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## Preface

Although a summary of animal rabies cases in the United States has been published by CDC since 1960, with cases prior to that year reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a somewhat different format was adopted a few years ago. Canada and Mexico share the northern and southern borders of the United States, and rabies outbreaks on one or the other side of those borders occasionally involve two countries. This occurred, for instance, in 1961, when rabid foxes from the Canadian province of Ontario apparently crossed the frozen St. Lawrence River into the United States, extending a rabies outbreak that had begun in northern Ontario in the 1950s. Similarly, in recent years rabid skunks have often been reported from contiguous areas of northern Montana and southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, with movement of disease both northward and southward.

For these reasons CDC has, since 1973, included in its annual rabies report summaries of animal and human rabies in both Canada and Mexico, provided through the courtesy of epidemiologists and other public health officials in those two countries. For the following report we would like to especially acknowledge the contributions of the following persons: Dr. David Gregory, Animal Health Division, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, and Dr. Jaime Sepulveda, Dirección General de Epidemiología, Secretaría de Salud, México, D.F. The information submitted on the annual numbers of rabies cases by state or province and the species in the three countries has been helpful in reviewing the patterns and movement of disease, especially in contiguous areas. It is apparent that the United States and Canada bear the burden of enzootic wildlife rabies, although in dissimilar species, with mostly canine rabies found in Mexico. The continuing surveillance of rabies cases in the three countries, along with additional mapping activities, should help to show additional similarities and differences in the disease in those areas.

This report summarizes information received from state and local health departments and other pertinent sources. It is intended primarily for use by those responsible for disease control activities. Anyone desiring to quote this report should contact the appropriate state or international health agency for updated information and analyses.

Contributions to the Rabies Surveillance are most welcome. Please address them to:

Chief, Rabies Laboratory<br>Viral and Rickettsial Zoonoses Branch<br>Division of Viral Diseases<br>Center for Infectious Diseases<br>Centers for Disease Control<br>P.O. Box 363<br>Lawrenceville, GA 30246<br>404-963-9211
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## I. ANIMAL RABIES IN NORTH AMERICA — SUMMARY

## United States

The United States and its territories reported 5,551 cases of animal rabies to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) in 1986, almost the same number as the 5,606 reported the previous year. This includes rabies in wild and domestic animals. Just as in 1985, wild animals accounted for $91 \%$ of all cases (Figure 1).*

## I. LA RAGE ANIMALE EN AMÉRIQUÉ DU NORD - RÉSUMÉ

## Les Etats-Unis

Les Etats-Unis et leurs Territoires ont déclarés aux Centers for Disease Control (CDC) 5.551 cas de rage animale en 1986, un nombre proche des 5.606 cas déclarés l'année précédente. Ce nombre concerne les cas de rage diagnostiques chez les animaux sauvages et domestiqués. Tout comme en 1985, les animaux sauvages représentent $91 \%$ des cas déclarés (Figure 1). ${ }^{\text {. }}$

## I. LA RABIA ANIMAL EN NORTEAMERICA - RESUMEN

## Los Estados Unidos

Se reportaron 5,551 casos de rabia animal a los Centros de Control de Enfermedades (CDC) de los Estados Unidos y sus territorios, casi el mismo numero que el año pasado $(5,606)$. Esta cifra incluye animales domesticos y animales silvestres. La gran mayoria de casos, el $91 \%$, se reportaron en varias especies de animales silvestres, tal como el año anterior (Figure 1). ${ }^{\ddagger}$
FIGURE 1. Animal rabies, United States, 1986


[^0]
## Canada

Canada reported 3,819 cases of animal rabies in 1986, up $39 \%$ from the number reported in 1985 and $125 \%$ more than in 1984. Wild animals, especially foxes and skunks, accounted for the majority of cases (Figure 2).§

## Canada

Le Canada a déclaré 3.819 cas de rage animale en 1986, soit $39 \%$ de plus que les cas déclarés en 1985. Les animaux sauvages tout particulièrement les renards et les moufettes représentent la majorité des cas (Figure 2)I..

## Canada

Canada reportó 3,819 casos de rabia animal en 1986, $39 \%$ mas de los 2,340 casos del año pasado y $125 \%$ mas que en 1984. Tal como en los Estados Unidos, la mayoria se diagnosticaron en animales silvestres, sobre todo zorros y zorillos (Figure 2) $\boldsymbol{m}$.

Source: Canadian data provided by Agriculture Canada, Food Production and Inspection Branch, Animal Health Division, Ottawa.

## FIGURE 2. Animal rabies, Canada, 1986



[^1]Jos casos de rabia en Canada por especie y los totales por provincia se encuentran en Anexo 4.

## Mexico

Mexico reported 9,069 cases of animal rabies in 1986, a decrease of $18 \%$ from the 10,736 cases reported in 1985 . Unlike cases in the United States and Canada, where wild animals are the principal hosts of the disease, most Mexican cases were in domestic and farm animals (97\%) (Figure 3).**

## Mexique

Le Mexique a déclaré 9.069 cas de rage animale en 1986, soit une diminution de 18\% par rapport aux 10.736 cas déclarés en 1985. Contrairement aux Etats-Unis et au Canada, où les animaux sauvages constituent les principales victimes de la maladie, les animaux domestiques représentent la majorité des cas (97\%) (Figure 3). ${ }^{\text {+† }}$

## México

Mexico reportó 9,069 casos de rabia animal en 1986, $18 \%$ menos que los 10,756 casos en 1985. La gran mayoria de estos casos, $97 \%$, se diagnosticaron en animales domesticos (incluyendo animales de granja), a diferencia de los Estados Unidos y Canada donde animales silvestres predominaron (Figure 3). ${ }^{\ddagger \ddagger}$

Source: Mexican data provided by Dirección General de Epidemiologia, Secretaria de Salud, Mexico, D.F.

FIGURE 3. Animal rabies, Mexico, 1986
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## II. RABIES IN NORTH AMERICA - WILD ANIMALS

## United States

Skunks, raccoons, and bats remained the major wild animal hosts of rabies in the United States in 1986.* The reported cases of rabies in these three species all stayed at about the same level as in 1985: 2,379 rabid skunks in 1986 vs. 2,507 in 1985; 1,576 rabid raccoons vs. 1,487; and 788 rabid insectivorous bats vs. 830.

In the last decade, the epidemiologic features of rabies have changed very little, with most cases occurring in the same wildlife species (skunks, raccoons, foxes, bats) and in the same areas, except for the introduction of raccoon rabies to the mid-Atlantic states.

Virus analysis by monoclonal antibodies has permitted study of the distribution of different rabies virus strains in these areas. A study of skunk rabies in enzootic areas of the central United States showed that two viruses were actually circulating. One strain was found in the upper midwest (Montana, Minnesota, lowa, Wisconsin), and the other in Texas and other south central states. Both types are found in Missouri and Arkansas.

