFGs differ from everyday medical and clinical guidelines; 2) the primary trigger for statewide implementation of the PFGs; and 3) the consistency of statewide implementation.

a. Differences between everyday medical and clinical guidelines and PFGs

Everyday medical and clinical practice guidelines are utilized within the context of everyday healthcare delivery <u>uncomplicated by a scarcity of medical resources</u>, including health care delivery personnel. The PFGs address the <u>scarcity of medical resources available in a</u> <u>PIPHE</u> to treat patients and provide objective guidance on the necessary allocation and

rationing decisions, especially upon when to withhold or withdraw ventilatory support. ⁵ With the PFGs, medical priorities focus on providing care and allocating scarce resources, supplies and personnel in a manner that saves the greatest number of lives as opposed to focusing on just a single life. In this sense, the PFGs differ greatly from everyday medical and clinical practice guidelines.

b. The Trigger for Implementing PFGs

The trigger for statewide implementation of the PFGs should be clearly articulated, understood and agreed upon by professional organizations and regulatory boards dealing with healthcare delivery in South Carolina. The primary trigger for implementing the PFGs is DHEC confirmation of an onset of pandemic influenza cases anywhere in South Carolina that is accompanied by the local exhaustion of medical resources to treat the pandemic patient surge load.

Pre-pandemic planning must address the equitable implementation of the PFGs across the state. The logistical difficulties inherent in achieving a consistent statewide implementation should be examined by all stakeholders to minimize the effect of differing availabilities of medical services in lesser medically equipped communities. Failure to resolve the logistical difficulties will create inequities in patient treatment and risk the potential of one county exhausting its resources while an adjacent county has available resources for an influenza patient surge.

c. Preventing Inconsistent PFGs implementation

LHCP are concerned that some practitioners may implement the PFGs while others defer to the everyday medical and clinical guidelines out of fear of liability. Inconsistent implementation of the PFGs will result in health care inequities and could lead to an increase in successful medical malpractice suits after the pandemic influenza crisis has passed. For these reasons it is strongly suggested that all LHCP actively encourage position statements and public support on implementing the PFGs in a PIPHE by their respective professional organizations and regulatory boards.

To strengthen consistent statewide implementation and increase liability protection for LHCP, relevant professional organizations should seek visible support for their members from their respective regulatory boards. The South Carolina Board of Medical Examiners and the South Carolina Board of Nursing are the two main regulatory bodies given statutory authority to oversee health care practice and delivery. Under the Medical Practice Act ⁶ and

⁵ See for example, Devereaux, Asha V., et al., Definitive Care for the Critically III During a Disaster: A Framework for Allocation of Scarce Resources in Mass Critical Care, Chest 2008; 133;55-66.

⁶ Medical Practice Act. Title 40. Chapter 47. Article 1.

the Nurse Practice Act⁷ each board can publish advisory opinions and position statements relating to practice procedures or policies authorized or acquiesced to by any agency, facility, institution, or other organization that employs persons authorized to practice under each of its respective acts. Additionally, each regulatory board should apply their respective codes of professional ethics to guide health care professionals during a PIPHE, pursuant to the powers given to each under Section 40-1-70 (4).⁸

Recommendations:

- DHEC should determine the use of its authorities under its basic public health authorities and the Emergency Health Powers Act, Sections 44-4-100 to -570, to trigger a statewide implementation of the PFGs for triage and treatment during a PIPHE.
- 2. South Carolina's LCHP, professional organizations and regulatory boards should identify, articulate and obtain consensus regarding a clear primary trigger(s) for implementing the PFGs

G. Present Statutory Provisions

Presently, there are two South Carolina statutes that directly limit the civil liability of some classifications of LHCP. <u>These statutes are limited in their applicability and would not</u>

Section 40-47-10 (I)(1 & 3). In addition to the powers and duties enumerated in Section 40-1-70, the board may:

(1) publish advisory opinions and position statements relating to practice procedures or policies authorized or acquiesced to by any agency, facility, institution, or other organization that employs persons authorized to practice under this chapter to comply with acceptable standards of practice;

(3) *adopt rules governing the proceedings of the board and may promulgate regulations for the practice of medicine* and as necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter

⁷ Nursing Practice Act. Title 40. Chapter 33. Article 1.

Section 40-33-10 (I)(1) In addition to the powers and duties enumerated in Section 40-1-70, the board may:

(1) *publish advisory opinions and position statements relating to nursing practice procedures or policies* authorized or acquiesced to by any agency, facility, institution, or other organization that employs persons authorized to practice under this chapter to comply with acceptable standards of nursing practice

⁸ Professions and Occupations. Title 40. Chapter 1. Article 1.

Section 40-1-70 (4) Powers and duties of boards. The powers and duties of regulatory boards include but are not limited to: (4) adopting a *code of professional ethics* appropriate to the profession or occupation which it licenses or regulates

<u>cover all LHCP providing health care under the PFGs.</u> The two statutes are the Emergency Health Powers Act (EHPA)⁹ and the Medical Malpractice Insurance Act.¹⁰

The EHPA deals specifically with *appointed* LHCP and provides civil liability protection during a "public health emergency" declared by the Governor. Once the EPHA is triggered, DHEC is granted authority to appoint and prescribe the duties of LHCP as volunteers to assist with the response to the public health emergency. DHEC appoints volunteer health professionals under S.C. Code Ann. 44-4-570 by entering into a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with the volunteer with duties prescribed by various DHEC policies and standing medical orders. A LHCP appointed under this statute "will not be held liable for any civil damages as a result of medical care or treatment including, but not limited to, trauma care and triage assessment, related to the appointment of the health care provider and the prescribed duties unless the damages result from providing, or failing to provide, medical care or treatment under circumstances demonstrating a reckless disregard for the consequences so as to affect the life or health of the patient." ¹¹

South Carolina's Medical Malpractice Insurance Act provides liability protections for *volunteer* LHCP. No LCHP "who renders medical services voluntarily and without compensation or the expectation or promise of compensation is liable for any civil damage for any act or omission resulting from the rendering of the services." This statute does not cover an act or omission that was the result of gross negligence or willful misconduct. The LHCP who seeks this protection must enter into an agreement to provide a voluntary non-compensated service prior to rendering the care.

Due to the lack of specific liability protection for LHCP during a response to a PIPHE, the Task Force recommends that the LHCP professional organizations and regulatory boards consider legislation modeled after Virginia Code Section 8.01-225.02. "Certain liability protection for health care providers during disasters":

Section 38-79-30 Volunteer Health Care Provider not liable for civil damages; exception.

No licensed health care provider, as defined in Section 38-79-410, who renders medical services voluntarily and without compensation or the expectation or promise of compensation is liable for any civil damage for any act or omission resulting from the rendering of the services unless the act or omission was the result of the licensed health care provider's gross negligence or willful misconduct. The agreement to provide a voluntary non-compensated service must be made before the rendering of the service by the licensed health care provider.

¹¹ Emergency Health Powers. Section 44-4-570 (C)(1).

⁹ Emergency Health Power Act Title 44, Chapter 4, Article 1.

¹⁰ Medical Malpractice Insurance Act. Title 38. Chapter 79. Article 1.

In the absence of gross negligence or willful misconduct, any health care provider who responds to a disaster shall not be liable for any injury or wrongful death of any person arising from the delivery or withholding of health care when (i) a state or local emergency has been or is subsequently declared in response to such disaster, and (ii) the emergency and subsequent conditions caused a lack of resources, attributable to the disaster, rendering the health care provider unable to provide the level or manner of care that otherwise would have been required in the absence of the emergency and which resulted in the injury or wrongful death at issue.

In support of specific legislation, there are several public policy considerations that justify limiting the liability of *all LHCP* appropriately implementing the PFGs. These considerations are based on certain ethical principles: 1) the LHCP obligation to provide care; 2) fairness; and 3) reciprocity. Inherent to all codes of ethics for health care professionals is the duty to provide care and to respond to suffering. Health care providers will have to weigh demands of their professional roles against other competing obligations to their own health, and to family and friends. Moreover, health care workers will face significant challenges related to resource allocation, scope of practice, professional liability and workplace conditions. Ethical principles dictate that society should support those who face a disproportionate burden in protecting the public health and welfare and take steps to minimize the excessive burdens when providing health care under extraordinary circumstances.

Recommendations:

- 1. Within existing DHEC policies and standing medical orders under the EHPA, DHEC should:
 - a. clarify "appointee" and "appointment" as these terms relate to appointing volunteers in the specific context of a PIPHE;
 - b. delineate which classifications of LHCP are to be appointed;
 - c. confirm the MOA process by which LHCP, as defined in S.C. Ann. § 44.4.130(L), are to be appointed under Section 44-4-570 of the EHPA; and
 - d. determine what duties would be prescribed to the appointed LHCP.
- The South Carolina LHCP and their professional organizations and regulatory boards should explore the need for a legislative initiative to provide additional statutory or regulatory liability protection for the professionals each governs and regulates.

The Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force understands it is an advisory body and that these recommendations do not constitute legal advice to any Regulatory Board or to DHEC. However, the Task Force recognizes the well founded concerns of LHCP, as outlined above, and encourages the professional organizations, regulatory boards and DHEC to take the steps recommended in this report.

H. Notes on Public Response to Draft Report

Regional Public Forums

In April of 2009, the South Carolina Pandemic Ethics Task Force held public forums in Myrtle Beach, Greenville, Charleston and Columbia to present the Task Force's initial recommendations for the decisions that may be made in a pandemic.

The Myrtle Beach and Greenville public forums were held prior to the occurrence of the H1N1 novel virus in South Carolina. These public forums were attended by a few members of the general and health care public. At these forums, attendees primarily questioned the distribution of antivirals and ventilators, how many were available and who would receive the public stockpiles of antivirals. There were no specific concerns related to the recommendations, but the forums did provide an opportunity to discuss some of the issues that might arise in a pandemic.

Immediately prior to the Charleston and Columbia public forums, the first cases of H1N1 novel virus were identified in South Carolina. These public forums were well attended; many of the questions and discussions were focused on the H1N1 virus and influenza prevention. However, questions were again raised on the distribution of antivirals, especially to special populations; with no disagreement noted on the Task Force's recommendations. Questions were raised about SCDHEC's plans to reach non-English speaking communities in a pandemic. There was general agreement that health care providers would have to make difficult decisions and the recommendations as listed in the public summary regarding this decision-making were supported by the attendees.

State Summit

The Ethics Task Force report was presented in a public summit held in Columbia, South Carolina, on July 15, 2009. The Summit was publicized in the media and advance notices were sent to pandemic planning partners. A live webcast of the summit presentations was made available for persons who could not attend the summit in Columbia.

As in the regional public forums, there were no disagreements voiced over the published recommendations. There were, however, many questions about response to a pandemic, particularly to the H1N1 influenza pandemic. Questions included concerns over availability of a vaccine and information related to that vaccine, and the roles of various agencies such as churches and synagogues and home care providers. A question was raised by a volunteer agency over the protection of volunteer physicians from malpractice. This question was answered by an attending SCDHEC legal representative who assured the attendee that the Emergency Health Powers Act provides limited liability for health care providers who become SCDHEC volunteers.

