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## Purpose:

The analyses included in this report attempt to provide answers to additional questions posed by Mr. Patrick McMillan and Dr. Barbara McLean, members of the Maryland Spay/Neuter Task Force Commission, raised at the commission's November $14^{\text {th }}$ meeting. The questions are as follows:

1) What was the overall incidence of pet ownership by those responding to the survey?
2) Of those respondents who supported the creation of a low cost spay neuter program, what percent of those were pet owners?
3) Of those owning dogs or cats, what percent supported the following:
a. Paying an extra dollar or two when getting pet rabies shots?
b. Paying an extra penny or two when buying pet food?
c. Paying an extra dollar or two added to your annual state income tax?
d. Paying an extra dollar or two when renewing pet licenses?

## Survey Questions Included on AACC-CSLI Survey:

The questions appearing on the October, 2012 AACC-CSLI survey pertaining to these issues are again provided here for clarity, in Table 1 and Table 2. They are identical to those presented in the main report.

## Table 1

Questions As Asked On CSLI-Biannual Survey - Fall, 2012
7.0 Maryland is considering a program to subsidize low-cost spaying and neutering for low income pet owners to lessen the problem of stray dogs and cats.

Do you support or oppose the creation of such a program?
(1) Support If SUPPORT go to question 7.1 below
(2) Oppose
(3) Unsure
(0) No answer

If Oppose, Unsure or No answer go to $\square$ question 8 next page

If "SUPPORT" for question 7, ask: Do you support or oppose the following ideas for
financing this program...

| Paying an extra... | Support | Maybe | Oppose | N.A. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.1 Dollar or two when getting pet rabies shots? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 7.2 Penny or two when buying pet food? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 7.3 . Dollar or two added to your annual state income tax? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| 7.4 Dollar or two when renewing pet licenses? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

## Table 2

22.1. Do you currently own a dog or a cat? Yes
(2) No (0) No answer

Results:

1. Mr. McMillan's request:

What was the overall incidence of pet ownership by those responding to the survey?
Over half of the survey population (56.2\%) currently owned a dog or cat. See Table 3.

| Table 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you currently own a dog or a cat? |  |  |
| Yes | No |  |
| $56.2 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ |  |
| $(277)$ | $(217)$ |  |

## 2. Dr. McLean's requests:

a. Of those respondents who supported the creation of a low cost spay neuter program, what percent of those were pet owners?

Approximately 8 out of 10 (79.7\%) of the respondents currently owning a dog or cat supported the creation of a low cost spay neuter program. Furthermore, commonly accepted statistical analysis used for inference testing from these data indicate very strong significant differences among the subgroups (chi square $=10.237 \mathrm{p}<.001$ ). See Table 4.

| Table 4 <br> Do you support or oppose the creation of a program to subsidize low-cost spaying <br> and neutering for low income pet owners to lessen the problem of stray dogs and cats? |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Responses from: | Support | Oppose |
| 1. Those currently owning a dog or cat | $79.7 \%$ | $20.3 \%$ |
|  | $(208)$ | $(53)$ |
| 2. Those NOT currently owing a dog or cat | $66.5 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ |
|  | $(133)$ | $(67)$ |

## b. Of those owning dogs or cats, what percent supported paying an extra dollar or two when getting pet rabies shots?

Almost 9 out of 10 ( $88.5 \%$ ) respondents currently owning a dog or cat supported paying an extra dollar or two for such a program, when getting pet rabies shots. Again, commonly accepted statistical analysis used for inference testing from these data indicate very strong significant differences among the subgroups (chi square $=10.909 \mathrm{p}<.004$ ). See Table 5 on next page.