A study of wildlife rabies cases in New York showed that a cluster of four cases in gray foxes in a two-county area was apparently the result of contact with infected bats, either big browns (Eptesicus fuscus) or reds (Lasiurus borealis). This raises the distinct possibility that epizootics in foxes and other wild animals may be started by bats and that future control efforts, such as oral vaccination of foxes, skunks, and raccoons must be accompanied by a careful surveillance system to assure that rabies-free areas remain so and are not reinfected by rabid bats.

## Canada

Foxes and skunks continued to be the predominant rabid wild animals in Canada in 1986. Reported wild animal cases again rose markedly in 1986 to 2,994, a 64\% increase from the 1,826 in 1985. Ontario continued to report the greatest number of cases, accounting for $84 \%$ of all reported wild animal rabies in Canada. ${ }^{\dagger}$

## Mexico

Mexico reported 50 cases of rabies in bats, 122 in coyotes, and 12 in rats in 1986. ${ }^{\ddagger}$

[^3]
## III. RABIES IN NORTH AMERICA — DOMESTIC ANIMALS

## United States

Virtually no change occurred in the number of rabies cases in domestic animals in the United States: 515 in 1986 and 503 in 1985. Cattle continued to be the animal most commonly infected, followed by cats, which in turn outnumbered dogs for the sixth consecutive year.*

## Canada

Canada reported 825 cases of rabies in domestic animals in 1986 compared with 514 in 1985, a 60\% increase, and 333 in 1984, a 148\% increase. As in the United States, cattle accounted for the majority of cases, with cats second. Cases reported by Ontario accounted for $93 \%$ of all reported rabid domestic animals in Canada in 1986. ${ }^{\dagger}$

## Mexico

Mexico reported 8,483 rabid dogs in 1986, a decrease of $8 \%$ compared with the 10,036 reported in 1985. These 8,483 cases of canine rabies made up $96 \%$ of all reported animal rabies in Mexico for 1986. Cats, pigs, and horses accounted for an additional 319 cases of domestic animal rabies. ${ }^{\ddagger}$

[^4]
## IV. REPORTS - ANIMALS, UNITED STATES

## Mid-Atlantic States Raccoon Rabies

The 1,195 rabid raccoons reported by the mid-Atlantic states of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia represented a moderate increase ( $11 \%$ ) from the 1,078 in 1985 (Figures 4 and 5). The increase was most notable in Pennsylvania ( $44 \%$ ) and Virginia ( $36 \%$ ); the number reported for the District of Columbia increased from four to 29. In Maryland, however, rabies cases in raccoons continued to decline from 964 in 1984 to 672 in 1985 and to 588 in 1986, a 39\% decrease in the last 2 years (Table 1). Raccoons represented $77 \%$ of the total number of rabid animals reported by the mid-Atlantic area in 1986.

## Ferret Rabies

Three ferrets were reported rabid in 1986. Reports of rabid ferrets are rare (11 since 1980). Because no one has tested rabies vaccine in ferrets, vaccination cannot be relied on to protect them from infection. The ferret belongs to the Mustelidae family, along with the skunk, otter, mink, and weasel. The species used for pets, Mustela putorius furo, should be distinguished from the black-footed ferret, M. nigripes (1). Ferrets, originally imported into the United States from Europe and also known as European ferrets, are descendants of the European polecat.

There has been considerable publicity regarding the aggressive tendencies of ferrets; this aggression is frequently directed at young children (2). According to Dr. George G. Harmon, executive director of the International Ferret Association, ferrets are not suitable pets for children. Harmon says he'won't sell a ferret to anyone who has a child under 6 years old"(3). This has been the policy of the International Ferret Association since it was founded in 1980.

At its meeting in March 1986, the Council on Public Health and Regulatory Veterinary Medicine of the American Veterinary Medical Association reaffirmed its opinion that keeping ferrets as pets poses certain risks and hazards, especially to infants and other young children. The Council concluded that the ferret, although domesticated as a working animal to hunt rodents and snakes, is wild in nature and is not a suitable household pet (4).

TABLE 1. Cases of raccoon rabies in mid-Atlantic states, 1983-1986

| State | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | $\mathbf{1 9 8 6}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Maryland | 732 | 964 | 672 | 588 |
| Pennsylvania | 81 | 281 | 285 | 409 |
| Virginia | 545 | 158 | 102 | 139 |
| West Virginia | 88 | 27 | 15 | 30 |
| District of Columbia | 158 | 12 | 4 | 29 |
| Total | 1,604 | 1,442 | 1,078 | 1,195 |

FIGURE 4. Raccoon rabies cases, mid-Atlantic states, 1978-1986


FIGURE 5. Raccoon rabies cases by county, mid-Atlantic states, 1980-1986


## V. REPORTS - HUMAN RABIES

## United States

No cases of human rabies were reported to CDC in 1986 (Figure 6).
FIGURE 6. Human rabies cases, United States,* by 5-year periods, 1940-1986


* Includes all cases diagnosed in the United States and cases diagnosed outside the United States in United States citizens.
12-year period only.


## Canada

No cases of human rabies were reported in Canada in 1986.

## Mexico

Mexico reported 81 human rabies cases in 1986. Seventy were caused by dog bites, two by cat bites, five by exposure to rabid bats, and four by exposure to other species.

## Human Postexposure Prophylaxis - U.S. Update

## Montana

Since 1980, the Montana State Department of Health and Environmental Sciences has collected data on requests for human diploid cell vaccine (HDCV). During 1985 and 1986, 199 and 135 postexposure consultations were done, respectively. Sixteen consultations in 1985 and 19 in 1986 resulted in no treatment. No treatment was given in these instances for one or more of the following reasons: because 1) the animal was available for observation or testing, 2) no exposure occurred, and 3) the animal species was not thought to be involved in the endemic rabies cycle and the animal was acting normally.
In both 1985 and 1986, three persons began treatment but did not finish the series. The most common reason for this was that the animal was found for observation or
testing after the treatment was initiated. In 1986, 113 persons completed postexposure rabies prophylaxis. Thirty-five percent of those were exposed to a rabid animal (Table 2). In 1985, 180 persons received postexposure rabies prophylaxis, and $54 \%$ of those treatments were due to exposure to an animal proven to be rabid.
It is interesting to note that between 1985 and 1986 the number of persons treated for exposure to dogs decreased markedly ( 69 persons in 1985 vs. 30 in 1986), as did the number treated for exposure to rabid cows ( 40 vs. 13), but the number treated for exposure to cats remained about the same ( 33 vs . 37) (Table 3).

Source: Judith Gedrose, State Epidemiologist, Montana Department of Health and Environmental Sciences, Helena.