VI. APPENDICES:

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Pandemic Influenza Severity Index

2. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Table 1. Vaccination target groups, estimated populations, and tiers for severe, moderate, and less severe pandemics as defined by the Pandemic Severity Index (PSI)

3. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "Guidance on Antiviral Drug Use during an Influenza Pandemic", Table: Settings and strategies for antiviral drug use during an influenza pandemic

- 4. Capacity: Approaches to Optimizing Hospital Capacity
- 5. Specific Clinical Practice Guidelines
 - a. Adult Self-Assessment Tool
 - b. Potential Actions to Maintain Critical Primary Care Services by Pandemic Period
 - c. Primary Assessment Record Adult
 - d. Secondary Assessment Record Adult
 - e. SOFA Scoring
 - f. SOFA Score by Date-Time
 - g. Multi-principle Strategy for ventilator allocation
 - h. Multi-principle Patient Comparison Scoring
 - i. Adult Palliative Care Orders
 - j. Adult Continuous Analgesia and Dyspnea Opiod Therapy Orders End of Life Patients
 - k. Palliative Care Protocol for Withdrawal of Artificial Life Support in the Intensive Care Unit
- 6. Bibliography

APPENDIX 1: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Pandemic Influenza Severity Index.



Assumes 30% Illness Rate and Unmitigated Pandemic Without Interventions

APPENDIX 2: Vaccine Target Groups, Estimated Populations, and Tiers for Severe, Moderate and Less Severe Pandemics as Defined by the Pandemic Severity Index (PSI)

Table 1. Vaccination target groups, estimated populations, and tiers for severe, moderate and less severe pandemics as defined by the Pandemic Severity Index (PSI). Persons in occupational groups not specifically targeted for vaccination in Moderate and Less Severe pandemics are targeted according to their age and health status in the general population.

	Tier 1 Tier 2 Tier 3 Tier	4 Tier 5 No	ot Targeted**		
			Seve	rity of Pando	emic
Category	Target Group	Estimated Number*	Severe	Moderate	Less severe
Homeland and national security	Deployed and mission critical personnel Essential support & sustainment personnel Intelligence services Border protection personnel National Guard personnel Other domestic national security personnel Other active duty & essential support	700,000 650,000 150,000 100,000 500,000 50,000 1,500,000			
Health care and community support services	Public health personnel Inpatient health care providers Outpatient and home health providers Health care providers in LTCFs Community support & emergency management Pharmacists Mortuary services personnel Other important health care personnel	300,000 3,200,000 2,500,000 1,600,000 600,000 150,000 50,000 300,000			
Critical infrastructure	Emergency services sector personnel (EMS, law enforcement and fire services) Mfrs of pandemic vaccine & antivirals Communications/IT, Electricity, Nuclear, Oil & Gas, and Water sector personnel Financial clearing & settlement personnel Critical operational & regulatory government personnel Banking & Finance, Chemical, Food & Agriculture, Pharmaceutical, Postal & Shipping, and Transportation sector personnel Other critical government personnel	2,000,000 50,000 2,150,000 3,400,000			
General population	Pregnant women Infants & toddlers 6–35 mo old Household contacts of infants < 6 mo Children 3–18 yrs with high risk condition Children 3–18 yrs without high risk Persons 19–64 with high risk condition Persons >65 yrs old Healthy adults 19–64 yrs old	3,100,000 10,300,000 4,300,000 6,500,000 58,500,000 36,000,000 38,000,000 123,350,000			

*Estimates rounded to closest 50,000. Occupational target group population sizes may change as plans are developed further for implementation of the pandemic vaccination program

APPENDIX 3: Settings and Strategies for Antiviral Drug Use During an Influenza Pandemic and Rationales.

Setting and target population	Antiviral strategy	Rationale	Pandemic response goals addressed by antiviral strategy	Estimated number of regimens (million)
	Recom	mendations for antiviral drugs from public sector stockpiles		
Initial pandemic outbreaks overseas and in the U.S.	Treatment; PEP, targeted prophylaxis	Effective containment of the initial outbreak of a novel influenza virus strain may prevent the pandemic Quenching efforts overseas and in the U.S will slow pandemic spread and provide more time for preparedness	Slow pandemic spread	6
Exposed travelers entering the U.S. early in a pandemic	PEP	Contributes to a risk-based policy to reduce the entry of infected persons and delay U.S. outbreaks	Slow pandemic spread	
Persons with pandemic influenza illness	Treatment	 Reduces influenza complications, hospitalization, and death Reduces duration of illness and transmission of infection Meets patient and provider expectations for medical care 	Reduce health impacts	79*
Outbreak control in closed settings (e.g., nursing homes, prisons)	PEP	High risk of illness and death when outbreaks occur in closed settings Documented success of PEP for seasonal outbreaks Consistent with accepted public health practice Protects those in whom vaccination may be less effective	Reduce health impacts	5
	Recommend	ations for antiviral drugs primarily from private sector stock	piles	
Healthcare and emergency service workers	Outbreak (pre- exposure) prophylaxis for workers with high- risk exposure	Reduces infection and absenteeism in a critical workforce Protects those at highest occupational risk Reduces chance of transmitting infection to high-risk patients with illnesses other than influenza	Reduce health impacts Minimize societal disruption	103
	PEP given exposure of other workers			
Persons who are severely immuno- compromised	PEP	 High risk for severe complications and mortality from pandemic influenza, if infected Antiviral drugs are the only option for disease prevention 	Reduce health impacts	2
TOTAL NUMBER (OF ANTIVIRAL DRU	G REGIMENS FOR FULL IMPLEMENTATION	£	195

*A prior estimate of 75 million regimens has served as the basis for public sector stockpiling. The 79 million regimen estimate was calculated 4 using updated planning assumptions

Capacity	Activity
	 Defer any services for non-life-threatening conditions where no severe adverse health consequences are anticipated for the delay
	 Discharge Alternate Level of Care (ALC) patients to Long-Term Care homes when beds are immediately available
	 Discharge acute inpatients to home care when care can be provided safely in that environment
Physical Capacity	 Discharge acute patients to family and self care when care can be provided safely in the environment
	Create "flex beds" from reserved beds or recently closed beds
	 Use ventilator capacity anywhere in the hospital where sufficient oxygen capacity exists (e.g. ER, post-anesthetic care units), cohort infectious patient and noninfectious patients
	Deploy freed-up beds for influenza patients
	Re-deploy clinical staff from deferred services
	Defer staff holidays and leaves of absence until pandemic ends
	• For staff willing to work extra hours, establish 12-hour shifts up to the maximum recommended number of days per staff
Hospital	 Training non-clinical staff to provide support services such as meals, personal care, and patient movement for treatment, site cleaning and support for health care workers and their families, so the workers can do their job (e.g. child care, pet care)
Staffing	 Recruit clinical agency staff in coordination with other hospitals in the immediate geographic area
	 Encourage members of the public to take home health care courses before the pandemic so they know how to prevent infection and provide supportive care for family members who are ill; train family members of hospital patients to provide home health care
	 Cross-train clinical staff for influenza care and other essential services during a pandemic and other large-scale emergencies
Clinical Practices	Adopt clinical care practices to optimize hospital capacity

APPENDIX 4: Capacity: Approaches to Optimizing Hospital Capacity

APPENDIX 5: Specific Clinical Practices

APPENDIX 5 a: Adult Self-Assessment Tool

Adult Self-Assessment Tool





Continuing Influenza-Like Illness Assessment

APPENDIX 5 b: Potential Actions to Maintain Critical Primary Care Services by Pandemic Period

Strategy	Actions During the Pandemic Alert (phases 3 to 5, before pandemic influenza is in your community)	Actions During the Pandemic (phase 6, when pandemic influenza is in your community)
	□ Identify the types of services that could be delivered by phone (e.g., counseling, some assessment services)	□ Provide as much care and advice as is safely possible by phone.
Deliver services in different	□ Identify the types of prescription medications that can be renewed without having the patient come into the office	□ Consider home visits to patients whose health may be compromised by coming into the office.
ways	□ Inventory your staff's competencies to identify services that could be delegated to other providers/ staff members competent to provide them [SC Delegation of Controlled Acts policy for more information.]	<i>[Work within Delegation of Controlled Acts policy to delegate tasks.]</i>
Defer some services	 Identify primary care services that can safely be reduced or deferred during a pandemic <i>[see Ontario Table 11.3]</i> See the laboratory/diagnostic services that will be reduced or suspended during a pandemic <i>[see Ontario Chapter 14, Table 14.2]</i> Learn how to access information from your public health unit during an emergency (i.e.,how can you get on their distribution list). Take into account the services that local hospitals plan to defer (e.g., outpatient clinics, nonessential referrals, elective surgeries). 	 Decide which services to defer – and the length of the deferment – based on the severity of the pandemic, and triage patients accordingly Access information in real time from the local medical officer of health about the severity of the pandemic in your district and how to handle services Do not send patients to the hospital for non-essential services.
Deliver new services	□ Take into account new services you may have to provide during a pandemic (e.g., services currently offered in hospital).	Implement plan.
Develop plans to ensure continuity of care for all patients, including vulnerable patients	 Maintain a list of vulnerable patients (e.g., people who live alone, people who are handicapped, people who require ongoing monitoring for a health condition, frail elderly) Identify strategies to meet their needs during a pandemic (e.g., regular phone contact, having them move in with a family member, home blood pressure monitoring, referring them to a community service if available) 	🗆 Implement plan
Use appropriate occupational health	 Be familiar with recommended occupational practices for employer Reinforce training, hand hygiene health and safety/infection prevention and control practices [Ontario see Chapter 7] Be aware of your responsibilities under the Occupational Health and Safety Act (e.g., train workers, provide appropriate personal protective equipment) Engineering controls: Make changes to the physical environment (if possible) to reduce the spread of influenza Administrative/Work Practices: Recommend annual influenza immunization for all staff; Hand washing with soap & water at the point of care; ask coughing patients to wear a surgical mask in the waiting room; have a separate area for influenza-like illness (ILI) patients; schedule ILI patients at a certain time during the day (e.g., non-ILI patients in the morning and ILI patients in the afternoon); conduct telephone triage to divert patients to appropriate level of care; erect plexiglass barriers between receptionists and clients; cohort patients in the waiting area Develop policies to encourage staff to stay home when they are sick Personal Protective Equipment: Determine type of personal protective equipment required for all staff based on the job that they perform [see risk assessment in Ontario Chapter 7] Ensure you have received your emergency infection control kit from DHEC Establish fit testing program for staff who require (based on the risk assessment) N95 respirators (phase 5). [See list of organizations assisting with fit testing] 	Practitioner as employer Reinforce training, hand hygiene Use the screening tool provided by DHEC to screen patients for flu symptoms, and implement appropriate precautions (e.g., referring patients to a flu surge center, asking patients to wear a surgical mask in the waiting area). Use DHEC screening tool to screen staff for flu symptoms and implement appropriate workplace practices (i.e., ask staff to go home if they are sick) Clean more frequently and follow environmental guidelines for cleaning [see Ontario Chapter 7] Access DHEC district equipment stockpiles when necessary

