

This article was downloaded by: [CDC]

On: 09 July 2012, At: 12:01

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



## Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/uaoh20>

### Evaluation of Potential Bloodborne Pathogen Exposures Among Body Piercers

Angela M. Weber

Version of record first published: 30 Nov 2010

To cite this article: Angela M. Weber (2001): Evaluation of Potential Bloodborne Pathogen Exposures Among Body Piercers, Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene, 16:10, 925-935

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/104732201300367146>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

## Case Studies

# Evaluation of Potential Bloodborne Pathogen Exposures Among Body Piercers

*Dawn Tharr, Column Editor*

Reported by Angela M. Weber

In June and October 1999 the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) received health hazard evaluation (HHE) requests from a body piercing studio (Facility A) in Orlando, Florida, and a body piercing studio (Facility B) in Tallahassee, Florida, respectively. The owners' requests concerned potential occupational exposures to bloodborne pathogens during body piercing procedures. Both requests were prompted by the passage of a new rule (Chapter 64E-19 of the Florida Administrative Code), which requires the Florida Department of Health (DOH) to regulate body piercing salons.

## Background

### *History of Body Piercing*

Until recently, body piercing sites other than the earlobe have been relatively rare in Western culture. Body piercing is gaining widespread popularity among both teens and adults from a variety of occupations and social classes. Although it may seem like a new fad, body piercing has been popular in some cultures for many years. Piercings have been performed as a rite of passage, to indicate social standing, and as a mark of royalty.<sup>(1,2)</sup> Roman centurions were said to have pierced their nipples to hold their capes in place, Mayans pierced their tongues for spiritual purposes, and the Pharaohs of Egypt ceremoniously had their navels pierced. Genital piercings were, and still are, seen in areas around the Indian Ocean and among peoples of the South Pacific. In Victorian England, both sexes of royalty had nipple and geni-

tal piercings. One particular type of genital piercing was supposedly worn by, and named after, Queen Victoria's husband, Prince Albert.

### *Piercing Procedure*

Body piercing is a quick procedure that is done without local anesthesia. The type of piercing and the location on the body determine the gauge of the jewelry and the diameter of the rings or length of the "barbell" to be placed through the skin or mucosa. Piercing locations include the ears, nose, lips, chin, tongue, eyebrows, nipples, navel, and genitals. The types of jewelry range from small to wide hoops, to ear or barbell-type studs. Once the jewelry is chosen, it is autoclaved for sterilization. Most jewelry is made of surgical-grade stainless steel, solid 14- or 18-karat gold, niobium, titanium, platinum, low-porosity plastic, or silver.

A single-use setup is used to perform the piercing. The piercer cleanses the piercing area with a topical antiseptic. Entrance and exit sites are marked with a pen to provide a guide for the needle, and the skin is held taut by forceps, while the piercing is made with a large-gauge (12-16-gauge) hollow-bore needle. Some piercers prefer to place a cork at the exit site to catch the needle. Jewelry is then attached to the needle and quickly guided through the hole in a needle-and-thread type fashion. A bead, metal ball, or disk is then screwed on to the exiting side of the jewelry. Because a small amount of bleeding usually occurs, manual pressure is applied to the pierced area with sterile gauze. The amount of blood depends on the piercing location; the nose and genital areas generally produce the most blood.

Variations of this procedure may occur. In piercing the tongue, a longer "barbell" is initially used to allow for edema of the tongue. In the Prince Albert penile piercing, the needle passes through the urethra, where a receiving tube is used to guide the needle. Receiving tubes are also used for nose piercings, in which the tube is placed in the client's nostril. To stretch existing piercing site openings so that larger-diameter jewelry can be worn, tapers are slowly passed through them.

### *Training Level of Piercers*

Body piercing is currently performed by unlicensed personnel who have learned their trade from colleagues, magazines, or videos.<sup>(2)</sup> In the absence of local or federal regulations, piercers may not have received training in anatomy, infection control, or universal precautions. The Association of Professional Piercers (APP) recommends that an apprenticeship of at least one year be completed.<sup>(3)</sup> Some of the requirements listed for an apprenticeship include attending an Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) bloodborne pathogen course; spending a minimum of three months full-time as a trainee, learning sterilization, disinfection, and cross-contamination avoidance; spending a minimum of six months to one year in full-time supervised training before achieving the title of piercer; and observing all procedures before performing them. The APP has four different piercing titles: apprentice/trainee, piercer, senior or training piercer, and master piercer. The designated title depends on the amount of time the person has been piercing. For example, an apprentice is someone who has worked as a piercer for less than a year, while a master piercer is

an individual with no less than five years of full-time piercing experience.

## Methods

At both of the body piercing studios (Facilities A and B), NIOSH investigators observed the assembly of instruments, jewelry, and supplies used during the piercing procedure; the preparation of the piercing area; the piercing itself; the disposal of the piercing needle in a sharps container; the disinfection of contaminated surfaces; and the sterilization of reusable instruments. The use of personal protective equipment (PPE) was observed for the activities noted above, as well as general housekeeping procedures. Written policies and programs were evaluated when present, and informal interviews were conducted with the HHE requesters and their employees.

The observed practices in both piercing studios were compared to the requirements outlined in the new Florida ruling (APP recommendations discussed in the Background section of this article) in order to identify any potential inconsistencies or areas in need of improvement. This evaluation was limited to those areas relating to occupational health. To gain a better understanding of the factors that prompted the regulating of body piercing studios in the State of Florida, NIOSH investigators met with the authors of the ruling in Tallahassee, Florida, on January 7, 2000. Additionally, implementation strategies for the new rule, including the training of DOH inspectors, were discussed.