TABLE 2. Treatment and exposure status of persons seeking consultations for potential exposure to rabies - Montana, 1985 and 1986

| Treatment and exposure status | 1985 | 1986 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total postexposure consultations | $199^{*}$ | $135^{\dagger}$ |
| No treatment after consult | 16 | 19 |
| Didn't finish treatment | 3 | 3 |
| Total treated after exposure | 180 | 113 |
| Exposed to a rabid animal | 98 | $(54 \%)$ |
| Exposed to untested or unknown animal | 81 | $(45 \%)$ |
| Treated even though animal available | 1 | $(1 \%)$ |
| $\quad 180$ | 39 | $(35 \%)$ |
| $\quad$ Total |  | 74 |
|  |  | $(65 \%)$ |
|  |  | 113 |

*Eleven had had preexposure vaccine.
${ }^{\dagger}$ 'Six had had preexposure vaccine.
TABLE 3. Human postexposure rabies prophylaxis, by species involved Montana, 1985 and 1986

|  | Number of Persons Treated |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Species | 1985 | 1986 |  |  |
| Dog | 69 | $(38 \%)$ | 30 | $(27 \%)$ |
| Cow | 40 | $(22 \%)$ | 13 | $(12 \%)$ |
| Cat | 33 | $(18 \%)$ | 37 | $(33 \%)$ |
| Horse | 9 | $(5 \%)$ | 6 | $(5 \%)$ |
| Skunk | 9 | $(5 \%)$ | 10 | $(9 \%)$ |
| Bat | 9 | $(5 \%)$ | 7 | $(6 \%)$ |
| Pig | 4 | $(2 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Dog/Coyote | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Gopher | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Squirrel | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ |
| Raccoon | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ |
| Fox | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ | 0 |  |
| Bear | 0 |  | 2 | $(2 \%)$ |
| Bobcat | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ |
| Unknown | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ | 4 | $(4 \%)$ |
| Other | 0 |  | 1 | $(<1 \%)$ |
| Total | 180 | 113 |  |  |

## Now Jersey

In New Jersey 62 persons received postexposure rabies prophylaxis in 1986, a decrease of six ( $9 \%$ ) from the number in 1985. The average cost of the prophylaxis was $\$ 393$, an increase of $27 \%$ over the $\$ 310$ average for 1985.
New Jersey surveillance data (15) indicate that of the 62 persons treated, three had been exposed to animals that were rabid. The other 59 were exposed to animals that escaped after biting. The animals identified as sources of exposure for humans were: bat, raccoon, dog, cat, opossum, hyrax, monkey, and ferret (Table 4).

Source: Paul Marzinsky, Public Health Epidemiologist, New Jersey Department of Health, Trenton.

TABLE 4. Human postexposure rabies prophylaxis, by species involved New Jersey, 1985

| Species | No. Persons Treated |
| :--- | :---: |
| Bat | 39 |
| Raccoon | 9 |
| Dog" | 8 |
| Cat | 1 |
| Opossum | 1 |
| Hyrax | 1 |
| Monkey | 1 |
| Ferret | 2 |
| Total | 62 |

*Six of the exposures occurred outside the United States: four were to dogs (one in Israel, two in Belize, and one in Mexico), one was to a hyrax in Kenya, and one was to a monkey in Mexico.

## VI. CANADIAN REPORTS

## Rabies and Postexposure Treatment in Canada - 1985

## Rabies in Humans

Human rabies is rare in Canada. Since 1924, only 21 cases have been reported; the two most recent ones occurred in 1984 and 1985. The former was an imported case resulting from a bite of a rabid dog in the Dominican Republic (5). The second case involved a young man from Calgary, Alberta, who was a student at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver (6). In late July 1985, while working in Northern Alberta, he was scratched or bitten on the face by a bat. He received no immediate rabies postexposure treatment. Approximately 3 months after the incident, when he had returned to the university, he experienced neck pain, swollen cervical lymph nodes, and sweating. He was admitted to the hospital in Vancouver where a brain biopsy confirmed rabies by the fluorescent antibody test. Human rabies immune globulin and human diploid cell vaccine were administered at this time, but his condition did not improve and he died approximately 4 months after the incident. A bat strain of rabies virus was identified by monoclonal antibody testing. Because the infection occurred in Alberta and in a resident of that province, the Provincial Epidemiologists for Alberta and British Columbia have agreed to report this as an Alberta case.

## Human Rabies Postexposure Prophylaxis

In 1985, a total of 2,495 persons ( 10 per 100,000 population) were treated (an increase of $11 \%$ over 1984). Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia reported increases in the number of postexposure prophylaxis, while Manitoba and Alberta reported a decline. The remaining four provinces and the two territories did not report any postexposure prophylaxis. In 1985, Ontario accounted for $86 \%$ of all treatments, followed by Quebec (4\%) and Saskatchewan (4\%). Nationally, one in every 10,000 Canadians received rabies treatment; for Ontario residents this was two to three times higher.

At least 17 species of animals were involved in incidents requiring postexposure treatment in 1985. Table 5 shows the provincial distribution of human postexposure prophylaxis, by species of animal involved. Dogs continue to be most frequently involved ( $27 \%$ of postexposure prophylaxis treatments in 1985), followed by cats (22\%) and cattle (13\%). The percentages for the various species involved were similar to those for 1984. In addition, it should be noted that 28 persons received postexposure treatment following contact with the Alberta rabies patient.

Rabies in pet animals is important because of the human contact involved. During the years 1980-1985, 77\%-100\% of confirmed rabies cases in dogs (mean $=91 \%$ ) and $76 \%-95 \%$ of confirmed disease in cats (mean $=87 \%$ ) resulted in postexposure prophylaxis. The number of persons treated following exposure to rabid dogs has declined steadily since 1981, while the number exposed to "rabies suspect" dogs has increased significantly (Figure 7). Figure 7 also shows that postexposure prophylaxis involving rabid cats increased steadily from 1980 to 1983, but declined in 1984 and 1985.

## Animal Rabies

In 1985, a total of 2,340 laboratory-confirmed cases of rabies in animals were reported. As in previous years, the highest proportion of cases ( $85 \%$ ) occurred in Ontario, followed by Saskatchewan (10\%). Compared with 1984 totals, the number of reported cases in 1985 increased 44\% in Ontario and 25\% in Saskatchewan. No cases were reported from the Atlantic provinces and the Yukon Territory. Of the 2,340 reported animal cases, 1,730 ( $74 \%$ ) involved wild animals and 610 ( $26 \%$ ) domestic animals. A total of 16 species were identified; foxes accounted for $44 \%$, followed by skunks ( $30 \%$ ), cattle ( $11 \%$ ), and other species ( $15 \%$ ). Other species included dogs, cats, horses, sheep, goats, swine, coyotes, wolves, raccoons, bats, rabbits, groundhogs, and beavers.