Strategy	Actions During the Pandemic Alert (phases 3 to 5, before pandemic influenza is in your community)	Actions During the Pandemic (phase 6, when pandemic influenza is in your community)
	□ Maintain a four-week stockpile of personal protective equipment [DHEC also maintains a four-week stockpile. To access this stockpile, contact your District	☐ If supplies of equipment such as N95 or comparable respirators run out, provide surgical masks
	DHEC office]	Practitioner as employee
Use appropriate	Use DHEC training materials to provide general training/information for staff	□ Follow recommended practices,
occupational health continued	Practitioner as employee Be familiar with recommended occupational health and safety/infection prevention and control practices [Ontario Chapter 7.5, p 7-8]	including appropriate use of personal protective equipment
	□ Participate in risk assessment and training policies and procedures, cough	
	etiquette, and use of personal protective equipment	
Establish links	Establish links with other primary care practitioners and make arrangements to provide coverage for one another in the event of staff shortages during a pandemic	Work collaboratively to maintain essential primary care services and provide care for
with other primary care providers	☐ Identify opportunities to collaborate/ share resources (e.g., share responsibility for staffing patient call line, collaborate to reduce costs associated with fit testing of N95 masks, designate one site for influenza assessment and another for other patients)	people with influenza
	□ Ensure local public health unit district, DHEC, and your professional college and association have your up-to-date contact information so you receive information and directives during pandemic	☐ Implement role in the plan
Be part of the community's	□ Be aware of the resources (website, tools, subcommittees) available from the local public health district and how to access them during pandemic	
pandemic plan	□ Identify issues to addressee in local plans to maintain primary care services	
	(e.g., access to child care and elder care services)	
	□ Negotiate arrangements to provide services in flu surge centers (if established), long-term care homes or other settings, if required	
	□ Maintain an up-to-date list of patient contact information	Use messages on answering
	□ Tell patients how office and care practices will change during pandemic (e.g., more care provided by phone, the use of flu surge centers in communities that establish them)	machines and signs on doors to advise patients to call the office or [<i>Flu Information Hotline</i>], rather than coming in.
Communicate with patients	□ Give patients information about how to protect themselves from flu and how to care for family members who fall ill. [DHEC has fact sheets in several languages. During pandemic alert period (phase 5), district PH offices will distribute these fact sheets to all primary care practices, along with information on how to order more.]	□ Walk-in and after hours clinics should post signs advising people to phone for information whether to come to clinic or go elsewhere for assessment and care.
	□ Explore services, such as mass emails or reverse 911, which will automatically send a phone message to all your patients	□ Put information about deferred services during the pandemic on answering machine, on doors and in offices.
		□ Use information provided by DHEC (e.g., fact sheets) to ensure patients & public receive consistent messages.
	□ Maintain an up-to-date list of all staff contact information	□ Update staff daily
Communicate with	□ Inform staff about the plans to maintain services during a pandemic	Use information provided by
staff	□ Consult with and inform public health district office	DHEC (e.g., Important Health Notices, directives) to ensure staff
	□ Use DHEC fact sheets to provide information on influenza, occupational health and safety/infection prevention and control	receive consistent messages
Maintain business continuity plans	Review and update your business continuity plan. [See Ontario tools for business continuity checklist]	□ Implement business continuity

APPENDIX 5 c: Primary Assessment Record – Adult

			MRN:	(rth: / / ie: Home: () -	Age:
	Prima	ry Assessm	ent Record -	Adult	
Date:	Tim	e:			
(hand hygier			y have influenza! N95 respirator and	l gown if clo	ose contact)
Section	1: History				
Check all that applies below and give dates when symptoms started					
Che	ck all that app	lies below and give	dates when sympton	ns started	
Che General	ck all that app When?	lies below and give Doctor's Comments	dates when sympton	when?	Doctor's Comments
	 I	Doctor's		1	
General	 I	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting Diarrhea	1	
General Fever (>100.4°F)	 I	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting	1	
General Fever (>100.4°F) Chills Headache Aching muscles	 I	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting Diarrhea	1	
General Fever (>100.4°F) Chills Headache	 I	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting Diarrhea Abdominal Pain	When?	
General Fever (>100.4°F) Chills Headache Aching muscles and joints	 I	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting Diarrhea Abdominal Pain Neurological Confusion or	When?	
General Fever (>100.4°F) Chills Headache Aching muscles and joints Stiffness	 I	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting Diarrhea Abdominal Pain Neurological Confusion or drowsiness	When?	
General Fever (>100.4°F) Chills Headache Aching muscles and joints Stiffness Weakness	 I	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting Diarrhea Abdominal Pain Neurological Confusion or drowsiness Convulsions Contact Have you had contact with someone with	When? When?	
General Fever (>100.4°F) Chills Headache Aching muscles and joints Stiffness Weakness Red or watery eyes	 I	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting Diarrhea Abdominal Pain Neurological Confusion or drowsiness Convulsions Contact Have you had contact	When? When?	
General Fever (>100.4°F) Chills Headache Aching muscles and joints Stiffness Weakness Red or watery eyes Earache	When?	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting Diarrhea Abdominal Pain Neurological Confusion or drowsiness Convulsions Contact Have you had contact with someone with	When? When?	
General Fever (>100.4°F) Chills Headache Aching muscles and joints Stiffness Weakness Red or watery eyes Earache Respiratory Cough Sore Throat	When?	Doctor's	Digestive Vomiting Diarrhea Abdominal Pain Neurological Confusion or drowsiness Convulsions Contact Have you had contact with someone with proven Influenza? Have you had contact with someone with	When? When?	

		Name of patient: Address: Date of birth: / / MRN:	Age:
		Telephone: Home: Other: () -	()-
Section 2: Aller	gies		
1	Reaction:	:	
2	Reaction	:	
3	Reaction		
4	Reaction:	:	
Section 3: Med	lications		
Please list the medications you t	take:		
Medication List			
Name	Dose (mg/# of pills)	When taken/how often	What is it for?
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			

Name of patient: Address: Date of birth: / / MRN: Telephone: Home: () -Other: () -

Age:

Section 4: Assessment

Clinical Case definition

When influenza is circulating in the community, the presence of fever and cough of acute onset are good predictors of influenza. The positive predictive value increases when fever is higher than 38°C (100.4°F) and when the onset of clinical illness is acute. Other symptoms, such as sore throat, rhinorrhea, malaise, chills, myalgia and headache may also be present. Any case definitions developed prior to the pandemic may need to be modified once the pandemic occurs. A history of contact with another patient with influenza-like illness or with an influenza case confirmed by the laboratory should be sought. If present, it is of diagnostic value

 \times

Signature of patient or person completing this form

If patient meets any of the following criteria, apply oxygen to maintain spO2>90% and notify MD immediately:

 Clinical evidence of severe respin impending respiratory failure 	atory distress or 🛛 🕄	SpO2 ≤ 90%
 Systolic BP < 90mmHg Inability to protect airway 		HR < 40/min or > 120/min RR > 30
Heart Rate: (per min)	HR > 100/min?	□ no □ yes
Resp Rate: (per min)	RR > 24/min?	□ no □ yes
Blood Pressure:(mmHg)	Systolic BP < 100mmHg?	□ no □ yes
Temp:(°F)	T > 100.4°F?	□ no □ yes
SpO2:%	SpO2 < 90%?	□ no □ yes
Mucous Membranes:	Lips/Nail beds cyanotic?	□ no □ yes
Chest Auscultation:	Are crackles present?	□ no □ yes
Mental Status:	Is patient confused?	□ no □ yes
Chest Pain:	Patient has chest pain?	□ no □ yes
Vomiting:	Vomiting > 3 times/24hrs	🗆 no 🗆 yes

If all "no" boxes are checked, go to section 5. If any "yes" boxes are checked send the patient for secondary assessment¹ (document in Section 8, Part C).

¹ Secondary assessment may be a doctor's office, an emergency room, hospital or any designated place that the patient will be evaluated by a physician or mid-level provider.

	Name of patient: Address:
	Dale of birth: / / Age: MRN: Telephone: Home: () - Other: () -
Section 5: Discharge Assessment	
Does this patient have influenza-like illness?	
 □ No -→ Discharge home with influenza education. □ Yes -→ Continue this questionnaire. 	
Did this patient's influenza symptoms start within the last 48 hours?	
 □ No —→ Skip to Section 8. □ Yes -→ Continue. 	
Has this patient had contact with influenza or an influenza-like illness?	
 No -→ Continue to Section 6. Yes -→ Skip to Section 7. 	
When available, perform influenza testing.	
Section 6: Testing	
□ Influenza test positive→ Continue on to sec (If indicated, send to DHEC lab for	
□ Influenza test negative -→ Skip to Section 8.	
If influenza testing not available, send patient for secondary assessme	nt ² .
2	

² Secondary assessment may be a doctor's office, an emergency room, hospital or any designated place that the patient will be evaluated by a physician or mid-level provider.

	Name of patient: Address:	
	Date of birth: / / MRN: Telephone: Home: () - Other: () -	Age:
Section 7: Treatment		
This patient has confirmed or presumed influenzo	1!	
Treat with antiviral per current CDC recommendations.		
Other symptomatic treatment as indicated.		
Prescriptions given:		
1		
	_	
2	_	
3	_	
Give patient influenza education and self-care instruction s		r and courth have
Give patient influenza education and self-care instruction s Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have
Patient should be considered contagious and avoid contact resolved.		r and cough have

Name of patient: Address: Date of birth: / / MRN: Telephone: Home: () -Other: () -

Age:

Section 8: Disposition

Check all that apply:

Age > 65 years	Pregnancy
Chronic lung disease	Congestive heart failure
Renal Failure	Immunosuppression
Hematologic / Blood abnormalities	Diabetes
Liver disease	

A. If any boxes are checked, discharge home with telephone follow-up in 48 hours.

Patient discharged to home; telephone follow-up scheduled for _____

B. If no boxes are checked, discharge home with follow up as needed.

- Self care instruction sheet given.
- Influenza education given.
- Contagious / contact precautions given (for confirmed, presumed or possible influenza).
- Prescriptions provided.

And for patients requiring secondary assessment per Section 4:

C. Patient sent for secondary assessment at _____

Contact precautions instituted.

Transportation arranged (if necessary).

