

useful while researchers continue to evaluate methods for reducing the risk of endoscope-related infection.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Evan Doyle, BS, for his editorial assistance.

Financial support. 3M provided funding and materials to Ofstead and Associates for the study discussed in B. Petersen's commentary (to which this letter replies). 3M did not have access to any study data and was not involved in the preparation of this letter. Additional research support was provided by Mayo Clinic and Ofstead and Associates. Neither the physicians at Mayo Clinic (K.H.V., P.K.T.) or the University of North Carolina School of Medicine (T.H.B.) nor their departments received monetary compensation for participating in the study.

Potential conflicts of interest. C.L.O. reports that she is employed by Ofstead and Associates, which has received research funding and speaking honoraria related to infection prevention from 3M, Johnson and Johnson, Ecolab, and Sanofi Pasteur. H.L.Y. and H.P.W. report that they are employed by Ofstead and Associates. All other authors report no conflicts of interest relevant to this article. All authors submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest, and the conflicts that the editors consider relevant to this article are disclosed here.

**Kavel H. Visrodia, MD;¹ Cori L. Ofstead, MSPH;^{2,3}
Hannah L. Yellin, BA;² Harry P. Wetzler, MD, MSPH;²
Pritish K. Tosh, MD;³ Todd H. Baron, MD⁴**

Affiliations: 1. Department of Internal Medicine, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota; 2. Ofstead and Associates, Saint Paul, Minnesota; 3. Division of Infectious Diseases, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota; 4. Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Address correspondence to Cori L. Ofstead, MSPH, Ofstead and Associates, 400 Selby Avenue, Suite V, Blair Arcade West, Saint Paul, MN 55102 (cori@ofsteadinsights.com).

Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2014;35(10):1309-1310

© 2014 by The Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. All rights reserved. 0899-823X/2014/3510-0017\$15.00. DOI: 10.1086/678075

REFERENCES

- Petersen B. Monitoring of endoscope reprocessing: accumulating data but best practices remain undefined. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2014;35:995–997.
- Visrodia KH, Ofstead CL, Yellin HL, et al. The use of rapid indicators for the detection of organic residues on clinically used gastrointestinal endoscopes with and without visually apparent debris. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2014;35:987–994.
- Dirlam Langlay AM, Ofstead CL, Mueller NJ, et al. Reported gastrointestinal endoscope reprocessing lapses: the tip of the iceberg. *Am J Infect Control* 2013;41(12):1188–1194.
- Aumeran C, Poincloux L, Souweine B, et al. Multidrug-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* outbreak after endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography. *Endoscopy* 2010;42(11):895–899.
- Carbonne A, Thiolet JM, Fournier S, et al. Control of a multi-hospital outbreak of KPC-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* type 2 in France, September to October 2009. *Euro Surveill* 2010; 15(48):1–6.
- Frias M, Tsai V, Moulton-Meissner H, et al. Notes from the field: New Delhi metallo-beta-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli* associated with endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography—Illinois, 2013. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2014;62(51/52):1051.
- Alfa MJ, Degagne P, Olson N. Worst-case soiling levels for patient-used flexible endoscopes before and after cleaning. *Am J Infect Control* 1999;27(5):392–401.
- Alfa MJ, Fatima I, Olson N. Validation of adenosine triphosphate to audit manual cleaning of flexible endoscope channels. *Am J Infect Control* 2013;41(3):245–248.
- Alfa MJ, Fatima I, Olson N. The adenosine triphosphate test is a rapid and reliable audit tool to assess manual cleaning adequacy of flexible endoscope channels. *Am J Infect Control* 2013; 41(3):249–253.
- Fushimi R, Takashina M, Yoshikawa H, et al. Comparison of adenosine triphosphate, microbiological load, and residual protein as indicators for assessing the cleanliness of flexible gastrointestinal endoscopes. *Am J Infect Control* 2013;41(2):161–164.
- Turner DE, Daugherty EK, Altier C, Maurer KJ. Efficacy and limitations of an ATP-based monitoring system. *J Am Assoc Lab Anim Sci* 2010;49(2):190–195.
- Hansen D, Benner D, Hilgenhoner M, Leisebein T, Brauksiepe A, Popp W. ATP measurement as method to monitor the quality of reprocessing flexible endoscopes. *Ger Med Sci* 2004;2:Doc04.
- Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation (AAMI). *Standard 58: Chemical Sterilization and High-Level Disinfection in Health Care Facilities*. Arlington, VA: AAMI, 2010.

Failure of a Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point–Based Legionnaires' Disease Prevention Program: 2 Definite Nosocomial Cases Tell the Story

To the Editor—In a recent article by Krageschmidt et al,¹ it is surprising to read the authors' conclusion that the hazard analysis and critical control point (HACCP) method was an "effective" program for controlling Legionnaires' disease even though 2 confirmed nosocomial cases of Legionnaires' disease occurred during the study period while the HACCP approach was being followed. Irrespective of what number of cases might have been occurring before implementation of the HACCP approach (data not reported), the occurrence of 2 nosocomial cases in 2 years in the 2 study hospitals while the HACCP approach was used documents a failure to recognize source amplification and to stop subsequent disease transmission.

