



State of California—Health and Human Services Agency
California Department of Public Health



EDMUND G. BROWN JR
Governor

Hantavirus
Yearly Summary Report

2001 - 2010

Center for Infectious Diseases
Division of Communicable Disease Control
Infectious Diseases Branch
Surveillance and Statistics Section

Hantavirus, Cases and Rates by Health Jurisdiction, California, 2001 to 2005

JURISDICTION	YEAR OF ESTIMATED ONSET									
	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE
CALIFORNIA TOTAL	-	-	2	0.0	2	0.0	3	0.0	-	-
ALAMEDA COUNTY TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALAMEDA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BERKELEY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALPINE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AMADOR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUTTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CALAVERAS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
COLUSA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CONTRA COSTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DEL NORTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EL DORADO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FRESNO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GLENN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HUMBOLDT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IMPERIAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
INYO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KERN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KINGS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAKE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LASSEN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOS ANGELES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LONG BEACH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PASADENA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MADERA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARIPOSA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MENDOCINO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MERCED	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MODOC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MONO	-	-	1	7.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
MONTEREY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NAPA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEVADA	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.0	-	-
ORANGE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PLACER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PLUMAS	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4.7	-	-
RIVERSIDE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN BENITO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN BERNARDINO	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN JOAQUIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN LUIS OBISPO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN MATEO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SANTA BARBARA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SANTA CLARA	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
SANTA CRUZ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SHASTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SIERRA	-	-	-	-	1	27.0	-	-	-	-
SISKIYOU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOLANO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SONOMA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
STANISLAUS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUTTER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TEHAMA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TRINITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TULARE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TUOLUMNE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VENTURA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
YOLO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
YUBA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Rates are expressed as cases per 100,000 population.

Source: California Department of Public Health, Infectious Diseases Branch, Surveillance and Statistics Section.
California Department of Finance: Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, July 2007.

Hantavirus, Cases and Rates by Health Jurisdiction, California, 2006 to 2010

JURISDICTION	YEAR OF ESTIMATED ONSET									
	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE
CALIFORNIA TOTAL	4	0.0	1	0.0	-	-	3	0.0	2	0.0
ALAMEDA COUNTY TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALAMEDA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BERKELEY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ALPINE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
AMADOR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BUTTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CALAVERAS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
COLUSA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CONTRA COSTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DEL NORTE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EL DORADO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FRESNO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GLENN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HUMBOLDT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IMPERIAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
INYO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5.2
KERN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KINGS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAKE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LASSEN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LOS ANGELES COUNTY TOTAL	2	0.0	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
LOS ANGELES	2	0.0	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
LONG BEACH	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PASADENA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MADERA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MARIPOSA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MENDOCINO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MERCED	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MODOC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MONO	-	-	1	7.1	-	-	-	-	1	6.7
MONTEREY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NAPA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NEVADA	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2.0	-	-
ORANGE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PLACER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PLUMAS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RIVERSIDE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SACRAMENTO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN BENITO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN BERNARDINO	1	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN DIEGO	1	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN FRANCISCO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN JOAQUIN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN LUIS OBISPO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SAN MATEO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SANTA BARBARA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SANTA CLARA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SANTA CRUZ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SHASTA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SIERRA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SISKIYOU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOLANO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SONOMA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
STANISLAUS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUTTER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TEHAMA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TRINITY	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TULARE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TUOLUMNE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VENTURA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
YOLO	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
YUBA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Rates are expressed as cases per 100,000 population.

Source: California Department of Public Health, Infectious Diseases Branch, Surveillance and Statistics Section.