## Evaluation Criteria

### *Bloodborne Pathogens Standard*

Bloodborne pathogens include, but are not limited to, the hepatitis B virus (HBV); human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), which causes acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS); hepatitis C virus (HCV); human T-lymphotrophic virus Type 1; and pathogens causing malaria, syphilis, babesiosis, brucellosis, leptospirosis, arboviral infections, and viral hemorrhagic fever. For the purposes of this report, attention will be focused on the three most commonly transmit-

ted bloodborne viruses: HBV, HCV, and HIV.

OSHA regulation on bloodborne pathogens, 29 CFR 1910.1030, took effect on March 6, 1992.<sup>(4)</sup> The OSHA standard covers all employees who may be reasonably anticipated to be occupationally exposed to blood and other potentially infectious materials. The key requirements of the standard are the determination of occupational exposure and the implementation of appropriate control measures and work practices to minimize these exposures. The following section outlines the major requirements of the bloodborne pathogens standard.

### *Written exposure control plan.*

- Identification of job classifications where there is exposure to blood or other potentially infectious materials
- Identification of protective measures currently in effect at the facility
- Establishment of procedures to evaluate the circumstances of an exposure incident

### *Hazard communication to employees.*

- Implementation of employee training programs, which should include information on bloodborne pathogens, OSHA regulations, and the employer's exposure control program

### *Preventive measures.*

- Hepatitis B vaccination provided within 10 working days of initial job assignment at no cost to the employee
- Application of the universal precautions approach to infection control, which assumes that the blood, body fluids, and tissues of all persons are potentially infectious

### *Engineering and work practice controls.*

- Use of puncture-resistant, leak-proof containers (color-coded red or labeled as a biohazard) to discard or transport sharps

and other potentially infectious material

- Use of work practice controls to reduce the probability of exposure by altering the manner in which the task is performed

### *Personal protective equipment (PPE).*

- Use of gloves, face shields, face masks, protective clothing, and other PPE to reduce workers' risk of exposure

### *Procedures after an exposure incident.*

- Medical evaluations and follow-up offered at no cost to the individual
- Employee must be immediately directed to a healthcare professional who is available during all working hours

### *Record keeping.*

- A medical record must be established for each employee with potential occupational exposure. A copy of the employee's hepatitis B vaccination status should be included. The record must be confidential, separate from other personnel records, and maintained for 30 years after employment
- Training records must be kept for three years

### *Specific Bloodborne Pathogens*

Although there are a number of bloodborne pathogens, as listed at the beginning of the section, only the three most common in the United States are discussed below.

*Hepatitis B.* One of the most infectious of all known bloodborne pathogens is HBV. Among healthcare workers who have had needlestick injuries involving a patient who has had HBV infection, up to 30 percent have developed infection with this virus.<sup>(5-8)</sup> Persons infected with HBV are at risk for chronic liver disease (i.e., chronic active hepatitis, cirrhosis, and primary hepatocellular carcinoma) and can potentially infect others. An estimated 100-200 healthcare

personnel have died annually during the past decade because of the chronic consequences of HBV infection (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], unpublished data). A vaccine for HBV is available, and the CDC recommends that workers potentially exposed to blood or blood-contaminated bodily fluids receive this vaccine.<sup>(9)</sup>

*Hepatitis C.* HCV infection is the most common chronic bloodborne infection in the United States.<sup>(10)</sup> HCV is most efficiently transmitted by large or repeated percutaneous exposures to blood, such as through the transfusion of blood or blood products from infectious donors, and sharing of contaminated needles among injection drug users. The risk factors for HCV transmission in the occupational setting are not well-defined.<sup>(11–14)</sup> During the past decade, the annual number of newly acquired HCV infections has ranged from an estimated 28,000 to 180,000.<sup>(15)</sup> Of these, an estimated 2–4 percent occurred among healthcare personnel who were occupationally exposed to blood.<sup>(16)</sup>

At least 85 percent of persons with HCV infection become chronically infected, and chronic liver disease with persistently elevated liver enzymes develops in about 67 percent of those chronically infected.<sup>(10)</sup> These extraordinarily high rates of chronic disease and persistent viremia in humans indicate the absence of an effective neutralizing immune response.<sup>(17,18)</sup> Although the efficacy of post-exposure prophylaxis after occupational exposure to HCV has been difficult to assess, immune globulin does not appear to be effective in preventing HCV infection.<sup>(19)</sup>

Even in the absence of available post-exposure prophylaxis, individual work sites should establish policies and procedures for follow-up after percutaneous or mucosal exposure to anti-HCV positive blood in order to address individual worker's concerns about their risk and outcome. Employers should provide education to employees regarding the prevention of hepatitis C in the occupational setting,<sup>(10)</sup> and such information should be routinely updated to ensure accuracy.

*Human immunodeficiency virus.* Exposures to HIV can occur through needlesticks or cuts from other sharp instruments contaminated with an infected person's blood, or through contact of the eye, nose, mouth, or skin with contaminated blood. All exposures of this type should be immediately evaluated by a healthcare provider.

Most occupational exposures to HIV do not result in infection. The risk of infection varies with the type of exposure, and also with factors such as the amount of blood involved in the exposure, the amount of virus in the blood, and whether treatment was given after the exposure. Between 1985 and June 1999, cumulative totals of 55 documented cases and 136 possible cases of occupational HIV transmission to U.S. healthcare workers were reported to the CDC.<sup>(20)</sup> Needlesticks were associated with 89 percent (49 out of 55) of the documented transmissions. Of these, 44 involved hollow-bore needles. There have been no documented cases of HIV transmission due to an exposure involving a small amount of blood on intact skin. The risk may be higher if the skin is damaged, if the contact involves a large area of skin, or if the contact is prolonged.