The inability to detect the etiologic source for 2 nosocomial cases raises questions about the validity of the environmental testing methods used to assess the overall success of the HACCP program. In particular, the environmental testing approach used by the authors may have been inadequately sensitive to detect the source of *Legionella* for these 2 cases. The testing methods as written in this study (only listed as previously described) are not detailed enough to determine

whether the proprietary rapid dip stick/slide test was relied on as the gold standard (as per reference 17 in the McCoy et al. article^{2,3}). The authors too easily explain away the occurrence of the nosocomial cases as being possibly attributed to viable but nonculturable *Legionella* and provide little to no discussion on study limitations and alternative explanations that are more plausible.

Given the alternate interpretation of the observations reported in this article, a more objective and critical review of the HACCP method (a process control system approach most commonly used in food production and processing settings) is warranted before it is recommended as a Legionnaires' disease prevention approach in nonprocess control settings, such as building water systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Potential conflicts of interest. B.G.S. is the owner/operator of PathCon Laboratories, which provides laboratory and consulting services including *Legionella* testing and Legionnaires' disease prevention guidance. B.G.S. was not paid to submit this letter. All authors submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest, and the conflicts that the editors consider relevant to this article are disclosed here.

Brian G. Shelton, MPH¹

Affiliation: 1. PathCon Laboratories, Norcross, Georgia.

Address correspondence to Brian G. Shelton, MPH, PathCon Laboratories, 270 Scientific Drive, Suite 3, Norcross, GA 30092 (bshelton@pathcon.com). *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2014;35(10):1310-1311

© 2014 by The Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America. All rights reserved. 0899-823X/2014/3510-0018\$15.00. DOI: 10.1086/678073

REFERENCES

1. Krageschmidt DA, Kubly AF, Browning MS, et al. A comprehensive water management program for multicampus healthcare facilities. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2014;(35):556–563.
2. McCoy WF, Downes EL, Leonidas LF, et al. Inaccuracy in *Legionella* tests of building water systems due to sample holding time. *Water Res* 2012;46:3497–3506.
3. Flanders WD, Kirkland KH, Shelton BS. Effects of holding time and measurement error on culturing *Legionella* in environmental water sources. *Water Res* 2014;62:293–301.

Reply to Shelton

To the Editor—We disagree with Mr Shelton¹ that our water management program (WMP) failed and that use of the hazard analysis and critical control point (HACCP) method is inappropriate.

The 2 legionellosis cases discussed in our article² occurred while we were developing our WMP. The Minnesota Department of Health performed extensive independent envi-

ronmental sampling and analyses using the spread plate culture method; no *Legionella* were recovered in any of its tests from the facilities associated with these cases. This confirms that mandating actions in response to “trigger levels” or to arbitrary “percent positivity” scores, which are so often recommended by those who sell culture tests for profit, are to be not recommended. The precision and accuracy of results is not sufficient to support such specifications. In other words, taking action—or not—only on the basis of results from culturing building water samples is not scientifically defensible.

Our water management team (WMT) was in place, as is required by the HACCP system, and could therefore respond systematically to coordinate prevention efforts and use the data from clinical disease surveillance to further develop specifications in the WMP. Through this effort and within the context of developing the HACCP plan, we found *Legionella* in certain locations (eg, electronic “auto” faucets and within thermal expansion tanks) and identified insufficient disinfectant (chlorine) concentrations within the facility. The WMT used this hazard analysis to establish critical control points and control limits, monitoring, corrective actions, verification, and validation of the program.

No nosocomial disease cases have occurred since implementation of our WMP. However, if a nosocomial disease case associated with our facility water systems should occur, then in that hypothetical case, the WMT will be in place to coordinate prevention efforts, reassess the plan, and, if necessary, upgrade critical control limits. The HACCP system is a structured process to assess and respond to results from clinical disease surveillance and environmental sampling (validation). This aspect of HACCP is an important reason why the system has been so successful in the prevention of environmental-source disease and injury.

An aspect of HACCP that accounts for success in this application is that it is a practical, simple, and highly effective process management methodology. Typically, high-quality treated water enters the healthcare facility water system, where it is then processed. Water processing steps in buildings may include conditioning, filtering, heating, cooling, storing, pressure regulation, distributing, and recirculating the water. Processing water can affect its quality. Water quality can become degraded and potentially hazardous. Prevention of injury and disease depends on management of building water system processes. Although often similar, every building water system is unique in its water-processing configuration. HACCP adapted to building water system management is an ideal framework in this aspect.

With regard to the microbiological methods used in our article, the ISO 11731 spread plate method for *Legionella* was used, and results were reported for every sample. In addition, field culture “dipslide” samplers were used on site, and *Legionella*-specific polymerase chain reaction was performed on every sample. The field culturing sampler provided a reliable means to obtain *Legionella* results and total heterotrophic