Source: PV Varughese, DVM, MSc, Bureau of Communicable Disease Epidemiology, Ottawa, Ontario, adapted from Rabies and Post-Exposure Treatment in Canada - 1985. Canadian Diseases Weekly Report 1987;13-5:17-22.

## Rabies Exposures in a Nursing Home - Ontario, Canada

On August 15, 1986, a woman reported to a private veterinary practitioner that a fox had had direct contact with her female dog and its four puppies on the front porch of her farmhouse. The veterinarian advised her either to destroy the dogs or to have them quarantined on her premises, but failed to report the contact with a potentially rabid animal to the federal veterinarian as legally required. Subsequently, on August 20, the owner delivered the four puppies to a local animal shelter. She neglected to mention

TABLE 5. Number of persons receiving human postexposure rabies prophylaxis and species involved — Canada, 1985

| Species | Quebec | Ontario | Manitoba | Saskatchewan | Alberta | British Columbia | Total (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dogs | 58 | 557 | 19 | 16 | 17 | 7 | 674 | (27.0) |
| Cats | 16 | 482 | 7 | 34 | 11 | 3 | 553 | (22.2) |
| Cattle | 6 | 268 | 12 | 26 |  |  | 312 | (12.5) |
| Foxes | 7 | 283 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 292 | (11.7) |
| Skunks |  | 124 | 6 | 3 | 1 |  | 134 | (5.4) |
| Horses |  | 113 |  | 5 |  |  | 118 | (4.7) |
| Not known | 2 | 106 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 112 | (4.5) |
| Bats | 1 | 71 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 24 | 104 | (4.2) |
| Raccoons | 4 | 68 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 74 | (3.0) |
| Sheep/Goats | 1 | 69 |  |  |  |  | 70 | (2.8) |
| Human |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 25 | 28 | (1.1) |
| Swine |  | 9 |  |  |  |  | 9 | (0.3) |
| Squirrels |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 | (0.2) |
| Muskrat |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 3 | (0.1) |
| Coyotes |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | (0.1) |
| Wolves |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | (0.1) |
| Beavers |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Rodents |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | (0.1) |
| Monkeys |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Total (\%) | 95 (3.8) | 2,150 (86.2) | 61 (2.4) | 89 (3.6) | 38 (1.5) | 62 (2.5) | 2,495 | (100\%) |

FIGURE 7. Number of persons treated for rabies by confirmation status of animals involved, Canada, 1980-1985


YEAR
Source: Adapted from Rabies and Post-Exposure Treatment in Canada - 1985. Canada Diseases Weekly Report 1987;13-5:21.
the fox contact to the staff. That afternoon, two of the puppies were taken to a nursing home and introduced to most of the residents and staff and a limited number of visitors.
Within 24 hours, all four puppies had been adopted by four different families. On August 24, one of the pups had diarrhea and vomiting and was seen at a veterinary clinic. It died on August 29. A second pup became ill on August 28 and died on August 31. The brain in each case was submitted for rabies testing. On September 4 and 5, the Health Unit was notified that both puppies were positive for rabies. Furthermore, there was strong evidence that one of the rabid puppies was one of the two taken to the nursing home. The remaining two puppies were traced and destroyed. They were subsequently found to be negative for rabies. The owner's dog was placed under a federal quarantine for a six-month period and is currently asymptomatic.

With the assistance of Health Unit staff, the nursing home immediately prepared lists of those individuals who had definitely been in contact with the pup (26), those who were definitely not in contact (approximately 25), and those for whom the contact was uncertain. In addition, two press releases were issued by the Health Unit because of the large number of people who had had contact with the rabid puppies. Individuals were encouraged to question their children to determine whether they had had contact with the pups and, if so, to consult their family physician. The press releases were followed by an audit of all households in the vicinity of the homes that had adopted the two rabid animals. It was learned that one of the rabid pups had been placed in a carriage with two babies.

In total, 134 Canadians received postexposure treatment with rabies vaccine and rabies immune globulin: 60 nursing home contacts, 62 neighborhood contacts (mostly children), six veterinary clinic staff, and six animal shelter staff. Also, one boy visiting from England and four vacationers from Massachusetts had been exposed; all were vaccinated.

The average cost of a course of rabies immune globulin and vaccine ranges from $\$ 400$ to $\$ 700$ per person, depending on body weight. Total cost of prophylaxis provided by the Ontario Ministry of Health is estimated at $\$ 65,000$.

This incident emphasizes the problems that may result from failure to report the rabies risk of animals and the need to immunize pets against rabies before they have contact with large numbers of people. If the fox contact had been reported promptly, the large number of treatments and the consequent expense and anxiety may have been avoided.

Source: CG Clark, Director of Environmental Health, Peel Regional Health Unit, and C LeBer, DVM, DVPM, Senior Veterinary Consultant, Disease Control and Epidemiology Service, Public Health Branch, Ontario Ministry of Health.
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## APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. Reported rabies in the U.S.," by animal type, 1953-1986 ${ }^{\dagger}$

| Year | Dogs | Cats | Farm <br> Animals | Foxes | Skunks | Bats | Raccoons | Other Animals | Humans | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1953 | 5,688 | 538 | 1,118 | 1,033 | 319 | 8 | 40 | 79 | 14 | 8,837 |
| 1955 | 2,657 | 343 | . 924 | 1,223 | 580 | 14 | 37 | 61 | 5 | 5,844 |
| 1957 | 1,758 | 382 | 714 | 1,021 | 775 | 31 | 36 | 79 | 6 | 4,802 |
| 1959 | 1,119 | 292 | 751 | 920 | 789 | 80 | 43 | 83 | 6 | 4,083 |
| 1961 | 594 | 217 | 482 | 614 | 1,254 | 186 | 58 | 62 | 3 | 3,470 3,933 |
| 1963 | 573 | 217 | 531 | 622 | 1,462 | 303 | 162 | 62 | 1 | 3,933 |
| 1965 | 412 | 289 | 625 | 1,038 | 1,582 | 484 | 99 | 54 | 1 | 4,584 |
| 1967 | 412 | 293 | 691 | 979 | 1,568 | 414 | 143 | 107 | 2 | 4,609 3,522 |
| 1969 | 256 | 165 | 428 | 888 | 1,156 | 321 | 255 | 52 99 | 1 | 4,522 |
| 1971 | 235 | 222 | 484 | 677 | 2,018 | 465 | 190 | 99 | 1 | 4,392 3,698 |
| 1973 | 180 | 139 | 448 | 477 | 1,851 | 432 | 114 | 56 31 | 1 3 | 3,698 |
| 1975 | 129 | 104 | 200 | 276 | 1,226 | 514 637 | 192 | 31 65 | 1 | 2,182 |
| 1977 | 120 | 108 | 217 | 122 | 1,631 | 637 | 543 | 34 | 5 | 5,150 |
| 1979 | 196 | 156 | 284 | 145 | 4,031 | 858 | 481 | 111 | 2 | 7,210 |
| 1981 | 216 132 | 285 168 | 581 284 | 196 | 4,480 $\mathbf{2 , 2 8 5}$ | 810 | 1,906 | 82 | 2 | 5,880 |
| 1986 | 132 95 | 166 | 255 | 207 | 2,379 | 788 | 1,576 | 85 | 0 | 5,551 |