Treatment is available after an occupational exposure to HIV. Results from a small number of studies suggest that the use of zidovudine (ZDV) and other antiviral drugs after certain occupational exposures may reduce the chance of HIV infection after exposure.<sup>(21)</sup> However, a healthcare provider who is familiar with the risks of HIV infection and the side effects of the drugs should be consulted to determine whether post-exposure treatment is appropriate.

#### *Regulation of Body Piercing Studios*

Most body piercing studios in the United States are not regulated. In 1998, Texas, Oregon, and Wisconsin were the only states that specifically regulated body piercing. According to the APP's Web site, approximately 18 states are currently in the process of enacting legislation to regulate body piercing.<sup>(22)</sup>

The APP is a nonprofit organization that was formed in an attempt to initiate self-regulatory policies for the body piercing industry.<sup>(23)</sup> The association publishes a procedural manual that provides safety suggestions, as well as a monthly newsletter called "The Point." In addition, the APP holds an annual conference, where safety and health issues are discussed. To become a member of the APP, applicants must prove that they have been piercing full-time for at least one full year, that they are certified in First Aid/CPR, and that they use an autoclave for sterilization of reusable instruments. Spore testing for the autoclave must be submitted on a monthly basis.

Currently, there are over 100 members belonging to the APP. At the time of the HHE requests, the only APP members from Florida, out of an estimated 300 piercers in the state, were the owners of the two piercing studios that submitted the NIOSH HHE requests. The total number of piercing studios in the United States is unknown; therefore, an estimate of at-risk piercing employees cannot be calculated. Since this occupation is not closely monitored, the potential for disease transmission among workers is also unknown.

#### *Chapter 64E-19, Florida Administrative Code*

The Florida ruling prescribes minimum sanitary and safety requirements regarding the design, operation, and maintenance of body piercing studios and temporary establishments. The primary focus of the standard is the prevention of infections in those receiving the piercings, not occupational risks to those performing them. Potential risks to recipients of piercings include localized bacterial infections, tetanus, non-menstrual toxic shock syndrome, viral hepatitis, and HIV.<sup>(24–32)</sup> These infections have been attributed to the use of contaminated equipment and improper aftercare by the client.

The sections of the standard that specifically address occupational concerns

of the piercers are summarized below:

**Requirements for Premises (64E-19.004):** This section contains requirements for handwashing facilities within each body piercing area; appropriate disposal of biohazardous waste; cleaning and sterilization of instruments; and prohibiting smoking, eating, and drinking in piercing areas.

**Requirements for Sterilizing Jewelry and Instruments (64E-19.005):** This section recommends the use of tuberculocidal sanitizers for surface cleaning.

**Piercing Procedures (64E-19.006):** This section requires piercers to wear “disposable sterile medical gloves” during procedures, and to wear protective eyewear if splashing is expected. This section also states that the skin area to be pierced must be “free of rash, infection, or any other visible disease condition.”

**Other Operations (64E-19.007):** This section requires the completion of training covering the areas of safety, sanitation, and sterilization for the prevention of infectious diseases.

Although the ruling requires that injuries to a customer’s body structure or function be reported to the local health department, there is no discussion for the need to report an occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens as required by OSHA.<sup>(4)</sup> The Florida standard does not cover ear piercings performed in beauty salons or jewelry stores.

## Results

### Facility A

Facility A served as a piercing studio, as well as a clothing, shoe, and music store. Approximately 15 employees worked at the establishment, but only 2 employees actually performed piercings. Approximately 100 piercings were completed per week, depending on the time of year. The most common piercing sites were the tongue and navel. Jewelry was displayed near the entrance of the store in an enclosed case and was kept separate from the stock jewelry.

There were two areas in the facility designated for piercing activities: a piercing room and a decontamination/sterilization room. All surfaces of the piercing room, including the walls, floors, and procedure surfaces, were constructed of smooth, nonabsorbent, and washable materials. There were approximately 64 square feet of floor space containing one piercing station. A viewing window with blinds had been installed in one of the walls so that customers could observe the piercings. This limited both the number of people entering the room and the introduction of additional contaminants to the surrounding environment. The room was well-lit and in good physical condition, and smoking, eating, and drinking were not allowed in the piercing areas.

A large industrial-sized toolbox, located in the piercing room, was used for storing individually packaged jewelry that had been sterilized. The sharps container was bolted to the wall behind the piercing chair. A handsink was located along the same wall as a countertop cabinet where supplies were stored and instruments were assembled in preparation for piercings. Paper towels were dispensed from a wall-mounted unit located above the preparation area. A stainless steel rolling cart with a tray holder was used for positioning the forceps, jewelry, gloves, needle, and gauze used during the piercings. The tray was wiped down


with a disinfectant before and after each use.

During the site visit, NIOSH investigators observed a labret piercing (through the skin beneath the bottom lip). After the client chose the type of jewelry (a barbell with a flat disk on the end inside the mouth and a ball on the exterior end), the piercer selected the same type from stock that had already been sterilized. Prepackaged, sterilized jewelry has a shelf life of 30 days; after this time, it needs to be re-autoclaved. A pair of packaged, sterilized latex gloves was worn by the piercer during setup, which involved opening another package of gloves. The packaging was opened to cover the entire tray, with the inner portion (sterilized side) facing up (Figure 1). Other materials needed for the piercing included gauze; a 14-gauge, hollow-bore disposable needle, about 1.5 inches in length; marking dye and applicator; and sterilized, packaged forceps, which were unwrapped and placed on the tray. The piercer cleaned the area of the face with a topical antiseptic applied to gauze, and the client was asked to use mouthwash antiseptic to cleanse the inside of her mouth. Using a toothpick, the piercer marked the location of the piercing with the dye, both inside the mouth and on the face.