Table 5
If you support the creation of such a program, do you support or oppose paying an extra dollar or two when getting pet rabies shots?

| paying an extra dollar or two when getting pet rabies shots? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Responses from: | Support | Maybe | Oppose |
| 1. Those currently owing a dog or cat | $88.5 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ |
|  | $(192)$ | $(7)$ | $(18)$ |
| 2. Those NOT currently owning a dog or cat | $75.2 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ | $19.5 \%$ |
|  | $(100)$ | $(7)$ | $(26)$ |

## c. Of those owning dogs or cats, what percent supported paying an extra penny or two when buying pet food?

Almost 8 out of $10(78.7 \%)$ respondents currently owning a dog or cat supported paying an extra penny or two for such a program when buying pet food. Commonly accepted statistical analysis used for inference testing from these data indicate very strong significant differences among the subgroups (chi square $=6.626 \mathrm{p}<.036$ ). See Table 6.

| Table 6 <br> If you support the creation of such a program, do you support or oppose <br> paying an extra penny or two when buying pet food? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Responses from: | Support | Maybe | Oppose |
| 1. Those currently owing a dog or cat | $78.7 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ |
|  | $(170)$ | $(8)$ | $(38)$ |
| 2. Those NOT currently owning a dog or cat | $67.2 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $24.4 \%$ |
|  | $(88)$ | $(11)$ | $(32)$ |

## d. Of those owning dogs or cats, what percent supported paying an extra dollar or two added to your state income tax?

Respondents currently owning a dog or cat were almost evenly divided over whether they supported (48.6\%) or opposed (47.7\%) paying an extra dollar or two added to on their state income tax to support such a program. Their responses were almost statistically identical to those who did not own a pet ( $43.7 \%$ support, and $50.4 \%$ opposed) yielding no statistically significant differences overall (chi square $=2.537, p<.469$ ), with neither group showing strong support for this option. See Table 7.

| Table 7 <br> If you support the creation of such a program, do you support or oppose <br> paying an extra dollar or two added to your state income tax? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Responses from: | Support | Maybe | Oppose |
| 1. Those currently owing a dog or cat | $48.6 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $47.7 \%$ |
|  | $(104)$ | $(8)$ | $(102)$ |
| 2. Those NOT currently owning a dog or cat | $43.7 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $50.4 \%$ |
|  | $(59)$ | $(7)$ | $(68)$ |

## e. Of those owning dogs or cats, what percent supported paying an extra dollar or two added when renewing pet licenses?

Over 7 out of 10 ( $76.1 \%$ ) respondents currently owning a dog or cat supported paying an extra dollar or two when renewing pet licenses. Their responses were almost statistically identical to those who did not own a pet, with over 7 out of 10 ( $72.7 \%$ ) of that group, too, supporting this method of funding. There were no overall statistically significant differences (chi square $=1.64, p<.440$ ), with both groups showing strong support for this option. See Table 8.

| Table 8 <br> If you support the creation of such a program, do you support or oppose <br> paying an extra dollar or two when renewing pet licenses? |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Responses from: | Support | Maybe | Oppose |
| 1. Those currently owing a dog or cat | $76.1 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ |
|  | $(162)$ | $(12)$ | $(39)$ |
| 2. Those NOT currently owning a dog or cat | $72.7 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $23.4 \%$ |
|  | $(93)$ | $(5)$ | $(30)$ |

## Conclusions:

What conclusions can be drawn from these additional analyses that may help the decisionmaking of the spay/neuter task force?

Slightly more survey respondents reported that they currently owned dogs or cats than those who did not. However, whether they are pet owners or not appears to have little impact on their support for both the development of a low cost spay neuter program for low income pet owners - or how to pay for it. Here's why.

First, majority support for the program comes from both groups: 1) pet owners and; 2) those who don't own pets. Almost 8 out of 10 respondents owning dogs and cats support the initiative, and 6 out of 10 respondents not owning dogs and cats do so, too.

Second, the supporting evidence is even more compelling when considering how to pay for it among those who would most likely be exclusively bearing the cost: current dog and cat owners.

Taking each suggested funding option in turn: 1) Almost 9 out of 10 dog or cat owners support paying an extra dollar or two for the cost of a rabies shot; 2) Almost 8 out of 10 dog and cat owners support paying an extra penny or two when buying pet food; 3) Over 7 out of 10 dog and cat owners support paying an extra dollar or two when renewing pet licenses; 4) There is much less support (5 out of 10) among dog and cat owners for paying an extra dollar or two added to their annual state income tax.

Clearly, the main report of these survey findings previously provided to the commission, along with these additional finding demonstrate two things. First, there is very strong public support for establishing such a program in Maryland, especially among dog and cat owners. Second there is also very strong support for three of the four key options suggested for funding it - all of which would only financially impact current owners of dog and cats in Maryland.