*Includes Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands
tData prior to 1960 from USDA, ARS. Subsequent data from PHS, CDC.

|  | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.274 | 4.392 | 4.427 | 3.698 | 3.156 | 2.675 | 3.146 | 3.182 | 3.282 | 5.150 | 6.482 | 7.210 | 6.278 | 5.880 | 5.630 | 5.607 | 5.551 |
| Alabama | 3.274 | 61 | 82 | 52 | 48 | 34 | 18 | 13 | 53 | 73 | 55 | 123 | 146 | 83 | 130 | 124 | 115 |
| Alaska | 21 | 43 | 11 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 46 | 40 | 10 | 19 | 53 | 44 | 89 | 20 | 18 | 43 | 20 |
| Arizona | 48 | 40 | 61 | 39 | 50 | 26 | 31 | 49 | 23 | 27 | 77 | 30 | 60 | 33 | 50 | 123 | 102 |
| Arkansas | 53 | 108 | 112 | 108 | 61 | 83 | 155 | 118 | 160 | 332 | 191 | 152 | 157 | 160 | 101 | 151 | 168 |
| California | 322 | 322 | 275 | 401 | 358 | 290 | 357 | 434 | 355 | 358 | 544 | 579 | 517 | 358 | 547 | 586 | 520 |
| Colorado | 66 | 33 | 23 | 19 | 50 | 32 | 52 | 56 | 37 | 51 | 51 | 39 | 47 | 36 | 44 | 26 | 32 |
| Connecticut | 4 | 17 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 2 |
| Delaware | 0 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| District of Columbia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 162 | 12 | 8 | 42 |
| Florida | 97 | 76 | 87 | 43 | 50 | 37 | 100 | 93 | 47 | 79 | 101 | 116 | 80 | 131 | 149 | 146 | 183 |
| Georgia | 116 | 146 | 109 | 94 | 138 | 170 | 225 | 210 | 288 | 338 | 250 | 225 | 213 | 214 | 200 | 200 | 202 |
| Hawaii | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Idaho | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 17 | 11 | 10 | 9 |
| Illinois | 158 | 318 | 277 | 202 | 120 | 65 | 50 | 51 | 76 | 226 | 520 | 552 | 294 | 236 | 73 | 49 | 46 |
| Indiana | 31 | 82 | 84 | 57 | 15 | 10 | 24 | 12 | 13 | 68 | 75 | 91 | 76 | 30 | 23 | 24 | 19 |
| lowa | 136 | 240 | 350 | 214 | 130 | 102 | 125 | 134 | 150 | 206 | 545 | 881 | 377 | 200 | 152 | 149 | 193 |
| Kansas | 107 | 112 | 129 | 101 | 75 | 60 | 68 | 42 | 34 | 128 | 159 | 211 | 147 | 83 | 53 | 61 | 61 |
| Kentucky | 141 | 187 | 271 | 238 | 157 | 96 | 63 | 29 | 78 | 139 | 153 | 131 | 134 | 83 | 53 | 42 | 106 |
| Louisiana | 69 | 62 | 49 | 52 | 25 | 8 | 8 | 22 | 17 | 41 | 20 | 31 | 32 | 34 | 67 | 24 | 23 |
| Maine | 49 | 198 | 100 | 69 | 5 | 52 | 41 | 34 | 79 | 31 | 31 | 20 | 21 | 17 | 20 | 1 | 1 |
| Maryland | 3 | 3 | 19 | 16 | 27 | 15 | 40 | 16 | 22 | 39 | 37 | 50 | 153 | 828 | 1,100 | 760 | 684 |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 12 | 26 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 15 | 11 | 9 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 8 |
| Michigan | 28 | 48 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 7 | 20 | 22 | 26 | 23 |
| Minnesota | 126 | 265 | 295 | 373 | 254 | 184 | 193 | 342 | 204 | 172 | 278 | 491 | 224 | 171 | 104 | 219 | 177 |
| Mississippi | 3 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 9 | 15 | 10 | 9 |
| Missouri | 125 | 148 | 110 | 92 | 41 | 42 | 72 | 59 | 95 | 307 | 379 | 232 | 123 | 97 | 70 | 59 | 73 |
| Montana | 3 | 6 | 7 | 41 | 36 | 172 | 92 | 56 | 26 | 21 | 56 | 123 | 97 | 119 | 122 | 250 | 205 |
| Nebraska | 17 | 12 | 18 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 92 | 199 | 126 | 64 | 48 | 36 | 37 |
| Nevada | 11 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 17 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 38 | 23 | 15 | 13 |
| New Hamoshire. | 2 | 4 | 4 | 38 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 17 | 1 | 1 |
| New Jersey | 11 | 20 | 21 | 18 | 28 | 22 | 27 | 28 | 14 | 12 | 18 | 24 | 16 | 24 | 35 | 38 | 17 |
| New Mexico | 16 | 9 | 16 | 7 | 78 | 42 | 22 | 21 | 27 | 49 | 21 | 28 | 22 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 7 |
| New York | 260 | 136 | 45 | 30 | 43 | 76 | 27 | 65 | 62 | 48 | 40 | 85 | 113 | 84 | 137 | 153 | 93 |
| North Carolina | 3 | 5 | 4 | 14 | 26 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 26 | 18 | 18 | 66 | 24 | 27 | 12 | 10 |
| North Dakota | 57 | 193 | 147 | 159 | 114 | 103 | 137 | 122 | 105 | 99 | 255 | 359 | 97 | 92 | 138 | 149 | 162 |
| Ohio | 60 | 123 | 101 | 38 | 32 | 18 | 35 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  | 60 | 27 | 30 | 16 |
| Oklahoma | 103 | 283 | 299 | 174 | 164 | 105 | 181 | 243 | 177 | 293 | 247 | 219 | 189 | 107 | 104 | 111 | 60 |
| Oregon | 4 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 14 | 17 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| Pennsylvania | 4 | 23 | 63 | 29 | 18 | 20 | 24 | 19 | 22 | 17 | 19 | 14 | 75 | 168 | 385 | 449 | 583 |
| Rhode Island | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 11 |  | 35 | 119 | 173 | 62 | 49 | 66 | 35 | 67 | 62 | 78 |
| South Dakota | 119 | 167 | 132 | 151 | 164 | 85 | 114 | 139 | 97 | 143 | 471 | 322 | 115 | 149 | 218 | 347 | 192 |
| Tennessee | 65 | 108 | 316 | 149 | 53 | 21 | 48 | 37 | 35 | 109 | 145 | 251 | 356 | 190 | 82 | 74 | 152 |
| Texas | 227 | 323 | 344 | 264 | 396 | 326 | 347 | 389 | 556 | 1,194 | 945 | 697 | 784 | 703 | 720 | 589 | 470 |
| Utah | 2. | 9 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 21 | 11 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 18 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 7 |
| Vermont | 57 | 16 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Virginia | 216 | 79 | 109 | 99 | 113 | 114 | 56 | 5 | 14 | 19 | 37 | 166 | 745 | 625 | 208 | 179 | 200 |
| Washington | 8 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 21 | 3 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| West Virginia | 153 | 121 | 60 | 25 | 32 | 5 | 17 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 27 | 35 | 62 | 120 | 41 | 29 | 64 |
| Wisconsin | 60 | 93 | 156 | 154 | 109 | 72 | 97 | 90 | 94 | 119 | 294 | 336 | 193 | 119 | 71 | 66 | 46 |
| Wyoming | 6 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 25 | 36 | 19 | 9 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 34 | 27 | 10 | 30 | 85 | 254 |
| Guam | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Puerto Rico | 49 | 80 | 56 | 57 | 49 | 50 | 54 | 51 | 40 | 26 | 68 | 93 | 66 | 50 | 60 | 41 | 47 |
| Virgin Islands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