The additional pair of gloves on the tray were then placed over the gloves already being worn. The forceps were used



**FIGURE 1**  
Tray preparation.




**FIGURE 2**  
Area held with forceps.

to align the entrance and exit markings of the piercing, and then tightened. The tips of the forceps are looped; therefore, they provide guidance for the needle, which passes through the looped area (Figure 2). The needle (with the attached barbell) was inserted from the outer skin below the lip, through the skin, to the inside of the mouth (Figure 3). The needle was removed, and a ball was screwed on to the end of the exterior portion of the barbell.

Pressure was applied to the pierced area with sterile gauze to slow the bleeding (Figure 4), followed by the application of an antiseptic. The entire process took less than five minutes, with the majority of time spent marking the

piercing site. Throughout the process, all materials and instruments, including the needle, were placed back on the tray. The amount of blood produced by the piercing could be cleaned with two gauze pads. According to the piercer, this amount of blood is similar for all piercings except those in the nose and genital areas, which bleed more. After the procedure was completed, the contaminated needle was picked off the tray by hand and disposed of in the sharps container. The blood-contaminated gauze and gloves were discarded as biohazardous waste; the forceps were taken to the sterilization room; and all other materials were thrown away as regular trash. Between clients, the tray, chair, and



**FIGURE 3**  
Insertion of jewelry.

countertop were sanitized with a germicidal agent. The floor was mopped with a diluted sodium hypochlorite (bleach) solution at least once per day.

In addition to the piercing, NIOSH investigators observed the stretching of an existing piercing. Stretching is accomplished with the use of tapers (Figure 5), which are made of solid, surgical-grade stainless steel and are reusable after they have been autoclaved. A lubricant is used to slowly insert the taper through the pierced area. This procedure was much less invasive than a piercing; no blood was visible, which is reportedly the case for most circumstances. The same type of skin preparation and cleanup was used for the stretching as for the piercing; latex gloves were used throughout the procedure.

The decontamination/sterilization room was off limits to clients, except for the performance of genital piercings, which are rare. At the time of the survey, genital piercings were performed in this room because it offered more privacy than the piercing room. Contaminated instruments were brought to this room and soaked in an open tray, in either Cidex® or Wavicide®. The active ingredient in both agents is glutaraldehyde. A single pair of latex gloves was worn during the handling of contaminated instruments. Once the instruments had soaked in the decontaminant, they were rinsed in the sink and put in the sonicator for 30 minutes. A lid was placed on the sonicator while it was in use. The instruments were removed from the sonicator and allowed to dry. After drying, instruments were bagged and placed in the autoclave. Both the cleanup of contaminated equipment and the sterilization of equipment were done in this room. A comprehensive set of material safety data sheets (MSDSs) for the chemicals used in the store and studio were kept in a binder located in this room.

The heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning (HVAC) system serving the store consisted of a typical central forced-air residential unit. A low-efficiency filter was used in the unit, and a half-inch gap was found at the top of



**FIGURE 4**  
Applying pressure.

the filter frame; this allows for the passage of unfiltered air through the system. The system was serviced by an outside contractor. The piercing room was under negative pressure (air flowed from the hallway into the room).

Neither of the body piercers had been vaccinated against HBV, and an exposure control program, as required by OSHA, had not been prepared for the facility at the time of the site visit. However, a bloodborne pathogens training course had been completed by both piercers.

#### *Facility B*

Facility B piercing studio shared space with a tattoo parlor. At the time

of the site visit, there were two piercers in the studio; one was the owner, and the other was completing her apprenticeship. Approximately 100 piercings were completed per week, with the most common piercing site being the navel. Jewelry was displayed in an enclosed countertop viewing case, which was kept separate from the stock jewelry.

The piercing area was located near the entrance of the tattooing room. There were approximately 45 square feet of floor space in this area, which contained one piercing station. The piercing area was blocked off from the main reception area by a curtain. All other surfaces of the piercing room, including the floor and procedure surfaces, were constructed of



**FIGURE 5**  
Insertion of taper.

smooth, nonabsorbent, washable materials. The room was in good physical condition and was well-lit; additional light was provided by an adjustable lamp. Smoking, eating, and drinking were not permitted in the piercing area.

Individually packaged, sterilized jewelry was stored in a credenza situated in the piercing area. The sharps container was situated behind the piercing chair, a handsink was located along the same wall as the jewelry credenza, and paper towels were dispensed from a wall-mounted unit positioned above the sink. Additional piercing supplies and instruments were assembled in the credenza. A stainless steel rolling cart with a tray holder was used for positioning the forceps, jewelry, gloves, needle, and gauze used during the piercings. The tray was wiped down with a disinfectant before and after each use. The sonicator and autoclave were also located in the piercing area, along the same wall as the credenza.

NIOSH investigators were able to observe numerous procedures during the site visit, including piercings in the eyebrow, nostril, navel, tongue, as well as a female genital piercing. The same measures were followed as described for Facility A, except that corks were used during the piercings. Corks can be used to support the tissue and forceps during the piercing, and they potentially offer protection against needlesticks. In addition, a receiving tube was used during the nostril piercing; forceps cannot be used for this body area. Prior to the piercing, the receiving tube was placed inside the client's nostril. The needle (with the attached jewelry) was inserted from the outer part of the nose, through the skin, to the inside of the nose, where it was pushed through the receiving tube and out through the nostril. Nasal jewelry has no further attachments inside the nose; instead, the portion of the jewelry inside the nose is bent by the piercer to conform to the inside of the nostril. There was significantly more blood associated with this piercing, compared to all of the others that were observed on the day of the site visit.