Discharge Date:	Time:	
Assessors Name/ Title:		
Assessors signature:		

APPENDIX 5 d: Secondary Assessment Orders for Hospital – Adult

	Address		
	MRN		
	DOB:/		Age
	Phone: H	C	1334633
This patient may have in (hand hygiene, gloves, eye protection, N95 respira		f close cont	act).
Clinical Case Definiti	ion:		
When influenza is circulating in the community, the presence of feve predictors of influenza. The positive predictive value increases when of clinical illness is acute (less 48 hours after the prodromes). Other malaise, rigors or chills, myalgia and headache may also be present pandemic may need to be modified once the pandemic occurs. A his influenza-like illness or with an influenza case confirmed by the labo diagnostic value.	n fever is higher than symptoms, such as t. Any case definition story of contact with	38°C and wh sore throat, rh ns developed another patie	en the onset hinorrhea, prior to the nt with
Secondary Assessment for	Hospital – A	dult	
Assessor's name (first name, last name) Qualifications	Date (dd/mm/yy)	Time (hh	: mm)
Section 1 – Assess	ment		
1a. If patient meets any of the following criteria, apply oxygen and		ely - (check al	i that apply)
	notify MD immediate	ely - (check al	(that apply)
 1a. If patient meets any of the following criteria, apply oxygen and a SpO₂ < 90% Inability to protect airway HR < 40/min or >120/min Clinical evidence of severe respiratory distress or impending r	notify MD immediate	ely - (check al Time (hh : mm)	l that apply) Initials
 1a. If patient meets any of the following criteria, apply oxygen and a SpO₂ < 90% Inability to protect airway HR < 40/min or >120/min Clinical evidence of severe respiratory distress or impending means of the Systolic BP < 90mmHg RR > 30/min 1b. If none of the above criteria are present	notify MD immediate espiratory failure Completed Date	Time	
 1a. If patient meets any of the following criteria, apply oxygen and a SpO₂ < 90% Inability to protect airway HR < 40/min or >120/min Clinical evidence of severe respiratory distress or impending magnetic systelic BP < 90mmHg RR > 30/min 1b. If none of the above criteria are present - complete the following Orders 	notify MD immediate espiratory failure Completed Date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Time (hh:mm)	
 1a. If patient meets any of the following criteria, apply oxygen and a SpO₂ < 90% Inability to protect airway HR < 40/min or >120/min Clinical evidence of severe respiratory distress or impending means of the spore criteria are present complete the following Orders 1. CBC, K+, Na+, CI-, HC03, Cr, Ur, glucose, AST, ALT, ALP, Tbili, CK 	notify MD immediate espiratory failure Completed Date (dd/mm/yyyy) / / /	Time (hh:mm) :	
 1a. If patient meets any of the following criteria, apply oxygen and a SpO₂ < 90% Inability to protect airway HR < 40/min or >120/min Clinical evidence of severe respiratory distress or impending respiratory distress distress or impending respiratory distress distress distr	notify MD immediate espiratory failure Completed Date (dd/mm/yyyy) / / / / /	Time (hh : mm) :	

Patient r	name		
Address			
MRN	-		
DOB:	1	1	Age
Phone: I	H		

	Column A		Column B		Column C
	Acute confusion		Evidence of pneumonia		Age > 65 years
	Hgb < 8.0g/dL		New cough producing sputum,		Pregnancy
	WBC < 2.5 k or > 12 k		or change in sputum quality		chronic lung disease
	15% bands cells or `left shift'on CBC		Crackles or evidence or consolidation on chest		congestive heart failure
	Plt < 50 000/L	_	examination.	100	chronic renal failure
	Na+ < 125mEq or > 148mEq	ч	Infiltrates on chest xray		immunosuppression
	K+ < 3mEq or > 5.5mEq			1000	haematological abnormalities
	BUN > 30 mg/dL			1000	diabetes
	Cr > 1.7 mg/dl				hepatic disease
	glucose < 70 mg/dL or > 250 mg/dL				
	CK > 1000				
8	Requires supplemental oxygen Sp02 < 90% on room air				
	Requires Intravenous fluids/medications				
	Acute cardiac/hemodynamic Deterioration				
	EKG evidence of ischemia				
	Positive Troponin(cardiac enzymes)				
	unable to self-care/lack of home supports				
Hf o	Notify admission team Olumn B is checked, this p go to section 2	atier	checked, this patient requires adn It can be discharged with appropr checked this patient requires adn	iate ou	tpatient treatment.

Patient na	me			
Address				
MRN				
DOB:	1	1	Age	
Phone: H	- 25	0	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	

[140 -	(age in years) 1 x (Cr in µmol/L)	(wt in ka	X1.2=	x [0.85 if female] =	ml/min
lf CrCl > 50ml/min* 4 days	Levofloxacin 50 or Cefuroxime 500	0 mg PO od x 10 da) mg PO q12h x 10 d 00 mg PO x 1, then 2	iys lays and	Number of pi	
f CrCl 25 - 49 Ce	furoxime 500 mg Azithromycin 500	x 1 then or 250 mg PO q12h x 10 days mg PO x 1, then 25 days	and	First dos Time (h	e given hamm)
10 days If CrCl 10 – 24 4 days	or Cefuroxime 50	00g PO x 1 then 250 0 mg PO q12h x 10 00mg PO x 1, then 2	days and	Assessor	s initials
lf CrCl < 10 4 days	or Cefuroxime 50	50g POq48h x 10 da 0 mg POq24h x 10 00mg POx 1, then 2	days and		
Did this patien	t's influenza syn	nptoms start within	the last 48 hours	?	
Yes	oseltamivir	rge with Follow-up 75mg PO bid* x 5 d as first line treatme	days	Number of pi	lls provided
100000000000000000000000000000000000000	unless CrCl is <	10ml/min, or on dial ce daily if CrCl 10-3 OR	lysis)	First dose ose Time (h Assessor	h:mm)
(recomm	ended if CrCl < 10 bre	2 inhalations) bid ml/min, on dialysis, astfeeding). Warning: led for patients with	or if pregnant or	First dose zz Time (h 	h:mm)
Physician name		Physician signature	č	SC licence	Date (dd/mm/yyyy)

	Addre MRN DOB:	
	Phon	
Section 3	- Discharge with Fol	low-up
ollow-up planned: (in preferred order (ie. F	atient does not have access to a tel	ephone, clinical factors etc.)).
Check if antivirals received		
Primary care (copy assessment for		
 Assessment centre (copy assessment) Check if antibiotics received 	ent form for patient to bring to re-ass	essment)
Crieck in antibiotics received		
Self care instruction sheet provided and reviewed	Discharge date (dd/mm/yyyy) / /	Discharge time (hh : mm)
ischarge instruction sheet provided and aviewed	Discharge date (dd/mm/yyyy) / /	Discharge time (hh : mm)
ssessor's (first name, last name)	Assessor's signature	
Original Prescription (this page): Patient Copy	roupiloate . Pauent Ghait	

Patient name_

Patient nam	e		
Address			
DOB:	1	1	Age
Phone: H	2 10	C	2000

		Date (dd/mm/yyyy)	Time (hh: mm)
Influenza Admission (A		1 1	
Section 1 – History of prese			
See Primary Assessme	nt Sheet attached		
Additional			
history:			
N. Y. Marana			
Section 2 – Past Medical Hi	story		
Section 2 – Past Medical His Diabetes (type 1)	story CHF	Coronary Artery Disease	Stroke
		Coronary Artery Disease Asthma	Stroke Hyperlipidem
Diabetes (type 1) Diabetes (type 2)	CHF COPD	Asthma	Hyperlipidem
Diabetes (type 1) Diabetes (type 2) Hypothyroid	CHF COPD Hyperthyroid	Asthma Hypertension	Hyperlipidem Epilepsy
Diabetes (type 1) Diabetes (type 2)	CHF COPD	Asthma	Hyperlipidem Epilepsy
Diabetes (type 1) Diabetes (type 2) Hypothyroid Atrial Fibrillation Other, specify:	CHF COPD Hyperthyroid Chronic renal failure	Asthma Hypertension	Hyperlipidem Epilepsy
Diabetes (type 1) Diabetes (type 2) Hypothyroid Atrial Fibrillation	CHF COPD Hyperthyroid Chronic renal failure	Asthma Hypertension	Hyperlipidem Epilepsy
Diabetes (type 1) Diabetes (type 2) Hypothyroid Atrial Fibrillation Other, specify:	CHF COPD Hyperthyroid Chronic renal failure	Asthma Hypertension	Hyperlipidem Epilepsy GERD
Diabetes (type 1) Diabetes (type 2) Hypothyroid Atrial Fibrillation Other, specify: Section 3 – Past Surgical His	CHF COPD Hyperthyroid Chronic renal failure story	Asthma Hypertension Peripheral vascular disease	Hyperlipidem Epilepsy GERD

Patient na	ame		
Address			
MRN			
DOB:	1	1	Age
Phone: H	33		

	reaction:	4.		reaction:
2	reaction:	5.		reaction:
3.	reaction:	6.		reaction:
	lications (Drug taken at home)			
if further spa	ace required complete and atta			
Drug - medication na	rme, dose, route, frequency	To be orde	red in hospital	Initials
		yes	no	
		Yes	no	
		yes	00	
		Yes	no	
Section 6 – Subs	tance History			
Smoking - number of	packyears (consider nicotine patch)	Alcohol - consumpt	number of drinks/v ton consider alcoh	week (if more than 14/wk or daily ol withdrawal prophylaxis)
Section 7 – Soci	al Support			
Live alone / no suppo	rt (notily social work and flag for discharge	e planning)		
Lives with others/sup	port available	Supportive Car	e	Long-term Care
Physician name (first	and last and a	Thursday and	signature	

Patient na	me		
Address			
MRN			
DOB:	1	1	Age
Phone: H		0	



Patient name_		
Address		
MRN		
DOB: /	1	Age
Phone: H	C	100 Feb 23



Patient na	me		
Address			
MRN			
DOB:	1	1	Age
Phone: H	- 20		

	Orders	Completed Time (hh : mm)	initials
1.	Admit to – name of facility Team/Unit/Attending MD	0:50	
2.	Diagnosis – Suspected influenza		T T
3.	DIET Regular renai heathy heart NPO diabetic diet cal/or other		
4.	ACTIVITY As Tolerated bed rest other		
5.	Vitais q4h q6h other		2
6.	saline lock with flush as per protocol IV" atCo'h with IVMEq KCI/L"* atMEq 'IV rate must be re-assessed every 24h **electrolytes & Cr q 24h If IV contains KCI		
7.	nasai prongs atlpmsimple face mask at Ipm*venturi mask atFI02 use if COPD Oxygen *to keep Sp02 > 90% , notify MD if > 50% Fi02 or non-rebreather required, Discontinue 02 if Sp02 > 92% on room air		
8.	Antivirais – If symptoms onset < 48 hours Oseltamivir 75mg PO bid x 5 days (olsetamivir is recommended as first line treatment unless CrCl<10ml/min, on dialysis, or if pregnant/breastfeeding) Zanavamir 10 mg(2 inhalations) bid x 5 days (recommended if CrCl<10ml/min, on dialysis or if pregnant or breastfeeding. WARNING: zanamivir not recommended with asthma or COPD)		
9.	Oral Antibiotics – for pneumonia Levofloxacin 500 mg PO od x 10 days If CrCl > or 50ml/min* Cefuroxime 500 mg PO q12h x 10 days and Azithromycin 500 mg PO x 1, then 250 mg PO od x 4 days		
	Levofloxacin 500 mg PO x 1 then or 250 mg PO od x 10 days If CrCl 25 – 49 or Cefuroxime 500 mg PO q12h x 10 days and Azithromycin 500 mg PO x 1, then 250mg PO od x 4 days		
	Levofloxacin 500g PO x 1 then 250 mg PO q48h x 10 days or Cefuroxime 500 mg PO q12h x 10 days and Azithromycin 500mg PO x 1, then 250 mg PO od x 4 days		
	If CrCl < 10 Levofioxacin 250 mg PO q48h x 10 days or Cefuroxime 500 mg PO q24h x 10 days and Azithromycin 500 mg PO x 1, then 250 mg PO od x 4 days		

