



# HHS Public Access

## Author manuscript

*Zoonoses Public Health.* Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 December 01.

Published in final edited form as:

*Zoonoses Public Health.* 2015 December ; 62(8): 590–592. doi:10.1111/zph.12207.

## State and Local Perspective on Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Dog Confinement Agreement

**Ibrahim Zaganjor<sup>1</sup>, Julie R. Sinclair<sup>2,\*</sup>, and Margaret S. Coleman<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Hubert Department of Global Health, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

<sup>2</sup>Division of Global Migration and Quarantine, National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases (NCEZID), CDC, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

### Summary

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) works in conjunction with state, territorial, local, and tribal agencies (STLTAs) to prevent the transmission of infectious agents. Issuance of confinement agreements using CDC Form 75.37 “Notice to Owners and Importers of Dogs” to importers of dogs that are not vaccinated or incompletely vaccinated against rabies is part of the agency’s regulatory programme to prevent the entry of dogs infected with rabies. Although this is a regulatory programme that depends heavily on partnerships between CDC and STLTAs, CDC had never formally evaluated the acceptability of the confinement agreement process with these partners. Thus, a short survey of 9 STLTAs was conducted to evaluate whether these partners have enough personnel and resources to implement the regulation and their general opinions of the confinement agreement process. The results illustrate that CDC partners are dissatisfied to some extent with the process and there are multiple issues limiting their success in enforcing the regulation.

### Keywords

regulations; partnerships; importations; dogs; rabies

### Introduction

Rabies is a fatal virus that is endemic in more than 150 countries and territories (WHO, 2014). Rabid dogs serve as the primary reservoir for human disease transmission worldwide: 90% of human rabies exposures and more than 99% percent of human rabies cases (CDC, 2011). To prevent the importation of rabid dogs into the United States, CDC requires that all importers of dogs from rabies-endemic countries provide a valid rabies vaccination certificate upon arrival (CDC, 2013a; CDC, 2013b). Valid rabies vaccination certificates must state the dog was at least 3 months of age at the time of vaccination and that the initial rabies vaccine was administered at least 30 days before the dog’s arrival in the United States (CDC, 2013a). The certificate must also not be expired. If a dog does not meet vaccination requirements, the importer (or their agent) and a CDC official or U.S. Customs and Border

\*Corresponding author: Julie R. Sinclair, CDC Quarantine Station – Philadelphia, Terminal A-West, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Philadelphia International Airport, Philadelphia, PA 19153, tel. 215 365-6405, fax 215 365-5419; jsinclair@cdc.gov.

Protection (CBP) officer must sign a copy of CDC Form 75.37 (“dog confinement agreement”; Fig. S1). The importer is then legally obliged to confine the dog until fully immunized (i.e., 30 days following rabies vaccination at 3 months of age for initial vaccination and immediately upon rabies vaccination for booster). Under CDC regulations, found at Title 42 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), section 71.51, “confinement” is defined as “restriction of an animal by the owner or his agent to a building or other enclosure in isolation from other animals and from persons except for contact necessary for its care, or, if it is allowed out of such enclosure, muzzling the animal and keeping it on a leash” (CFR, 2015).

Although CDC has the authority to regulate the importation of dogs into the United States and has established an oversight programme, state, territorial, local, and tribal agencies (STLTAs) are critical to the success and enforcement of CDC regulations. CDC conducted this survey because it wanted to better understand whether or not STLTAs have sufficient resources to administer the CDC dog confinement agreement programme at the state and local level and to hear their thoughts on the current federal regulation and operations regarding the importation of dogs into the United States. To determine the level of STLTA resource use and potential follow-up of dog confinement agreements, we administered a short survey to several STLTA partners to assess their attitudes and practices.

## Methods

To best capture information regarding resource usage and attitudes, we developed a survey that gathered both quantitative and qualitative information. The survey included 7 binary questions and 1 Likert-scale question, each followed by an open-ended comments section. We contacted only 9 state and local health partners to comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act (CFR, 1995). Accordingly, we selected a convenience sample that included STLTAs from each major region of the country. We administered each 20-minute survey over the telephone. CDC determined that the survey did not constitute human subjects research and approved the survey as a programme evaluation.

## Results

Of the nine STLTAs surveyed, seven respondents were state employees (health and agriculture departments) and two respondents were county health department employees. Three respondents indicated that they were not “content” with the current federal dog confinement agreement procedures (Table 1). Those that were not content commented that the current operating procedures lack well-defined consequences for noncompliant importers and that the process did not capture many fraudulent documents. Also, one partner noted that their office had no way of determining that the importer was complying with the terms of the confinement agreement.

Four respondents stated that they believed that their office did not have sufficient personnel to respond adequately to each dog confinement agreement received (Table 1). Lastly, three respondents believed that the federal government should develop a simpler process to replace the current dog confinement agreement procedures (Table 1). Some suggested that

more effort should be placed on animal inspection upon entry, animal importations should be limited to specific points of entry, and the process should be redefined so expectations of STLTA would be clearer.