Contaminated instruments were soaked in MadaCide<sup>®</sup>, which has an alcohol-based active ingredient. A single pair of latex gloves was worn during the handling of contaminated instruments. Once the instruments had soaked in the decontaminant, they were rinsed in the sink and put in the sonicator for 30 minutes. A lid was placed on the sonicator while in use. The instruments were removed from the sonicator and allowed to dry. After drying, the instruments were bagged and placed in the autoclave. A comprehensive set of MSDSs for the chemicals used in the studio was available.

The HVAC unit was not accessed during the NIOSH site visit. The same unit serviced both the piercing studio and the tattoo parlor. Since the piercing area did not have floor-to-ceiling walls, there was no consistent directional airflow.

Both of the body piercers had been vaccinated against HBV, and had completed a bloodborne pathogen training course. An exposure control program, as required by OSHA, however, had not been prepared for the facility at the time of the site visit.

## Discussion and Conclusions

The primary hazard noted during the piercing process was the potential for needlesticks to occur. NIOSH investigators concluded that the body piercers at both facilities were at risk for exposure to bloodborne pathogens, due to the potential for needlestick injuries. While there are numerous publications on the risk of infections in those receiving body piercings, there is relatively little information available on the occupational risks posed to body piercers. For instance, the number of body piercers in the United States has never been documented. Additionally, there is no published data available regarding the number of body piercers who have had needlesticks, or how many of that group may have contracted an infection with a bloodborne pathogen. The fact that most, if not all, piercers have received numerous piercings themselves makes determining the number of occupational transmissions in this group of

employees even more difficult since an infection could have occurred while they were receiving a piercing.

The risk of infection after a needlestick depends on the pathogen, the immune status of the piercer, the severity of the needlestick injury, and the availability of appropriate post-exposure prophylaxis.<sup>(33)</sup> Healthcare workers (HCWs) are the only group of employees whose risk of infection due to needlesticks has been evaluated. Among HCWs, the average transmission rate for HIV, when the source is HIV-positive, is 0.3 percent per injury;<sup>(34)</sup> the rate of HBV transmission from an infectious source ranges from 6 to 30 percent;<sup>(9)</sup> and the average transmission of HCV is 1.8 percent (range of 0 to 7%) per injury when the source is infectious.<sup>(10)</sup> While HBV poses a high risk for infection, the hepatitis B vaccine has been shown to be 90 percent effective in preventing HBV infection.<sup>(34)</sup> There is no vaccine available for HIV or HCV; therefore, the only protection against these agents is to prevent the needlestick from ever occurring.

It is unknown whether these rates of transmission are similar among body piercers. The severity of the needlesticks may be different among the two groups. In body piercing, a relatively large needle (14-gauge) is used; in the healthcare industry, smaller needles tend to be used for the most common procedures. Additionally, the force applied to the needle during piercing is much greater than the force that is applied when collecting blood or injecting a drug into a patient. The risk of transmission is also greatly influenced by the population served; it is unknown, however, whether individuals seeking body piercings have a higher rate of bloodborne infections than persons receiving healthcare.

Another potential route of transmission of bloodborne pathogens is from an infected piercer to a customer. Within the healthcare industry there have been reports of 20 clusters of HBV transmission, in which a total of 300 patients were infected with HBV during an invasive procedure conducted by an

HBV-infected HCW.<sup>(35)</sup> According to data collected by the CDC, certain invasive surgical and dental procedures have been linked to HBV transmission and have been identified as exposure-prone. The question is whether or not body piercing falls into an exposure-prone category. Since the procedures identified by the CDC include manipulations that are much more invasive than body piercing (i.e., digital palpation of a needle tip in a body cavity, simultaneous presence of the HCW's fingers and a needle in a poorly visualized anatomical site), it can be concluded that body piercing cannot be considered exposure-prone. Therefore, there would be no reason to restrict the practice of piercers infected with a bloodborne pathogen, provided that the piercer complies with universal precautions and appropriate procedures for disinfection/sterilization.<sup>(36)</sup>

The implementation of engineering controls is one of the primary methods used to eliminate an occupational hazard. For example, in the healthcare industry the introduction of better designed needles has led to a drastic reduction in the number of needlesticks.<sup>(37)</sup> These devices, however, may not be functional in the piercing industry, since the needles must pass entirely through a body part. According to anecdotal information, needlesticks among piercers typically occur when the unprotected needle is exiting the piercing site. It is unclear whether or not a cork provides protection against a needlestick, since the cork reportedly may crack as the needle is pushing through it. The use of a cork during piercings appears to be solely dependent on the preference and training of the piercer. Since this aspect of piercing has not been widely studied, it is impossible at this time to make a recommendation regarding the use of corks.

In both facilities, the sharps containers were located behind the piercing chair. Because the sharps container was not within reach of the piercer, used needles were placed back on the tray. Picking up contaminated needles from the tray to discard them in the

sharps container is an unnecessary handling step, thus posing an unnecessary risk to the piercer. In addition, an inconvenient location of the sharps container forces the piercer to make unnecessary movements while holding the needle.

Additional infection risks were observed regarding exposures from the potential cross-contamination of instruments and surfaces. It is important to stress that the typical body-piercing procedure should not be considered a sterile procedure. Even the instruments that are autoclaved can become contaminated once their packaging is open, since the surrounding environment is not sterile. At the time of the site visit at Facility A, genital piercings were being performed in the same room where contaminated instruments were being cleaned in a sonicator. This practice has since been discontinued. At Facility B, all piercings were done within six feet of the sonicator. Although certain practices can reduce the number of viable organisms potentially aerosolized from a sonicator (see Recommendations section), there is the potential for the deposition of infectious droplets onto surfaces, equipment, and personnel located in the near vicinity.