Address	
MRN	
DOB: / / Ag	e
Phone: H C	13

	Orders	Completed Time (hh : mm)	Initial
	IV Antibiotics	2	E
10	(IF PATIENT HAS EVIDENCE OF PNEUMONIA AND CANNOT TAKE ORAL ANTIBIOTICS)	-	
	If CrCl > 50mi/min		
	Levofloxacin 500 mg IV g 24h x 10 days		
	or		
	Cefuroxime 750 mg PO q 8h x 10 days and		
	Azithromycin 500 mg IV x 5 days		
	If CrCl 25 - 49		
	Levofloxacin 500 mg IV x 1 then 250 mg IV q 24h x 10 days		
	or		
	Cefuroxime 750 mg IV q 8h x 10 days and		
	Azithromycin IV x 5 days		
	If CrCl 10 - 24		
	Levofloxacin 500 mg IV x 1 then 250 mg IV g 48h x 10 days		
	or		
	Cefuroxime 750 mg IV q 12h x 10 days and		
	Azithromycin 500mg IV x 5 days		
	If CrCl < 10		
	Levofloxacin 250 mg IV g 48h x 10 days		
	OF		
	Cefuroxime 750 mg IV g 24h x 10 days and		
	Azithromycin 500mg IV x 5 days		
1.	Bronchodilators		
	ventolin 2 puffs q4h and ventolin 2 puffs q1h pm and atrovent 4 puffs q4h		
	or		
	combivent 2 puffs q4h and ventolin 2 puffs q1h prn		
	flovent 500 µcg q12h via aerochamber	2	ξ
12.	Antiemetics	S	5
	dimenhydrinate 50mg PO/IV/IM q4h pm for nausea		
13.	Antipyretic/analgesic acetaminophen 650 mg PO/PR g6h pm		
	and the second se		
hysicia	n name (first name, last name) Physician signature		

Patient r	name		
Address			
MRN	12.		
DOB:	1	1	Age
Phone: H	-		

- 2	Orders	Completed Time	Initials
	orders	Completed Time (hh : mm)	
14.	Investigations (no routine bloodwork required)		-
	CBC, lyles, Cr, glucose qh x 3		
	AST, ALT, ALP, T bill, CK, LDH qh x 3		
	INR, PTT q H x 3		
	Troponin q8h x 3		
	EKG daily xDays and pm with chest pain		
	Order if baseline labs are abnormal or if history indicates		
15.	DVT Prophylaxis		-
	compression stockings until patient ambulating		
	heparin 5000u SC bid until patient ambulating*		
	*hold and notify MD if history of heparin induced thrombocytopenia or other contraindications (Le./patient on alternative blood thinner)		
16.	्रत्ने केंद्र केंद्र		
17.			
18.			2
19.			
20.			
21.			
22			
23.			2
24.			
25.			
26.		0	
27.			
28.			
29.		1	
30.		Ő	
Phys	idan name (first name, last name) Physician signature		
_			

APPENDIX 5 e: SOFA Scoring Tool

SOFA scoring comprises criteria for inclusion and exclusion from critical care and minimum qualifications for survival. Scores place patients into three categories: blue patients receive palliation; red patients have highest priority for ventilation, followed by yellow patients; green patients receive acute care outside of the critical care units. SOFA reassessments define movement between categories.

SOFA identifies patients for admission to critical care, primarily due to respiratory failure. The ability to provide invasive ventilatory support differentiates critical care units from other acute care areas, such as step-down units. However, expanded care units for surge capacity may offer hemodynamic support and other advanced care in areas which have appropriate monitoring but do not typically provide that level of care. If hemodynamic support is not available elsewhere, non-ventilator patients may receive critical care.

SOFA excludes from critical care:

- 1) People with very poor prognosis/chance of survival even when treated with aggressive critical care
 - a. severe burns or inhalation injury
 - b. unwitnessed or recurrent cardiac arrest patients or no response to prompt electrical interventions
 - c. patients with a SOFA score > 11 whose mortality rate exceeds 90% even with full critical care during normal circumstances;
- People needing level of resources that cannot be met during pandemic trauma or medical conditions requiring high volume blood transfusions, due to high mortality and limited supply of uninfected blood products;
- 3) People with advanced medical illnesses with high short-term mortality even without concurrent critical illness:
 - a. advanced cancer or immunosuppression
 - b. end-stage organ failure

Cardiac: NYHA stage III –IV heart failure

Pulmonary: FEV1 < 25% predicted

Hepatic: MELD score > 20

Renal: dialysis dependent

This criterion accepts that no organ transplants will occur during pandemic.

c. neuro: severe, irreversible neurological event/condition with high expected mortality.

Minimum Qualifications for Survival (MQS) represents the ceiling on resources allocated to one individual. SOFA requires ongoing, 48 hour & 96 hours patient reassessments. Greater pandemic severity will require more frequent SOFA scoring. If the patient ever develops a SOFA score of \geq 11 or any other exclusion criteria, she moves from critical care to palliative care. MQS attempts to identify early those patients not improving or likely to have poor outcome, since scarce resources preclude prolonged critical care during a pandemic.


SOFA Score

JAMA. 2001;286:1754-1758

Table 1. The Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) Score*

	SOFA Score										
Variables	0	1	2	3	4						
Respiratory Pao ₂ /FiO ₂ , mm Hg	>400	≤400	≤300	≤200†	≤100†						
Coagulation Platelets ×10 ¹ /µL‡	>150	≤150	≤100	≤50	≤20						
Liver Bilirubin, mg/dL‡	<1.2	1.2-1.9	2.0-5.9	6.0-11.9	>12.0						
Cardiovascular Hypotension	No hypotension	Mean arterial préssuré <70 mm Hg	Dop ≤5 or dob (any dose)§	Dop >5, epi ≤0.1, or norepi ≤0.1§	Dop >15, epi >0.1, or norepi >0.1§						
Central nervous system Glasgow Corna Score Scale	15	13-14	10-12	6-9	<6						
Renal Creatinine, mg/dL or urine output, mL/d]	<1.2	1.2-1.9	2.0-3.4	3.5-4.9 or <500	>5.0 or <200						

"Norrept indicates noreptinghtme: Dob, dobutamine; Dop, dopamine; Epi, epinephnine; and Fic_b, fraction of inspired oxygen. [Values are with respiratory support. 1To convert bilinklin from mg/d, to µmol/L, multiply by 17.1. §Adversergi or genets administered for all least 1 hour (doses given are in µg/kg per minute). [To convert creatinine from mg/d, to µmol/L, multiply by 88.4.

Critical Care Triage Tool

Critical Care Triage Tool (Initial Assessment)								
Color Code	Criteria	Priority/Action						
Blue	 Exclusion Criteria* <u>or</u> SOFA >11* 	Medical Mgmt +/- Palliate & d/c						
Red	 SOFA <u><</u>7 <u>or</u> Single Organ Failure 	Highest						
Yellow	• SOFA 8-11	Intermediate						
Green	 No significant organ failure 	Refer or d/c, reassess as needed						

SOFA data from Brussels is validated for 48 and 96 hrs, with the statistics being stronger for the first 48 hrs. The data set included incremental change in score, which showed worsening mortality rates with increase of scores between the 48 and 96 hr time points; mortality rate also increased if the score remained the same between these time points.

48hrs - (greatest predictor of mortality)

- score >11 = >90% mortality
- decreasing score = < 6% mortality</p>
- unchanged or increasing (SOFA 2-7) = 37%
- unchanged or increasing (SOFA 8-11) = 60%
- 96 hr regardless of the initial score
 - increased score = 50% mortality
 - unchanged = 27-35% mortality
 - decreased = <27%</p>

Evaluations: admission, 48 hrs, Q24 hrs there after

OR as indicated by patient condition & pandemic severity

Critical Care Triage Tool

	Critical Care Triage Too (48-Hour Assessment)	
Color Code	Criteria	Priority/Action
Blue	 Exclusion Criteria <u>οr</u> SOFA >11 <u>οr</u> SOFA 8-11 no Δ 	Palliate & d/c from CC
Red	 SOFA <11 and decreasing 	Highest
Yellow	• SOFA <8 no ∆	Intermediate
Green	 No longer ventilator dependent 	d/c from CC

С	ritical Care Triage	Tool					
Critical Care Triage Tool (96 hour Assessment)							
Color Code	Criteria	Priority/Action					
Blue	 Exclusion Criteria* <u>or</u> SOFA > 11* SOFA < 8 no ∆ 	Palliate & d/c from CC					
Red	 SOFA score <11 and decreasing progressively 	Highest					
Yellow	 SOFA <8 minimal decrease (<3 point decrease in past 48 hours) 	Intermediate					
Green	 No longer ventilator dependent 	d/c from CC					

Reevaluating patients presents a better picture of prognosis or disease trajectory for a particular patient. Worsening prognosis signals health care providers to counsel family members, preparing them for the possibility of palliation.

APPENDIX 5 f: SOFA Score by Date: Time

Date:Time			
Resp			
Coag			
Liver			
CV			
Hypotension			
CNS			
Glascow			
Renal			
SOFA			

Table 1. The Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) Score*

			SOFA Score			
Variables	0	1	2	3	4	
Respiratory Pao ₂ /FiO ₂ , mm Hg	>400	≤400	≤300	≤200†	≤100†	
Coagulation Platelets ×10 ³ /µL‡	>150	≤150	≤100	≤50	≤20	
Liver Bilirubin, mg/dL‡	<1.2	1.2-1.9	2.0-5.9	6.0-11.9	>12.0	
Cardiovascular Hypotension	No hypotension	Mean arterial pressure <70 mm Hg	Dop ≤5 or dob (any dose)§	Dop >5, epi ≤0.1, or norepi ≤0.1§	Dop >15, epi >0.1, or norepi >0.1§	
Central nervous system Glasgow Coma Score Scale	15	13-14	10-12	6-9	<6	
Renal Creatinine, mg/dL or urine output, mL/d	<1.2	1.2-1.9	2.0-3.4	3.5-4.9 or <500	>5.0 or <200	

*Norepi indicates norepinephrine; Dob, dobutamine; Dop, dopamine; Epi, epinephrine; and Fic₂, fraction of inspired oxygen. †Values are with respiratory support. ‡To convert bilirubin from mg/dL to µmol/L, multiply by 17.1. \$Adrenergic agents administered for at least 1 hour (doses given are in µg/kg per minute). [To convert creatinine from mg/dL to µmol/L, multiply by 88.4.

GLASCOW	Date:Time			
Eye Open	No- 1			
	Pain- 2			
	Voice- 3			
	Spont- 4			
Verbal	No – 1			
	Sounds- 2			
	Words- 3			
	Confuse-4			
	Orient – 5			
Motor	No- 1			
	Extend- 2			
	Flex- 3			
	Wdraw- 4			
	Localize- 5			
	Obey- 6			
SCORE	E+V+M			

Annals of Internal Medicine

Table 3. Illustration	of a Multiprinciple Strateg	y to Allocate Ventilat	ors During a Public Heal	th Emergency					
Principle	Specification		Point System*						
		1	2	3	4				
Save the most lives	Prognosis for short-term survival (SOFA score)	SOFA score <6	SOFA score, 6-9	SOFA score, 10–12	SOFA score >12				
Save the most life-years	Prognosis for long-term survival (medical assessment of comorbid conditions)	No comorbid conditions that limit long-term survival	Minor comorbid conditions with small impact on long-term survival	Major comorbid conditions with substantial impact on long-term survival	Severe comorbid conditions; death likely within 1 year				
Life-cycle principle†	Prioritize those who have had the least chance to live through life's stages (age in years)	Age 12-40 y	Age 41–60 y	Age 61–74 y	Age ≥75 y				

SOFA = Sequential Organ Failure Assessment. * Persons with the lowest cumulative score would be given the highest priority to receive mechanical ventilation and critical care services. † Pediatric patients may need to be considered separately, because their small size may require the use of different mechanical ventilators and personnel.