APPENDIX 3. Reported rabies in the U.S., by state and animal type, 1986

|  | Dops | Cates | Cattie | Horsee mules | Sheep coens | 8 wine | $\begin{gathered} \text { Domeette } \\ \text { enimel } \\ \text { totel } \end{gathered}$ | Skunks | Boberts | Coyotes | Fomes | Reccoons | Bets | Rodents alagomorpthe | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Outier } \\ & \text { wild } \\ & \text { andinels } \end{aligned}$ | Wind sonimel totel | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Totals | 95 | 166 | 197 | 43 | 13 | 2 | 516 | 2,379 | 8 | 6 | 207 | 1,576 | 788 | 15 | 56 | 5,035 | 5,551 |
| State |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama Alaska Arizona Arkansas California | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 3 $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  | 5 1 9 9 | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 57 \\ 143 \\ 368 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2 | 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 20 \\ 12 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 53 | $\begin{array}{r} 45 \\ 28 \\ 14 \\ 135 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 1 Opossum <br> 1 Javeline <br> 1 Opossum | $\begin{array}{r} 110 \\ 20 \\ 101 \\ 159 \\ 511 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 115 \\ 20 \\ 102 \\ 168 \\ 520 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Colorado Connecticut Delaware District of Columbia Florida | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 1 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 12 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $2$ <br> 3 |  |  | 5 | $\begin{array}{r} 29 \\ 128 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 30 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 34 \end{array}$ |  | $5^{5^{\circ}} 10$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 34 \\ 171 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 42 \\ 483 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Georgia Hawaii Idaho llinois Indiana | $2$ <br> 1 | $4$ $2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 4 \\ & 4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & \\ & 8 \\ & 1 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ \\ 29 \\ 13 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1 |  | 15 | 154 | $\begin{array}{r}17 \\ 9 \\ 9 \\ 9 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | 1 Otter | $\begin{array}{r} 193 \\ 9 \\ 38 \\ 18 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 202 \\ 0 \\ 9 \\ 46 \\ 19 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| lowa <br> Kansas <br> Kentucky <br> Louisiana <br> Maine | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 1 \\ 10 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | 21 5 | 46 2 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 1 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 2 | 84 9 15 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 103 \\ 45 \\ 70 \\ 18 \end{array}$ |  |  | 12 | 1 | 6 <br> 6 <br> 8 <br> 4 <br> 1 <br> 1 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 109 \\ 52 \\ 91 \\ 22 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 193 \\ 61 \\ 106 \\ 23 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Maryland Massachusetts Michigan Minnesota Mississippi | 8 | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ | $3$ <br> 26 | 1 <br> 3 | 1 |  | $23$ <br> 48 | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \\ 3 \\ 121 \end{array}$ |  |  | 25 1 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 588 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}27 \\ 8 \\ 18 \\ 5 \\ 9 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $89$ <br> 1 Woodchuck | 1 Deer | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 661 \\ 8 \\ 23 \\ 129 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 684 \\ 8 \\ 23 \\ 177 \\ 9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Missouri <br> Montana <br> Nebraska <br> Nevada <br> New Hampshire | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5 \\ & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 2 16 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 7 20 5 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 54 \\ 168 \\ 29 \end{array}$ |  |  | 1 | 2 | $\begin{array}{r}10 \\ 14 \\ 3 \\ 12 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | 1 Opossum | $\begin{array}{r} 66 \\ 185 \\ 32 \\ 12 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}73 \\ 205 \\ 37 \\ 13 \\ 1 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| New Jersey <br> New Mexico <br> New York <br> North Carolina <br> North Dakota | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 13 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 23 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 1 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \\ 44 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ 9 \\ 116 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 32 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 17 3 46 10 |  | 1 Ferret | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 7 \\ 88 \\ 10 \\ 118 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17 \\ 7 \\ 93 \\ 10 \\ 162 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island | 2 | 19 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 7 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 12 \\ 27 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 43 \\ 101 \end{array}$ |  |  | $1$ $\begin{array}{r} 24 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 409 | $\begin{array}{r}12 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 17 \\ 2 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 5 Woodchucks |  | $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 48 \\ 5 \\ 556 \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}16 \\ 60 \\ 5 \\ 583 \\ 3 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| South Carolina <br> South Dakota <br> Tennessee <br> Texas <br> Utah | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 9 \\ 4 \\ 14 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $2$ |  | 17 49 4 46 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 3 \\ 140 \\ 127 \\ 275 \end{array}$ | 3 | 2 | 5 1 7 11 | $\begin{array}{r} 37 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}15 \\ 14 \\ 132 \\ 6 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |  | 1 Ferret | $\begin{array}{r} 61 \\ 143 \\ 148 \\ 424 \\ 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 78 \\ 192 \\ 152 \\ 470 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Vermont <br> Virginia <br> Washington <br> West Virginia <br> Wisconsin | 1 | $3$ $2$ | 2 4 | 1 1 | 2 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 38 \\ 24 \\ 29 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1 |  | 12 4 | $\begin{array}{r} 139 \\ 30 \end{array}$ | 2 <br> 2 <br> 8 <br> 4 <br> 10 <br> 10 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 192 \\ 8 \\ 63 \\ 39 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 200 \\ 8 \\ 64 \\ 46 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Wyoming Guam Puerto Rico Virgin Islands | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 5 | 4 1 |  |  | 14 | 221 |  | 1 |  |  | 17 | 1 Prairie Dog | 42 Mongooses | 240 42 | $\begin{array}{r}254 \\ 0 \\ 47 \\ 0 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |

[^5]APPENDIX 4. Reported rabies in Canada, by province and animal type, 1986

| Province | Dogs | Cats | Cattie | Horses | Sheep/ Goats | Swine | Foxes | Skunks | Bats | Racoons | Other Wild | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alberta | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 6 | - | - | 7 |
| British Columbia | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | 9 |
| Manitoba | 3 | 1 | 6 | 1 | - | - | 5 | 57 | - | - | $1 *$ | 74 |
| North West Territory | - | - | - | - | - | - | 15 | - | - | - | $1 *$ | 16 |
| Nova Scotia | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Ontario | 130 | 150 | 357 | 36 | 82 | 12 | 1,650 | 722 | 45 | 32 | $57 \dagger$ | 3,273 |
| Quebec | 3 | - | 5 | - | - | - | 38 | 10 | 1 | 1 | - | 58 |
| Saskatchewan | 3 | 10 | 24 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 396 | 5 | - | - | 440 |
| Total | 139 | 161 | 392 | 38 | 83 | 12 | 1,708 | 1,186 | 67 | 33 | 59 | 3,878 |

*Wolf
tTen wolves, one bear, 35 coyotes, eight woodchucks, two rabbits, one bison

## RABIES CASES IN CANADA, 1986



APPENDIX 5. Reported rabies in Mexico, by state and animal type, 1986

| State | Dog | Cat | Bat | Mule Coyote | Rat | Pig | Others | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Aguascalientes | 682 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 720 |
| Baja Calif Norte | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baja Calif Sur | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Campeche | 867 | 34 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 928 |
| Coahuila | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Colima | 805 | 19 | 9 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 861 |
| Chiapas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chihuahua | 916 | 26 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 973 |
| Distrito Federal | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Durango | 723 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 767 |
| Guanajuato | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Guerrero | 807 | 38 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 867 |
| Hidalgo | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Jalisco | 616 | 12 | 14 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 664 |
| México | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Michoacán | 879 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 944 |
| Morelos | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nayarit | 488 | 15 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 519 |
| Nuevo León | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oaxaca | 571 | 21 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 611 |
| Puebla | 134 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| Querétaro | 597 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 654 |
| Quintana Roo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| San Luis Potosi | 305 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 336 |
| Sinaloa | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Sonora | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tabasco | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Tamaulipas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tlaxcala | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veracrúz | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yucatán | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Zacatecas | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Total | 883 | 273 | 50 | 38 | 122 | 11 | 8 | 83 | 9,088 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |



APPENDIX 6. Reported rabies in wild and domestic animals by year, U.S., 1953-1986


APPENDIX 7. U.S. counties reporting skunk rabies, 1986


APPENDIX 8. U.S. counties reporting raccoon rabies, 1986


APPENDIX 9. U.S. counties reporting bat rabies, 1986


APPENDIX 10. U.S. counties reporting fox rabies, 1986


APPENDIX 11. U.S. counties reporting cat rabies, 1986


APPENDIX 12. U.S. counties reporting dog rabies, 1986


APPENDIX 13. U.S. counties reporting cattle rabies, 1986


## APPENDIX 14. Countries reporting no rabies cases

The following areas reported that rabies was not present:

| Africa | St. Martin | Oceania ${ }^{\dagger}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mauritius* | St. Vincent | American Samoa |
|  | Turks | Australia |
| North America | Caicos Islands | Belau (Palau) |
| Bermuda | Virgin Islands (U.K./U.S.) | Cook Islands |
| St. Pierre and Miquelon | South America | Federated States of |
|  | Micronesia: |  |
| Caribbean | Suriname* | Kosrae |
| Anguilla | Uruguay | Ponape |
| Antigua and Barbuda |  | Truk Islands |
| Bahamas | Asia | Yap |
| Barbados | Bahrain | Fiji |
| Cayman Islands | Brunei | French Polynesia |
| Dominica | Japan | Guam |
| Guadeloupe | Kuwait | Kiribati |
| Jamaica | Malaysia (Malaysia-Sabah*) | New Caledonia |
| Martinique | Maldives* | New Zealand |
| Montserrat | Oman | Niue |
| Netherlands Antilles: | Singapore | Northern Mariana |
| Aruba | Taiwan | Islands |
| Bonaire |  | Papua New Guinea |
| Curacao | Europe | Samoa |
| Saba | Bulgaria* | Solomon Islands |
| St. Maarten | Faroe Islands | Tonga |
| St. Eustatius | Iceland | Vanuatu |
| St. Christopher (St. Kitts) | Ireland |  |
| Nevis | Malta |  |
| St. Lucia | Norway |  |
|  | Portugal |  |
|  | Spain |  |
|  | Sweden |  |
|  | United Kingdom |  |

*Countries that have only recently reported no cases of rabies; these classifications are considered provisional.
${ }^{\dagger}$ Most of Pacific Oceania is rabies-free.
This list is based on information and data provided to CDC from the following publications:
World Health Organization World Survey of Rabies XXII (for 1984/85), Veterinary Public Health Unit, Division of Communicable Diseases, Geneva, WHO, 1987.

WHO Collaborating Centre for Rabies Surveillance and Research Rabies Bulletin Europe 3/88 (July-September, 1986). 1986;10(3).
Pan American Zoonoses Center (PAHONHO) Epidemiological Surveillance of Rabies for the Americas (1986). 1986;16(1-6).