A great number of disinfectants can be utilized to clean surfaces and instruments used during the piercing procedures, such as alcohol, chlorine and chlorine compounds, formaldehyde, glutaraldehyde, hydrogen peroxide, iodophors, phenolics, and quaternary ammonium compounds. However, occupational skin diseases among cleaning personnel have been associated with the use of several of these disinfectants, including formaldehyde, glutaraldehyde, chlorine, and phenol.<sup>(36,37)</sup> The use of latex gloves while handling these chemicals, which was done at both facilities, does not offer adequate protection from any of these compounds.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations apply to both facilities, and were offered to reduce employees' exposures to po-

tentially infectious agents during body piercing activities and to chemicals during disinfection procedures.

1. Develop and implement all components of the OSHA Bloodborne Pathogen Standard.<sup>(4)</sup> The major components of this standard include the following: housekeeping; adherence to universal precautions; appropriate use of PPE and sharps containers; offering hepatitis B vaccinations to all employees; post-exposure management, including an exposure evaluation and follow-up; bloodborne pathogen training; and record-keeping.
2. Procedures should be modified to allow the piercer to dispose of the needle as soon as possible after use without being required to put the needle down and pick it up again.<sup>(38)</sup> This may require that the sharps disposal container be mounted on wheels to accommodate its movement to the piercing station. Some manufacturers provide trays or holders to stabilize the sharps container during this type of application. Pushing the needle into a cork located on the tray is not considered a safe alternative to immediate disposal of needles.
3. All piercers should be required to be up-to-date on relevant immunizations according to recommendations by the CDC Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices.<sup>(9)</sup> Currently, vaccination against tuberculosis is not recommended in the United States. (Tuberculosis [TB] vaccination is recommended by the APP).<sup>(3)</sup> All nonimmune piercers should be offered the hepatitis B vaccination prior to performing any piercings. One to two months after completion of the 3-dose hepatitis B vaccination series, employees should be tested for antibody to hepatitis B surface antigen (anti-HBs).<sup>(35)</sup>

4. Consideration should be given to the use of improved needle designs (such as solid needles instead of the currently used hollow-bore needles) as they become available. Currently, solid needles are not available; they would have to be designed to work in combination with the insertion of jewelry. This would potentially reduce the amount of blood a piercer is exposed to if stuck, since the needle would not be full of blood. Prior to using any new device, training must be performed.
5. Immediately following an exposure to blood or bodily fluids, or to objects potentially contaminated with blood or bodily fluids, the following should occur: Areas of skin exposed to needlesticks and cuts should be washed with soap and water; after splashes to the nose, mouth, or skin, the area should be flushed with water; and after splashes to the eyes, the eyes should be irrigated with clean water, saline, or sterile irrigants. There is no evidence that the use of antiseptics for wound care nor the squeezing of the wound site further reduces the risk for disease transmission.<sup>(39)</sup> The application of caustic agents (such as bleach) is not recommended. All employee needlesticks; cuts from other sharp objects; or splashes onto the skin, eyes, nose, or mouth should be immediately reported and evaluated by an appropriate healthcare professional.
6. If permissible by law, an attempt should be made to determine the infectious status of the customer if a needlestick or exposure to blood or other bodily fluids occurs. If the customer's infectious status is unknown, contact information should be acquired, including name, address, and telephone number. This information could then be passed on to the health department or

healthcare professional providing the follow-up.

7. Since environmental contamination is a potential method of disease transmission, appropriate cleaning and disinfecting of work surfaces is necessary. "Appropriate disinfectants" include a diluted bleach solution and "EPA-registered tuberculocides" (list B). A list of EPA-registered products is available from the National Antimicrobial Information Network at 800-447-6349 or its website at <http://ace.orst.edu/info/nain/lists.htm>. The manufacturer's recommended contact time should be followed closely; a surface should never be prepared for another piercing until the appropriate decontamination contact time has elapsed.
8. Appropriate gloves should be worn and changed as needed. If latex gloves are used, reduced-protein, powder-free gloves should be worn to protect workers from developing latex allergy.<sup>(40)</sup> These gloves reduce exposures to latex protein, although some symptoms may still occur. "Hypoallergenic" latex gloves do not necessarily reduce the risk of latex allergy; they are designed to reduce reactions to chemical additives in the latex, which can cause allergic contact dermatitis.
 