APPENDIX 5 h: Multi-principle Patient Comparison Scoring

	PATIENT>>			
SOFA (S)	<6 (1)			
	6-9 (2)			
	10-12 (3)			
	>12 (4)			
Save life years (LY)	Comorbid No (1)			
	Minor effect Life-yr(2)			
	Major effect Life-yr (3)			
	Major Life exp <1 yr (4)			
Life cycle (LC)	12-40 yr (1)			
	41-60 yr (2)			
	61-74 yr (3)			
	<u>≥</u> 75 yr (4)			
M-P SCORE	S+LY+LC			

Multiple patient comparison: Lowest score = Highest priority for critical care

Pediatrics < 12 years must be separately considered due to usual limited availability of pediatric critical care capability (LC < 12 yr = 0).

APPENDIX 5 i: Adult Palliative Care Orders

These charts are examples of clinical orders for use in palliation. These are not exclusive recommendations; any organization using these orders should verify medication, dose, route and rate of administration with the prescribing clinician.

Adult Palliative Care Orders

Page 1 of 3

Instructions:

Check Yes (Y) block for all applicable orders and fill in any blanks and other boxes for those orders. Check No (N) block for all orders not applicable. Orders are not valid unless either Yes or No block checked.

ALLERGIES/DRUG SENSITIVITY: 1. 2. 3. 4.

Another brand of a generically equivalent product identical in dosage form and content of active ingredient may be administered unless checked.

Υ	Ν	 Medical Service: 	
		Attending:	Pager ID
		Resident:	Pager ID

- Y N 2. DIAGNOSIS: Palliative care (v66.7)
- Y N 3. TREATMENT GOALS: Comfort care until discharged with hospice
- Y N 4. CODE STATUS: Full Code Allow Natural Death (AND Orders required)
- Y N 5. VITALS: Daily Comfort assessment and RR Q4 hours and PRN Routine

Y N 6. PARAMETERS TO NOTIFY PHYSICIAN:

Patient remains uncomfortable after intervention of adult palliative care orders No vital sign parameters to notify physician

(NOTE: If signs of fever present, take temperature and treat per orders) Other

Y N 7. NURSING:

Assess every for signs of inadequate control of symptoms (pain, dyspnea, agitation, fever) Oral care every 4 hours. Teach family if they desire. Oral suction PRN (NO DEEP SUCTION) Oxygen nasal prongs at 2 liters per minute PRN dyspnea (titrate to comfort) Bedside Commode PRN Condom Catheter PRN urinary incontinence Straight Catheter PRN bladder distension Foley Catheter to drainage PRN urinary retention/urinary incontinence Implement Fall Prevention Precautions Skin integrity care

Y N 8. ACTIVITY:

Out of bed ad lib Out of bed to chair Bed rest Other

- Y N 9. **DIET**: NPO Oral diet type Parenteral Nutrition (must complete adult order form) Enteral Nutrition (must complete adult order form)
- Y N 10. IV: Saline lock If IV lost, do not replace

Y N 11. CONSULTATIONS: Physical Therapy for family instruction on "Activities of Daily Living" and assessment of equipment needs Wound Care - Reason: Chaplain - Reason: Pediatric Palliative Care - Reason:

Patient Name

MRN PATIENT ID LABEL

Patient Name MRN PATIENT ID LABEL

ALLERGIES/DRUG SENSITIVITY: 1.2.3.4.

Y N 12. **MEDICATIONS** (Review Drug Sensitivities): Another brand of a generically equivalent product identical in dosage form and content of active ingredient may be administered unless checked < .>

Medication Dose Route Frequency Comments

A. PAIN AND / OR DYSPNEA

Acetaminophen		PO	PR PEC	B PRN	Q4H Mile	d pain or temp > 101° F
Ibuprofen	mg	PO	PE	G PRN		d / moderate pain or if fever esponsive to acetaminophen
Morphine Sulfate CR Doses availat	mg ble: 15, 30, 60, 1	PO 00, an	PR d 200 mg	tablets	Q12H	
Morphine Sulfate IR common dose elixir (Roxano	mg es available 10, l) 10 mg per 5 n	PO 15 mg 1L, 20 i	SL PE tablets or mg per 5 r	-		ain,
	microgramsper ble (microgram/h		TD (tran: 25, 50, 75,		Q3 days F	ain (opioid tolerant ONLY)
	rograms TM (tra ble: 200, 400, 60 1200, 1600 with 200 or 400 i	0, 800 microg	, gram lozer	PR Iges.	N Q1H I	Pain (opioid tolerant ONLY)
Morphine Sulfate	mg	SC	IV	PR	N Q H	Pain or dyspnea
Hydromorphone	mg	SC	IV	PR	NQH	Pain or dyspnea
Gabapentin	mg	PO			QH	Neuropathic pain
Oxycodone Doses availat	mg ble: 5 mg tablets	PO or as e	PEG elixir 1 mg	PF /mL	RN Q H	Pain or dyspnea.
AND End-of-Life opiate [complete Adult Contin					oy Orders for I	End-of-Life patients]
B. DELIRIUM Haloperidol	mg	PO	IV PEG	SC PF	RN Q H termina	Restlessness due to al delirium
Risperidone	mg	PO	PEC	GODT PI		Restlessness due to al delirium
C. NAUSEA ANI						
Metoclopramide	mg	PO	PEG	IV P	RN AC & H	S Nausea and / or vomiting
Prochlorperazine	mg	PO	PEG	IV PR P	RN Q8H	Nausea and vomiting (first line if nausea and vomiting due to opioids)
	(PR	dosa 2	25 ma oth	or routos 1	0 ma)	·

	(PR do	se 25	mg, oth	er ro	utes,	10 mg)	
Haloperidol	mg	PO	PEG	IV	SC	PRN	Q H Nausea and / or vomiting

Adult Palliative Care Orders

Page 3 of 3

Patient Name MRN PATIENT ID LABEL

ALLERGIES/DRUG SENSITIVITY: 1. 2. 3. 4. Another brand of a generically equivalent product identical in dosage form and content of active ingredient may be administered unless checked.>

YN 12. MEDICATI Medication	ONS (Review Dru Dose		es): Trequency	Comments
D. BOWEL REG				
Docusate Sodium	100 mg	PO PEG	PRN BID	Constipation: First line: give regularly initially. Hold for excessive bowel movements
Senna (Senokot ®)	mg (Available ir	PO PEG 8.6 mg tab o	PRN Q day or 8.8 mg/5 mL syrup)	Constipation: First line: give regularly initially Hold for excessive bowel movements.
Bisacodyl (Dulcolax ®) Suppository Lactulose	10 mg	PR	PRN Q12H	lf no bowel movement in past 36 hours
	mL	PO PEC	G PRN QH	If no bowel movement in 48 hours
Loperamide	2 mg	PO PE	G PRN QH	Diarrhea
E. OTHER SYMP Lorazepam	PTOMS mg	PO IV	SL PRN Q1H	Anxiety
Midazolam	mg	IV SC	PRN Q H	Seizure and CALL Physician
Chlorpromazine	25 mg	PO IV	PRN Q6H	Hiccups
	patch 2 patches per patch. SC, Q4F		mal) Q 3 day TD mechanism effective	s Excessive secretions e.
Atropine 1% 2 dro ophthalmic solution	ops	SL (sublin	gual) PRN Q4H	Excessive secretions
Glycopyrrolate	0.1 mg 0.2 mg	IV S	C PRN Q4H	Excessive secretions
Baclofen	mg	F	PO QID	Spasms
Diphenhydramine	25 mg	PO ľ	V PRN Q6H	Itching
Dexamethasone	mg	I	V QH	
Prednisone	mg	PO	QH	
F. OTHER MEDI (dose / route / frequent				
(dose / route / frequent	cy / indication)			
(dose / route / frequent	cy / indication)			
(dose / route / frequen	cy / indication)			
Physician Signature		Pager ID	Date	Time AM/PM
r nysician Signature		rayei iD	Dale	

APPENDIX 5 j: Adult Continuous Analgesia and Dyspnea Opiod Therapy Orders – End of Life Patients

Adult Continuous Analgesia & Dyspr		Patient name		
Opiod Therapy Orders	MRN			
For use in End-of-Life Patients Only		Patient ID Label		
Allergies/Drug Sensitivity: 1 <u>For use only with Adult Palliative C</u>	2 Care Orders	3	4	

Before starting continuous opiates at End-Of-Life for pain & dyspnea document the following in the medical record:

[] goals of treatment to include continuous opiod therapy for pain and/ dyspnea for end of-life care

[] AND order complete & in medical record

- 1. Opiate Delivery Route: [] SC []
 - If SC: no maintenance IV

IV: if no maintenance fluids,

infuse IV PCA maintenance fluids Dextrose 5% [] normal saline [] @ ml/h

- 2. Medication: [] Morphine 1 mg/ml [] Morphine 5 mg/ml [] Hydromorphone 1 mg/ml [] Other
- 3. Loading Dose: [] no

[] yes mg IV q 10 min until patient reports or exhibits relief of pain / dyspnea

Maximum total loading dose mg

4. Pump settings: Incremental dose mg

Lock-out interval (delay) minutes

- 1 hour limit mg/hr
- 5. Pump settings: Initial basal rate mg IV h hour
- 6. If pain / dyspnea not controlled, patient may receive bolus of

 Morphine mg Q10 min x 3
 PRN for pain/dyspnea []Q hour []Q 2 hr
 Hydomorphone mg Q10 min []PRN for pain/dyspnea []Q hour []Q 2 hr
- 7. Side effects: See palliative care order set
- 8. Monitoring: per 24 hr pain management flowshet

NOTE: Expect falling respiratory rate in naturally dying process. If respiratory rate < 12 & no signs of dyspnea present, patient has no need for increased opiate drip or rescue doses. Agonal respirations are a normal part of dying

Physician name

Physician Signature	pager	date	time	am/pm

APPENDIX 6: Bibliography

Bibliography: Ethical Guidelines, State Plans and Resource Materials SC Pandemic Influenza Ethics Task Force June 23, 2009

Ethical Principles

Federal Guidance

Kinlaw, K. & Levine, R. (2007). Ethical guidelines in pandemic influenza: Recommendations of the Ethics Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee to the Director, Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from http://www.cdc.gov/od/science/phec/panFlu Ethic Guidelines.pdf

Articles

Berlinger, N. & Moses, J. (2007). *The five people you meet in a pandemic – and what they need from you today*. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from http://www.thehastingscenter.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/Special_Reports/Pandemic-Backgrounder-The-Hastings-Center.pdf

Canadian Medical Association. (2004). *CMA Code of Ethics*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Medical Association. November 13, 2008 from <u>http://policybase.cma.ca/PolicyPDF/PD04-06.pdf</u>