## Discussion

Hundreds of thousands of dogs are imported into the United States annually (McQuiston *et al.*, 2008). High rates of dog importation introduce the risk for potential infectious disease transmission to humans and other animals (Hendrix *et al.*, 1998). CDC issues dog confinement agreements for dogs improperly vaccinated against rabies coming from rabies-endemic countries not only to reduce the risk of reintroducing canine variant rabies to the United States but also in an effort to reduce the risk of exposing humans to any rabies virus variant.

CDC's dog confinement agreement programme relies considerably on CBP at U.S. ports of entry to review and process dog import documents and then STLTA for follow-up of importers whose dogs are issued confinement agreements at the port of entry. However, results from this survey illustrate that CDC's STLTA partners view the dog confinement agreement as underperforming and likely ineffective at achieving its purpose. CDC has made efforts to resolve some of the reoccurring problems with the process, including the release of a manual to help partner agencies identify fraudulent rabies certificates (Fig. S2). In addition, in July of 2014 CDC published a Federal Register Notice "Issuance and Enforcement Guidance for Dog Confinement Agreements" to further explain the purpose of dog confinement agreements and clarify that CDC has the authority to deny entry of dogs that are improperly vaccinated against rabies (CDC, 2014). However, more needs to be done to address the concerns of STLTA. Because effective partnerships between CDC and STLTA are critical to protect U.S. public health from the importation of zoonotic disease, CDC should reassess its current dog importation programme to make sure it is cost-effective, feasible, and practical for STLTA to administer.

## Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

## References

- CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). Rabies around the World. 2011. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/rabies/location/world/index.html> (Accessed 2 July 2014)
- CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). Bringing a Dog into the United States. 2013a. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/animalimportation/dogs.html> (Accessed 2 July 2014)
- CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). Rabies-Free Countries and Political Units. 2013b. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/animalimportation/rabies-free-countries.html>. (accessed on 1 July 2014)
- CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). Issuance and Enforcement Guidance for Dog Confinement Agreements. Fed Regist. 2014; 79:39403–39406.
- Hendrix CM, Benefield LT, Wohl JS, Bloom BC, Ostrowski SR. International Travel with Pets. Part I. Regulations. Compend Contin Educ Pract Vet. 1998; 20:1099–1108.

McQuiston JH, Wilson T, Harris S, Bacon RM, Shapiro S, Trevino I, Sinclair J, Galland G, Marano N. Importation of dogs into the United States: risks from rabies and other zoonotic diseases. *Zoonoses Public Health*. 2008; 55:421–426. [PubMed: 18833595]

U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Title 42: Public Health PART 71 - FOREIGN QUARANTINE Subpart F - Importations § 71.51 dogs and cats. 2015. Available at: <http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?c=ecfr&SID=4b2bfde498052f412eed550a188c053c&rgn=div8&view=text&node=42:1.0.1.6.59.6.1.9.2&idno=42> (accessed 18 May 2015)

U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Title 44: Chapter 35 – Coordination of Federal Information Policy. 1995. Available at: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-104publ13/html/PLAW-104publ13.htm> (Accessed 2 July 2014)

WHO (World Health Organization). Rabies. 2014. Available at: <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs099/en/> (Accessed 2 July 2014)

**Impacts**

- Copies of signed CDC dog confinement agreements are directed to STLTA for any necessary management and follow-up with importers after unvaccinated dogs enter the United States.
- Survey results from the STLTA indicate that all states do not have the resources (labour and time) to enforce importer compliance with the regulatory programme.
- CDC should consider restructuring its current regulations to account for the capabilities of STLTA to enforce the rule along with the need to protect public health.

**Table 1**

State and Local Health Department Evaluation Survey Results (n=9)

Survey Question	Response	Frequency (%)
Is your office content with current federal procedures associated with the dog confinement agreement?	No	3 (33%)
Do you believe your office has sufficient labour or personnel resources to respond adequately to each dog confinement form received, including follow-up with importers?	Yes No No Response*	4 (44%) 4 (44%) 1 (11%)
Do you believe your office has sufficient resources other than labour or personnel, for example availability of an official vehicle or wireless internet access, to respond adequately to each dog confinement form received including follow-up with importers?	Yes No No Response*	5 (55%) 3 (33%) 1 (11%)
Do you believe the federal government should develop a simpler process to replace current dog confinement procedures? By simpler, we mean one that would take less labour or personnel time and use fewer resources. If you have specific ideas for improvement, please list in the comments.	No	6 (67%)
How difficult is it for your office to make follow-up contact with dog importers (1–6)?	1 = Very Easy 2 = Easy 3 = Moderate 4 = Somewhat difficult 5 = Difficult 6 = Very Difficult No Response*	0 (0%) 0 (0%) 3 (33%) 1 (11%) 1 (11%) 1 (11%) 3 (33%)

\* No Response = STLTA unable to respond as insufficient information available to assess resources needed or question not applicable.