Latex gloves do not, however, provide adequate protection against disinfection agents, which contain chemicals that may cause deterioration of the glove material. Consideration should be given to using vinyl or nitrile rubber gloves instead of latex. Nitrile, for example, could be safely used with most disinfectants, including ethyl alcohol, hydrogen peroxide, glutaraldehyde, and sodium hypochlorite.<sup>(41)</sup> If this were done, only one type of glove would need to be purchased for both piercing and decontamination activities.
9. A spill response plan should be developed and implemented, and should be included as an employee training requirement. All spills of blood and blood-contaminated fluids should be promptly cleaned using an EPA-approved germicide or a 1:100 solution of household bleach, while wearing appropriate gloves. If visible materials are present, they should be removed first with disposable towels. If there are sharps present, they should be picked up using forceps or other means that do not require direct contact with the sharp. The area should then be decontaminated with the appropriate germicide, and hands should be washed immediately following the removal of gloves. A biohazard waste container should be available for the removal of contaminated items from the site of the spill.
10. Procedures or equipment (such as the sonicator) that have a high potential for generating droplets should be operated within an enclosed environment that passes its exhaust air through a high-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filter.<sup>(42)</sup> Additional methods of minimizing the aerosolization of infectious droplets include operating the sonicator only when a manufacturer-provided lid is in place. The lid should be left on for several minutes after the sonicator has completed its cycle, in order for the aerosols to settle. Soaking the instruments for the recommended contact time prior to the operation of the sonicator may also reduce the number of viable organisms in solution. While aerosolized bloodborne pathogens do not typically pose an inhalation hazard, cross-contamination could be an issue when aerosols settle out on surfaces in the piercing areas.
11. Piercings should not be performed in the same room where contaminated instruments are cleaned by sonication. In addition, sterilized materials should not be kept in the same room where contaminated materials are cleaned.
12. The use of recirculating, portable HEPA filtration units may be used in any of the piercing areas, including the piercing room, the cleaning room, or the sterilization room, where additional air filtration could aid in lowering the airborne bacterial and fungal loads. The placement and airflow capacity of the unit determine its ability to effectively recirculate and filter the room air.
13. Since body-piercing procedures are similar to the activities conducted in a hospital patient room, ventilation rates should comply with those recommended by the American Society for Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE). In Standard 62-1999, "Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality," ASHRAE recommends an effective outside air exchange rate of 25 cubic feet per minute (cfm) per person for patient rooms in hospitals.<sup>(43)</sup> Additionally, the piercing room should be kept under positive pressure to prevent the migration of air from an adjacent "dirtier" environment into the piercing room. Rooms with floor-to-ceiling solid walls are necessary to achieve controlled directional air flow and air exchange rates.
14. The current filtration is not adequate to prevent dust accumulation in the ventilation systems. Filters with an ASHRAE dust spot efficiency rating of 35 to 60 percent should be used instead of the current filters, which are less than 10 percent efficient. The most efficient filters whose pressure drop the system can handle should be used. A mechanical firm should be

consulted to determine the maximum filter efficiency. At Facility A, the filter should be seated correctly in the filter frame of the HVAC system to remove the gap that was present during the site visit.

15. Chemical indicator strips should be used on every load autoclaved, to ensure that the appropriate temperature is reached during the cycle.
16. Ideally, wrist-action or foot-pedal-operated sinks should be used in the piercing areas to reduce the potential for cross-contamination of hands. Towel dispensers should not be located over work areas where dripping water from wet hands could contaminate clean instruments.
17. Foot traffic in the piercing areas should be kept to a minimum to reduce the amount of contaminants tracked into the room. Piercing areas should never be carpeted, since carpeting cannot be appropriately cleaned. Customers' personal belongings (i.e., purses, bags, etc.) should remain outside of the piercing room.
18. Markers, which are reused between customers for the marking of piercing sites, should be discarded or cleaned between uses with an appropriate disinfectant.
19. Body piercing should be discouraged when piercers are fatigued, since this could lead to accidental needlesticks.