Hantavirus, Cases by Month, California, 2001 to 2005

MONTH OF ESTIMATED ONSET	YEAR OF ESTIMATED ONSET				
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
	CASES	CASES	CASES	CASES	CASES
TOTAL	-	2	2	3	-
JANUARY	-	-	-	-	-
FEBRUARY	-	-	-	-	-
MARCH	-	-	-	-	-
APRIL	-	1	-	-	-
MAY	-	-	-	1	-
JUNE	-	-	-	1	-
JULY	-	1	-	-	-
AUGUST	-	-	-	1	-
SEPTEMBER	-	-	-	-	-
OCTOBER	-	-	2	-	-
NOVEMBER	-	-	-	-	-
DECEMBER	-	-	-	-	-

Hantavirus, Cases and Rates by Age Group, California, 2001 to 2005

AGE GROUP	YEAR OF ESTIMATED ONSET									
	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE
TOTAL	-	-	2	0.0	2	0.0	3	0.0	-	-
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
01-04	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
05-14	-	-	1	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
15-24	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
25-34	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
35-44	-	-	-	-	2	0.0	-	-	-	-
45-54	-	-	1	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
55-64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
65 +	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
UNKNOWN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Hantavirus, Cases and Rates by Race / Ethnicity, California, 2001 to 2005

RACE / ETHNICITY	YEAR OF ESTIMATED ONSET									
	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE
TOTAL	-	-	2	0.0	2	0.0	3	0.0	-	-
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BLACK, NOT HISPANIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HISPANIC	-	-	1	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WHITE, NOT HISPANIC	-	-	-	-	2	0.0	2	0.0	-	-
UNKNOWN	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-

Rates are expressed as cases per 100,000 population

Source: California Department of Public Health, Infectious Diseases Branch, Surveillance and Statistics Section.
California Department of Finance: Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, July 2007.

Hantavirus, Cases by Month, California, 2006 to 2010

MONTH OF ESTIMATED ONSET	YEAR OF ESTIMATED ONSET				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
	CASES	CASES	CASES	CASES	CASES
TOTAL	4	1	-	3	2
JANUARY	-	-	-	-	-
FEBRUARY	-	-	-	-	-
MARCH	-	-	-	-	-
APRIL	-	-	-	-	-
MAY	-	-	-	-	-
JUNE	-	1	-	1	-
JULY	2	-	-	-	2
AUGUST	-	-	-	-	-
SEPTEMBER	1	-	-	-	-
OCTOBER	1	-	-	-	-
NOVEMBER	-	-	-	2	-
DECEMBER	-	-	-	-	-

Hantavirus, Cases and Rates by Age Group, California, 2006 to 2010

AGE GROUP	YEAR OF ESTIMATED ONSET									
	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE
TOTAL	4	0.0	1	0.0	-	-	3	0.0	2	0.0
0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
01-04	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
05-14	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
15-24	1	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25-34	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
35-44	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.0
45-54	1	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
55-64	2	0.1	1	0.0	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
65 +	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
UNKNOWN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Hantavirus, Cases and Rates by Race / Ethnicity, California, 2006 to 2010

RACE / ETHNICITY	YEAR OF ESTIMATED ONSET									
	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010	
	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE	CASES	RATE
TOTAL	4	0.0	1	0.0	-	-	3	0.0	2	0.0
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BLACK, NOT HISPANIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HISPANIC	1	0.0	-	-	-	-	1	0.0	1	0.0
AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WHITE, NOT HISPANIC	3	0.0	1	0.0	-	-	1	0.0	-	-
UNKNOWN	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-

Rates are expressed as cases per 100,000 population

Source: California Department of Public Health, Infectious Diseases Branch, Surveillance and Statistics Section.
California Department of Finance: Population Estimates with Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnic Detail, July 2007.

TECHNICAL NOTES FOR HANTAVIRUS YEARLY SUMMARY REPORT:

In interpretation of the numbers in this report, please consider the following points:

- Because of inherent delays in case reporting and depending on the length of follow-up clinical, laboratory and epidemiologic investigation, cases with estimated onset dates may be added or rescinded after the date of this report. Therefore, data in this report particularly for the current year are provisional and may differ from data published in future reports.
- Estimated onset date is the date closest to the time when symptoms first appeared. Since date of onset may not be recorded, the estimated date of onset can range from the first appearance of symptoms to the date the report was made to CDPH.
- Data are extracted from California Confidential Morbidity Reports that were submitted to CDPH by September 10, 2011.