## APPENDIX 15. State and Territorial Epidemiologists and State Public Health Veterinarians*

| State | State Epidemiologist/ <br> State Public Health Veterinarian ${ }^{\dagger}$ | Rabies Phone Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | Charles H. Woernle, MD Wallace E. Birch, DVM | 205-261-5018 |
| Alaska | John P. Middaugh, MD | 907-561-4406 |
| American Samoa | Julia L. Lyons, MD, MPH | 011-684-633-4590 |
| Arizona | Steven J. Englender, MD, MPH Harvel Alishouse, DMV, MPH | 602-255-1203 |
| Arkansas | Thomas C. McChesney, DVM ${ }^{\text { }}$ | 501-661-2597 |
| California | Vacant <br> Denny G. Constantine, DVM, MPH (Acting) | 415-540-2391 |
| Colorado | Richard E. Hoffman, MD, MPH | 303-331-8330 |
| Connecticut | James L. Hadler, MD, MPH | 203-556-2540 |
| Delaware | Paul R. Silverman, DrPH | 302-736-5617 |
| District of Columbia | Martin E. Levy, MD, MPH | 202-673-6741 |
| Florida | Michael H. Wilder, MD (Acting) | 904-488-2905 |
| Georgia | R. Keith Sikes, DVM ${ }^{\text { }}$ | 404-894-6527 |
| Guam | Robert L. Haddock, DVM | 011-671-734-2544 |
| Hawaii | Arthur P. Liang, MD, MPH Elizabeth L. Lyons, DVM | 808-548-5986 |
| Idaho | Charles D. Brokopp, DrPH | 208-334-5930 |
| Illinois | Byron J. Francis, MD <br> Russell J. Martin, DVM | 217-782-2016 |
| Indiana | Charles L. Barrett, MD James M. Shuler, DVM, MPH | 317-633-0122 |
| lowa | Laverne A. Wintermeyer, MD Russell W. Currier, DVM | 515-281-5643 |
| Kansas | Robert French (Acting) | 913-862-9360 $\times 481$ |
| Kentucky | James Michael Moser, MD, MPH Joseph W. Skaggs, DVM | 502-564-3418 |
| Louisiana | Joyce B. Mathison, MD, MPH\&TM William Fairchild, DVM | 504-342-4984 |
| Maine | Kathleen F. Gensheimer, MD | 207-289-3591 |
| Maryland | Ebenezer Israel, MD Joseph T. Horman, DVM | 301-225-6711 |
| Massachusetts | George F. Grady, MD | 617-522-3700 |
| Michigan | Kenneth R. Wilcox, Jr., MD George R. Anderson, DVM | 517-335-8057 |
| Micronesia | Eliuel K. Pretrick, MO | 619 |
| Minnesota | Michael T. Osterholm, PhD, MPH | 612-623-5414 |
| Mississippi Missouri | Fred Edgar Thompson, MD | 601-354-6660 |
| Missouri | H. Denny Donnell, Jr., MD FT. Satalowich, DVM | 314-751-6136 |
| Montana | Judith K. Gedrose, RN Donald P. Ferlicka, DVM | 406-444-2043 |
| Nebraska | Paul A. Stoesz, MD | 402-471-2937 |
| Nevada | George E. Reynolds, MD (Acting) | 702-885-4740 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { New Hampshire } \\ & \text { Naw larcos } \end{aligned}$ <br> New Jersey | Eugene Schwartz, MD | 603-271-4477 |
| New Mexico | Faye Sorhage, DVM, MPH Harry F. Hull, MD Millicent Eidson, DVM | $609-984-1371$ $505-827-0006$ |


| New York | Dale L. Morse, MD Melvin K. Abelseth, DVM, PhD | 518-474-7000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New York City | Stephen Schultz, MD | 212-566-7160 |
| North Carolina | J. N. MacCormack, MD, MPH John I. Freeman, DVM | 919-733-3410 |
| North Dakota | James L. Pearson, DrPH | 1-800-472-2180 |
| Northern Mariana Islands | Frank T. Palacios, MD | 011-670-6111 |
| Ohio | Ronald L. Fletcher, MD George T. Bear, DVM | 614-466-4643 |
| Oklahoma | Gregory R. Istre, MD Barton Rohrbach, DVM | 405-271-4060 |
| Oregon | Laurence R. Foster, MD <br> L. Paul Williams, Jr., DVM | 503-229-5015 |
| Palau | Anthony H. Polloi, MO (Acting) | 680-813, 420, 555 |
| Pennsylvania | Ernest J. Witte, VMD, MPH Bobby R. Jones, DVM, MPH | 717-787-3350 |
| Puerto Rico | Jose G. Rigau, MD | 809-758-5344 |
| Rhode Island | Barbara A. DeBuono, MD, MPH Alfredo C. Parrillo, DVM | 401-277-2781 |
| South Carolina | Richard L. Parker, DVM ${ }^{+}$ | 803-734-5010 |
| South Dakota | Kenneth A. Senger, BS | 605-773-3364 |
| Tennessee | Robert H. Hutcheson, Jr., MD Gary L. Swinger, DVM | 615-741-7247 |
| Texas | Charles E. Alexander, MD Foy V. McCasland, DVM, MPH | 512-835-8100 |
| Utah | Craig R. Nichols, MPA Michael Marshall, DVM | 801-533-6060 |
| Vermont | Richard L. Vogt, MD | 802-863-7240 |
| Virginia | Grayson B. Miller, Jr., MD Suzanne R. Jenkins, VMD, MPH | 804-786-6261 |
| Virgin Islands | John N. Lewis, MD | 809-773-1059 |
| Washington | John M. Kobayashi, MD | 206-361-2914 |
| West Virginia | Roy C. Baron, MD, MPH (Acting) Richard Hopkins, MD (Acting) | 304-348-5358 |
| Wisconsin | Jeffrey P. Davis, MD <br> Wayne H. Thompson, DVM, MPH, PhD | 608-262-3937 |
| Wyoming | Harry C. Crawford, MD Norman R. Swanson, DVM | 307-777-7515 |
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[^0]:    * U.S. comparisons with previous years by animal type and state are shown in Appendices 1, 2, and 3.
    ${ }^{\dagger}$ Pour les données concernant les Etats-Unis, les comparaisons pour les différentes espèces animales et par etat pour les années précédentes figurent en Annexes 1, 2, et 3.
    ${ }^{\ddagger}$ Los datos por especie en años pasados y por estado se encuentran en Anexos 1, 2, y 3.

[^1]:    §Canadian cases by province and animal type and totals by province are shown in Appendix 4.
    $\|$ Les cas enregistrés au Canada par espèce et par province et les totaux par province figurent en Annexe 4.

[^2]:    ** Mexican cases by state and animal type are shown in Appendix 5.
    ${ }^{\dagger \dagger}$ Les cas enregistrés au Mexique par espèce et par Etat figurent en Annexe 5.
    $\not{ }^{\ddagger \ddagger}$ Casos de rabia en México por estado y por especie se encuentran en Anexo 5.

[^3]:    * U.S. wild animal cases by county and animal type are shown in Appendices 7-10.
    ${ }^{+}$Canadian cases by province and animal type are shown in Appendix 4.
    * Mexican cases by state and animal type are shown in Appendix 5.

[^4]:    * U.S. domestic and farm animal cases by county and animal type are shown in Appendices 11-13.
    ${ }^{\dagger}$ Canadian cases by province and animal type are shown in Appendix 4.
    ${ }^{\ddagger}$ Mexican cases by state and animal type are shown in Appendix 5.

[^5]:    *Two red pandee two ooseeume one farret

[^6]:    *As of May 1, 1987.
    tState Public Health Veterinarian post vacant where none listed
    ${ }^{\ddagger}$ Dual Assignment

[^7]:    DEPARTMENT OF
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    Public Health Service
    Centers for Disease Control
    Atlenta GA 30333

    ## Official Business

    Penality for Private Use $\$ \mathbf{3 0 0}$