## REFERENCES

1. Samaa, S.; Tweeten, M.; Rickman, L.S.: Infectious Complications of Body Piercing. *Clin Infect Dis* 26:735-740 (1998).
2. Armstrong, M.L.; Ekmark, E.; Brooks, B.: Body Piercing: Promoting Informed Decision Making. *J of School of Nurs* 11(2):20-25 (1995).
3. Association of Professional Piercers: Ethics and Legalities. In: Grey, M., Ed. *Procedural Standards*, pp. 47-55, Chamblee, GA (1998).
4. Code of Federal Regulations: 29 CFR 1910.1030 Bloodborne Pathogens Standard. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, Office of the Federal Register.
5. Lymer, U.B.; Schütz, A.A.; Isaksson, B.: A Descriptive Study of Blood Exposure Incidents Among Healthcare Workers in a University Hospital in Sweden. *J Hosp Inf* 35:223-235 (1997).
6. Polish, L.B.; Tong, M.J.; Co, R.L.; et al.: Risk Factors for Hepatitis C Virus Infection Among Health Care Personnel in a Community Hospital. *Am J Inf Cont* 21(4):196-200 (1993).
7. Caird, A.; Wann, C.: Are Irish General Practitioners Minimizing Infection Risk from Sharps? *Irish Med Journal* 88(4):133-134 (1995).
8. Kopfer, A.M.; McGovern, P.M.: Transmission of HIV via a Needlestick Injury: Practice Recommendations and Research Implications. *AAOHN Journal* 41(8):374-381 (1993).
9. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Immunization of Health-Care Workers: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) and the Hospital Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC). *MMWR* 46(RR-18):1-42.
10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Recommendations for Prevention and Control of Hepatitis C Virus (HCV) Infection and HCV-Related Chronic Disease. *MMWR* 47(RR-19):1-39 (1998).
11. Alter, M.J.; Gerety, R.J.; Smallwood, L.; et al.: Sporadic Non-A, Non-B Hepatitis: Frequency and Epidemiology in an Urban United States Population. *J Infect Dis* 145:886-893 (1982).
12. Alter, M.J.: Epidemiology of Hepatitis C in the West. *Semin Liver Dis* 15:5-14 (1995).
13. Sartori, M.; La Terra, G.; Aglietta, M.; et al.: Transmission of Hepatitis C via Blood Splash into Conjunctiva. *Scand J Infect Dis* 25:270-271 (1993).
14. Mitsui, T.; Iwano, K.; Masuko, K.; et al.: Hepatitis C Virus Infection in Medical Personnel After Needlestick Accident. *Hepatology* 16:1109-1114 (1992).
15. Bolyard, E.A.; Ofelia, C.T.; Williams, W.W.; et al.: Guideline for Infection Control in Health Care Personnel. *Inf Cont & Hosp Epi* 19:407-463 (1998).
16. Alter, M.J.: The Detection, Transmission, and Outcome of Hepatitis C Virus Infection. *Infect Agents Dis* 2:155-166 (1993).
17. Bukh, J.; Miller, R.H.; Purcell, R.H.: Genetic Heterogeneity of Hepatitis C Virus: Quasispecies and Genotypes. *Semin Liv Dis* 15:41-63 (1995).
18. Farci, P.; Alter, H.J.; Wong, D.C.; et al.: Prevention of Hepatitis C Virus Infection in Chimpanzees After Antibody-Mediated In-Vitro Neutralization. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 91:7792-7796 (1994).
19. Krawczynski, K.; Alter, M.J.; Tankersley, D.L.; et al.: Effect of Immune Globulin on the Prevention of Experimental Hepatitis C Infection. *J Infect Dis* (in press).
20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: U.S. HIV and AIDS Cases Reported Through December 1998. *HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report* 10(2):26 (1998).
21. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Public Health Service Guidelines for the Management of Health-care Worker Exposures to HIV and Recommendations for Postexposure Prophylaxis. *MMWR* 47(RR-7):1-33 (1998).
22. Association of Professional Piercers: Body Piercing Legislation. [<http://www.safepiercing.org/legislation.html>]. Date accessed: November 21 (2000).
23. Association of Professional Piercers: Association of Professional Piercers. [<http://www.safepiercing.org>]. Date accessed: November 21 (2000).
24. Turkeltaub, S.H.; Habal, M.B.: Acute *Pseudomonas Chondritis* as a Sequel to Ear Piercing. *Ann Plast Surg* 24(3):279 (1990).
25. Stately, R.; Fitzgibbon, J.J.; Anderson, C.: Auricular Infections Caused by High Ear Piercing in Adolescents. *Pediatrics* 99:610-611 (1997).
26. George, J.; White, M.: Infection as a Consequence of Ear Piercing. *Practitioner* 233:405-406 (1989).
27. Morgan, L.G.: Primary Tuberculosis Inoculation of an Ear Lobe. *J Pediatrics* 40:482-485 (1952).
28. Mamtani, R.; Mahotra, P.; Gupta, P.S.; Jain, B.K.: A Comparative Study of Urban and Rural Tetanus in Adults. *Int J Epidemiol* 7:185-188 (1978).
29. Mele, A.; Corona, R.; Tosti, M.E.; et al.: Beauty Treatments and Risk of Parenterally Transmitted Hepatitis: Results from the Hepatitis Surveillance System in Italy. *Scand J Infect Dis* 27:441-444 (1995).

30. Ko, Y.-C.; Ho, M.-S.; Chiang, T.-A.; et al.: Tattooing as a Risk of Hepatitis C Virus Infection. *J Med Virol* 38:288-291 (1992).
31. Wu, J.-C.; Wang, Y.-J.; Hwang, S.-J.; et al.: Hepatitis D Virus Infection Among Prostitutes in Taiwan. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 8:334-337 (1993).
32. Pugatch, D.; Mileno, M.; Rich, J.D.: Possible Transmission of Human Immunodeficiency Virus Type 1 from Body Piercing. *Clin Infect Dis* 26:767-768 (1998).
33. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health: Preventing Needlestick Injuries in Health Care Settings. DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 2000-108 (1999).
34. Ippolito, G.; Puro, V.; Heptonstall, J.; et al.: Occupational Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infection in Health Care Workers: Worldwide Cases Through September 1997. *Clin Infect Dis* 28:365-383 (1999).
35. Centers for Disease Control: Recommendations for Preventing Transmission of Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Hepatitis B Virus to Patients During Exposure-Prone Invasive Procedures. *MMWR* 40(RR-08):1-9 (1991).
36. Hansen, K.S.: Occupational Dermatoses in Hospital Cleaning Women. *Contact Dermatitis* 9:343-351 (1983).
37. Melli, M.C.; Giorgini, S.; Sertoli, A.: Sensitization from Contact with Ethyl Alcohol. *Contact Dermatitis* 14:315 (1986).
38. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health: NIOSH Alert: Selecting, Evaluating, and Using Sharps Disposal Containers. DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 97-111 (1998).
39. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Public Health Service Guidelines for the Management of Health-Care Worker Exposure to HIV and Recommendations for Postexposure Prophylaxis. *MMWR* 47(RR-7):1-33 (1999).
40. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health: NIOSH Alert: Preventing Allergic Reactions to Natural Rubber Latex in the Workplace. DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 97-135 (1997).
41. Forsberg, K.; Mansdorf, S.Z.; Eds.: *Quick Selection Guide to Chemical Protective Clothing*, 3rd ed. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold (1997).
42. Gilchrist, M.J.R.: Biosafety Precaution for Airborne Pathogens. In: Fleming D.O., Richardson J.H., Tulis J.J., et al., Eds. *Laboratory safety principles and practices*. 2nd ed. Washington DC: American Society for Microbiology, p. 72 (1995).
43. American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc.: *Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality, Standard 62-1999* (1999).

---

**EDITORIAL NOTE:** Angela M. Weber is with the Atlanta Field Office of the Hazard Evaluation and Technical Assistance Branch of NIOSH. More detailed information on this evaluation is contained in Health Hazard Evaluation Report No. 2000-0013-2830, available through NIOSH, Hazard Evaluation and Technical Assistance Branch, 4676 Columbia Parkway, Cincinnati, Ohio 45226; telephone: (800) 35-NIOSH; fax: (513) 533-8573.

---