Kass, N. E., Otto, J., O'Brien, D., & Minson, M. Ethics and severe pandemic influenza: Maintaining essential functions through a fair and considered response. Biosecurity and Bioterrorism: Biodefense Strategy, Practice and Science, 6 (3), 227-236. doi: 10.1089/bsp.2008.0020. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.liebertonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1089/bsp.2008.0020

McGorty, E. K., Devlin, L., Tong, R., Harrison, N., Holmes, M. & Silberman, P. (2007). Ethical guidelines for an influenza pandemic. *North Carolina Medical Journal, 68* (1), 38-42. <u>http://www.ncmedicaljournal.com/jan-feb-07/McGorty.pdf</u>

Public Health Leadership Society. (2002). *Principles of the Ethical Practice of Public Health*. Retrieved November 7, 2008 from <u>http://www.apha.org/NR/rdonlyres/1CED3CEA-287E-4185-9CBD-BD405FC60856/0/ethicsbrochure.pdf</u>

Thomas, J. (2004). *Skills for the Ethical Practice of Public Health*. Retrieved November 7, 2008 from

http://www.asph.org/userfiles/DrPH_Skills%20for%20the%20Ethical%20Practice%20of%20Publ ic%20Health.pdf

Upshur, R. E., Faith, K., Gibson, J. L., Thompson, A. K., Tracy, C. S., Wilson, K. et al. (2005) *Stand on guard for thee: Ethical considerations in preparedness planning for pandemic influenza.* Toronto: University of Toronto Joint Centre for Bioethics. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.jointcentreforbioethics.ca/publications/documents/stand_on_guard.pdf</u>

State Emergency Operations Plans and Standard Operating Procedures

Federal Guidance

Homeland Security Council. (2005). *National strategy for pandemic influenza*. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/nspi.pdf</u>

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2005) *HHS Services Pandemic Influenza Plan.* Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.hhs.gov/pandemicflu/plan/</u>

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2006). *Template for state pandemic influenza operations plan submission*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from

http://www.pandemicflu.gov/plan/states/stateoperatingplanattach.html#template

U. S. Department of Homeland Security. (2006). *Pandemic influenza, preparedness, response and recovery : Guide for critical infrastructure and key resources.* Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.pandemicflu.gov/plan/pdf/cikrpandemicinfluenzaguide.pdf

U. S. Government. (2008). *Federal guidance to assist states in improving state-level pandemic influenza operating plans.* Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from <u>http://www.pandemicflu.gov/news/guidance031108.pdf</u>

South Carolina Plans

Learner, R. M. & Beasley, P. (2006). *South Carolina prepares: Pandemic influenza – An assessment of readiness and plan for improvement*. Columbia, SC: Department of Health and Environmental Control. Retrieved November 17, 2008 from <u>http://www.scstatehouse.gov/reports/dhec/pandemicinfluenza.pdf</u>

Learner, R. M. & Beasley, P. (2007). *South Carolina prepares: Pandemic influenza progress report, 2007*. Columbia, SC: Department of Health and Environmental Control. Retrieved November 17, 2008 from

http://www.scstatehouse.gov/reports/dhec/pandemicinfluenzaprogressreport2007 1.pdf

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. (2008). *Mass casualtypPlan: Appendix 5, South Carolina Emergency Operations Plan.* Columbia, SC: State Emergency Management Division.

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. (2008). *Pandemic influenza Annex 2, Mass Casualty Plan.* Columbia, SC: State Emergency Management Division.

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. (2008). *Mass fatality management plan, Annex 4 draft, Mass Casualty Plan.* Columbia, SC: State Emergency Management Division.

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. (2008). *Pandemic Influenza antiviral distribution plan: Standard operating procedures.* Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control.

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. (2008). *Community mitigation plan narrative.* Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control.

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. (2006). *Immunization pandemic influenza mass vaccination policies and procedures.* Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control.

State Emergency Management Division. (2008). *South Carolina Emergency Operations Plan – Basic Plan.* Columbia, SC: State Emergency Management Division.

State Emergency Management Division. (2008). *South Carolina Recovery Plan: Appendix, 6, South Carolina Emergency Operations Plan.* Columbia, SC: State Emergency Management Division

State of South Carolina. (2008). *State pandemic influenza plan submission*. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control.

State of South Carolina. (2007). *Template for state pandemic influenza operations plan submission*. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control.

Articles

Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. (2002). *Nature's terrorist attack: Pandemic influenza*. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.astho.org/pubs/PandemicInfluenza.pdf

National Association of County & City Health Officers. (2006). *Local health department guide to pandemic influenza planning*. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.naccho.org/topics/HPDP/infectious/influenza/upload/NACCHOPanFluGuideforLHD http://www.naccho.org/topics/HPDP/infectious/influenza/upload/NACCHOPanFluGuideforLHD http://www.naccho.org/topics/HPDP/infectious/influenza/upload/NACCHOPanFluGuideforLHD http://www.naccho.org/topics/HPDP/infectious/influenza/upload/NACCHOPanFluGuideforLHD http://www.naccho.org/topics/HPDP/infectious/influenza/upload/NACCHOPanFluGuideforLHD http://www.naccho.org/topics/HPDP/infectious/influenza/upload/NACCHOPanFluGuideforLHD

National Governor's Association Center for Best Practices. (2006). *Preparing for a pandemic influenza: A primer for governors and senior state officials.* Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/0607PANDEMICPRIMER.PDF</u>

Multiple Clinical and Public Health Ethical Issues for Pandemic Influenza

- Altered Standards of Care Workgroup. (2008). *Report and recommendations to the Department* of Health Secretary on establishing altered standards of care during an influenza pandemic (draft). Tumwater, WA: Washington State Department of Health.
- Berlinger, N., & Moses, J. (2008). Pandemic flu planning in the community: What can clinical ethicists bring to the public health table? *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 17, 468-470.
- Coughlin, S. S., Beauchamp, T. L., & Weed, D. L. (2009). *Ethics and Epidemiology, Second Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Engel, J. P. (2007). Pandemic influenza: The critical issues and North Carolina's preparedness plan. *North Carolina Medical Journal*, 68 (1), 32-37. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.ncmedicaljournal.com/jan-feb-07/Engel.pdf

Meslin, E. M., Alyea, J. M., & Helft, P. R. (2008). *Pandemic influenza preparedness: Ethical issues and recommendations to the Indiana State Department of Health*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Center for Bioethics. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.bioethics.iu.edu/pandemicFluPrep_2007.pdf

Indiana University Center for Bioethics. (2008). Confronting the ethics of pandemic influenza planning: Communiqué from the 2008 Summit of the States. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.bioethics.iu.edu/communique 2008 summit of the states.pdf</u>

New Jersey Hospital Association. (2008). Ethics planning and assessment tool: A healthcare guide for pandemic flu planning: Planning today for a pandemic tomorrow. Princeton: New Jersey Hospital Association. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.njha.com/paninf/pdf/ethics_module.pdf

North Carolina Institute of Medicine. (2007). Stockpiling solutions: North Carolina's ethical guidelines for an influenza pandemic. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.nciom.org/projects/flu_pandemic/flureport.pdf

Articles

Ministry of Health and Long Term Care. (2008) *Ontario health plan for an influenza pandemic*. Retrieved November 7, 2008 from <u>http://www.health.gov.on.ca/english/providers/program/emu/pan_flu/ohpip2/plan_full.pdf</u>

Abdel-Ghafar, A., Chotpitayasunondh, T., Gao, Z., Hayden, F. G., Hien, N. D., de Jong, M. D. et al. (2008). Update on avian influenza (H5N1) virus infection in humans. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *358* (3), 261-173. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://content.nejm.org/cgi/reprint/358/3/261.pdf

South Carolina Medical Association. (2008). Symposium Issue: Seasonal and Pandemic Influenza. *Journal of the South Carolina Medical Association*, 104 (5), 119-172.

Vawter, D. E., Garrett, J. E., Gervais, K. G., Prehn, A. W., DeBruin, D. A., Tauer, C. A., et al. (2009). For the good of us all: Ethically rationing health resources in Minnesota in a severe influenza pandemic. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Center for Health Care Ethics.

Ethical Issues in Clinical Practice

Federal Guidance

Phillips, S. J. & Knebel, A., Eds. (2007). *Mass medical care with scarce resources: A community planning guide (AHRQ Publication No. 07-0001)*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.ahrq.gov/research/mce/mceguide.pdf

Articles

American College of Chest Physicians. (2008) *Definitive care for the critically ill during a disaster: Message points*. Northbrook: IL: American College of Chest Physicians. Retrieved Novemner 13, 2008 from <u>http://a2p2.com/mep-p/ethics/CHEST_EMCC_Message_Points.pdf</u>

Amundson, D. (2008). Can there be a consensus on critical care in disasters? *Chest, 133,* 1065-1066. doi:10.1378/chest.08-0581

Christian, M. D., Devereaux, A. V., Dichter, J. R., Geiling, J. A., & Rubinson, L. (2008). Definitive care for the critically ill during a disaster: Current capabilities and limitations: From a Task Force for Mass Critical Care Summit meeting, January 26-27, 2007, Chicago, IL. *Chest, 133*, 8-17. doi:10.1378/chest.07-2707 Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.chestjournal.org/cgi/reprint/133/5 suppl/85

DeBruin, D. A., Parilla, E., Liaschenko, J., Marshall, M. F., Leider, J. P., Brunnquell, D. J., et al. (2009). *Implementing ethical frameworks for rationing scarce health resources in Minnesota during severe influenza pandemic.* St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Center for Health Care Ethics.

Devereaux, A. V., Dichter, J. R., Christian, M. D., Dubler, N. N., Sandrock, C. E., Hick, J. L., et al. (2008). Definitive care for the critically ill during a disaster: A framework for allocation of scarce resources in mass critical care: From a Task Force for Mass Critical Care Summit meeting, January 26-27, 2007, Chicago, IL. *Chest, 133*, 51-66. doi:10.1378/chest.07-2693 Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.chestjournal.org/cgi/reprint/133/5 suppl/515

Devereaux, A. V., Christian, M. D., Dichter, J. R., Geiling, J. A., & Rubinson, L. (2008). Summary of suggestions from the Task Force for Mass Critical Care Summit, January 26-27, 2007, Chicago, IL. *Chest*, *133*, 1-7. doi:10.1378/chest.08-0649 Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.chestjournal.org/cgi/reprint/133/5 suppl/1S

Okie, S. (2008). Dr. Pou and the hurricane: Implications for patient care during disasters. *New England Journal of Medicine, 358* (1), 1-5. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://content.nejm.org/cgi/reprint/358/1/1.pdf</u>

Royal College of General Practitioners. (2008). *Preparing for pandemic influenza: Guidance for GP practices, what to do now and in a pandemic.* London: Department of Health.

Rubinson, L., Hick, J. L., Curtis, R., Branson, R. D., Burns, S., Christian, M. D., et al. (2008). Definitive care for the critically ill during a disaster: A framework for optimizing critical care surge capacity: From a Task Force for Mass Critical Care Summit meeting, January 26-27, 2007, Chicago, IL. *Chest, 133*, 32-50. doi:10.1378/chest.07-2691 Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.chestjournal.org/cgi/reprint/133/5_suppl/185

Rubinson, L., Hick, J. L., Hanfling, D. G., Devereaux, A. V., Dichter, J. R., Christian, M. D., et al. (2008). Definitive care for the critically ill during a disaster: Medical resources for surge capacity: From a Task Force for Mass Critical Care Summit meeting, January 26-27, 2007, Chicago, IL. *Chest, 133*, 18-31. doi:10.1378/chest.07-2690 Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.chestjournal.org/cgi/reprint/133/5 suppl/32S

<u>Triage</u>

South Carolina Plans and Guidance

Limehouse, W. (2008). *Medical University Hospital Ethics Committee Disaster Triage Policy*. Charleston, SC: Medical University of South Carolina Emergency Medicine.

Articles

Christian, M. D., Hawryluck, L., Wax, R. S., Cook, T., Lazar, N. M., Herridge, M. S. et al. (2006) Development of a triage protocol for critical care during an influenza pandemic. *Canadian Medical Association Journal, 175* (11), 1377-1381. Doi:10.1503/cmaj.060911 Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.cmaj.ca/cgi/reprint/175/11/1377</u>

Melnychuk, N. P. & Kenny, N. P. (2006). Pandemic triage: the ethical challenge. *Canadian Medical Association Journal, 175* (11), 1393-1394. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.cmaj.ca/cgi/reprint/175/11/1393

Allocation of Ventilators

State Plans and Guidance

Alabama Department of Public Health. (2008). Final draft criteria for mechanical ventilator triage following proclamation of mass casualty respiratory emergency. Birmingham, AL: Alabama Department of Public Health, July 3, 2008.

New York State Department of Health. (2007). Allocation of ventilators in an influenza pandemic: Planning document draft for public comment. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from http://www.health.state.ny.us/diseases/communicable/influenza/pandemic/ventilators/docs/ventilators guidance.pdf

Articles

Powell, T., Christ, K. C., Birkhead, G. S. (2008). Allocation of ventilators in a public health disaster. *Disaster Medicine & Public Health Preparedness, 2* (1), 20-26.

White, D. B., Katz, M. H., Luce, J. M., & Lo, B. (2009). Who should receive life support during a public health emergency? Using ethical principles to improve allocation decisions. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *150*, 132-138.

Altered Standards of Practice

Federal Guidance

Health System Research. (2005). *Altered standards of care in mass casualty events* (AHRQ Publication No. 05-0043). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.ahrq.gov/research/altstand/altstand.pdf</u>

Palliative Care

Rosoff, P. M. (2006). A central role for palliative care in an influenza pandemic. Journal of Palliative Medicine, 9 (5), 1051-1053. Retrieved November 14, 2008 from http://www.liebertonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1089/jpm.2006.9.1051

Duty to Care, Rights and duties of health care workers

Articles

Irvin, C., Cindrich, L., Patterson, W., Ledbetter, A., & Southall, A. (2007). Hospital personnel response during a hypothetical influenza pandemic: Will they come to work? *Academy of Emergency Medicine*, *14* (5), S13.

Meerschaert, M. C. (2008). Physicians' duty to participate in pandemic care. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *300* (3), 284. doi:10.1001/jama.2008.32

Rhyne, J. A. Likely ethical, legal, and professional challenges physicians will face during an influenza pandemic. *North Carolina Medical Journal, 68* (1), 51-53. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.ncmedicaljournal.com/jan-feb-07/Rhyne.pdf

Sokol, D. K. Virulent epidemics and scope of healthcare workers' duty to care. (2006). *Emerging Infectious Diseases, 12* (8), 1238 – 1241. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/EID/vol12no08/pdfs/06-0360.pdf</u>

Workforce protection

Federal Guidance

Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2007). Pandemic influenza preparedness and response guidance for healthcare workers and healthcare employers (OSHA 3328-05). Washington: U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.osha.gov/Publications/OSHA pandemic health.pdf

Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2007). *Guidance for preparing workplaces for an influenza pandemic (OSHA 3327-02N)*. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.osha.gov/Publications/OSHA3327pandemic.pdf</u>

Ethical Issues in Public Health Practice

Community Mitigation Measures

Federal Guidance

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2007). Interim pre-pandemic planning guidance: Community strategy for pandemic influenza mitigation in the United States: Early, targeted, layered use of nonpharmaceutical interventions. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.pandemicflu.gov/plan/community/commitigation.html</u>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2008). Interim guidance on the use and purchase of facemasks and respirators by individuals and families for pandemic influenza preparedness. Retrieved November 10, 2008 from <u>http://aspe.hhs.gov/panflu/facemasks.html</u>

Occupational Safety and Health Agency. (2007). *Proposed Guidance on Workplace Stockpiling of Respirators and Facemasks for Pandemic Influenza*. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from http://www.osha.gov/dsg/guidance/proposedGuidanceStockpilingRespirator.pdf

South Carolina Plans and Guidance

Region 6 Pandemic Influenza Ethics Panel. (2007) Interim report on the activities of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control Region 6 Pandemic Influenza Ethics Panel. Conway, SC: Department of Health and Environmental Control.

Region 6 Pandemic Influenza Ethics Panel. (2008) Second Interim report on the activities of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control Region 6 Pandemic Influenza Ethics Panel. Conway, SC: Department of Health and Environmental Control.

Articles and Books

Lemon, S. M., Hamburg, M. A., Sparling, P. F., Choffnes, E. R., & Mack, A. (2007). *Ethical and legal considerations in mitigating pandemic disease: Workshop summary*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11917

Public Engagement Pilot Project on Pandemic Influenza. (2005). *Citizen voices on pandemic flu choices*. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from http://www.hhs.gov/nvpo/PEPPPI/PEPPPICompleteFinalReport.pdf

Selgelid, M. J. (2009). Pandethics. Public Health , 123 (3), 255-259.

Isolation and guarantine

Articles

Bostick, N. A., Levine, M. A., & Sade, R. M. (2008). Ethical obligations of physicians participating in public health quarantine and isolation measures. *Public Health Reports, 123*, 3-8.

Bryan, C. S., Call, T. J., & Elliott, K. C. (2007). The ethics of infection control: Philosophical frameworks. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology, 28*, 1077-1084.

Disparities in access to care

Articles

Blumenshine, P., Reingold, A., Egerter, S., Mockenhaupt, R., Braveman, P., & Marks, J. (2008). Pandemic influenza planning in the United States from a health disparities perspective. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 14 (5), 709-715.

Saunders, G. L. & Monet, T. (2007). Eliminating injustice toward disadvantaged populations during an influenza pandemic. North Carolina Medical Journal, 68 (1), 46-48. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.ncmedicaljournal.com/jan-feb-07/Saunders.pdf</u>

Needs of at-risk populations

Federal Guidance

Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. (2008). At-risk populations and pandemic influenza: Planning guidance for state, territorial, tribal and local health departments. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from <u>http://www.astho.org/pubs/ASTHO_ARPP_Guidance_June2008.pdf</u>

Mass fatalities

South Carolina Plans and Guidance

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. (2008). *Mass fatality management plan, Annex 4 draft, Mass Casualty Plan.* Columbia, SC: State Emergency Management Division.

State Plans and Guidance

Virginia Department of Health. (2008). *Information for managing pandemic influenza fatality events in Virginia*. Retrieved November 14, 2008 from <u>http://www.vdh.state.va.us/medExam/documents/PanfluMgmtPamphlet.pdf</u>

Virginia Department of Health. (2008). *Guidelines for reporting and managing mass fatality* events with the Virginia Medical Examiner System. Retrieved November 14, 2008 from http://www.vdh.state.va.us/MedExam/documents/Mass_Guidelines.pdf

Articles

Public Health Agency of Canada. (2004). *Annex 1: Guidelines for the management of mass fatalities during an influenza pandemic*. Retrieved November 14, 2008 from <u>http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/cpip-pclcpi/ann-i-eng.php</u>

Gursky, E. A. (2007). A working group consensus statement on mass-fatality planning for pandemics and disasters. Retrieved November 14, 2008 from http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/Default.aspx?oid=160&ocat=1

Allocation of Antiviral medicines

Federal Guidance

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2008). *Proposed Guidance on antiviral drug use during an influenza pandemic*. Retrieved November 10, 2008 from <u>http://aspe.hhs.gov/panflu/antiviraluse.html</u>

U. S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2008). *Proposed considerations for antiviral drug stockpiling by employers in preparation for an influenza pandemic*. Retrieved November 10, 2008 from <u>http://aspe.hhs.gov/panflu/stockpiling.html</u>

Articles

Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. (2007). *ASTHO comments on draft pandemic influenza stockpiling guidance documents.* Washington, DC: Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. December 19, 2007.

Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. (2007). *Report of the State, Local, and Medical Stakeholders Work Group on pandemic influenza stockpiling.* Washington, DC: Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. December 19, 2007.

Institute of Medicine. (2008). *Antivirals for pandemic influenza: Guidance on developing a distribution and dispensing program.* Washington: National Academy Press.

Allocation of Vaccines

Federal Guidance

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services & U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2008) *Guidance on allocating and targeting pandemic influenza vaccine*. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from <u>http://www.pandemicflu.gov/vaccine/allocationguidance.pdf</u>

Articles

Emanuel, E. J. & Wertheimer. (2006). Who should get influenza vaccine when not all can? *Science*, *312*, 854-855.

Gostin, L. O. (2006). Medical countermeasures for pandemic influenza: Ethics and the law. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 295* (5), 554-556.

Home Care and Outpatient Care

Federal Guidance

Knebel, A., & Phillips, S. J. (2008). Home health care during an influenza pandemic: Issues and resources (AHRQ Publication No. 08-0018). Washington, DC: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Retrieved November 13, 2008 from http://www.pandemicflu.gov/plan/healthcare/homehealthcare.pdf

Legal Issues

South Carolina

South Carolina Code of Laws. (2007). *Title 44 Chapter 4, Emergency Health Powers Act*. Retrieved November 17, 2008 from <u>http://www.scstatehouse.gov/code/t44c004.htm</u>

Articles

American Health Lawyers Association. (2008). *Community pan-flu preparedness: A checklist of key legal issues for healthcare providers.* Washington, DC: American Health Lawyers Association.

Annas, G. J., Mariner, W. K., & Parmet, W. E. (2008). *Pandemic preparedness: The need for a public health – not a law enforcement/national security- approach.* New York: American Civil Liberties Union. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from http://www.aclu.org/pdfs/privacy/pemic report.pdf

Gostin, L. O. (2006). Medical countermeasures for pandemic influenza: Ethics and the law. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 295 (5), 554-556.

Gostin, L. O. (2006). Public health strategies for pandemic influenza: Ethics and the law. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 295 (14), 1700-1704.

Proposed Legislation and Regulations

State Plans and Guidance

Virginia Acts of Assembly. (2008). Chapter 121. An Act to amend and reenact §§8.01-581.1, 38.2-324, 44-146.16, 44-146.18:1, 44-146.23, and 59.1-526 of the Code of Virginia and to amend the Code of Virginia by adding a section numbered 8.01-225.02, relating to health care provider liability protections. [H 403], March 2, 2008. Retrieved November 14, 2008 from http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504.exe?081+ful+CHAP0121

Articles

American Health Lawyers Association. (2008). *Community pan-flu preparedness: A checklist of key legal issues for healthcare providers*. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from <u>http://www2.cdc.gov/phlp/docs/Pan-Flu08.pdf</u>