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Introduction

Shelter Animals Count (SAC) is a collaborative, independent organization formed by a diverse group of stakeholders to create and share the national database of sheltered animal statistics, providing facts, and enabling insights that will improve animal welfare throughout the country. The SAC database follows the Basic Data Matrix specified by the National Federation of Humane Societies. The following paper provides a look at the 2020 data from Shelter Animals Count. The data was limited to organizations that completed a full year of reporting in 2020. The goal of this paper is to give an overview of the current state of the national sheltered animal database developed by SAC and demonstrate progress toward a truly national database that can be used to help understand the state of companion animals in this country.

It is worth pointing out both the strengths and weaknesses of the dataset. Since there is no national requirement for reporting, all the data is self-reported and contains natural under and over sampling biases in both the geographic and organization type dimensions. In other words, some areas had a greater level of reporting than others. To analyze the data, we utilized techniques that would minimize the potential bias effects of the partial dataset. The key methodologies were to aggregate at an appropriate level, which was predominately state, and to utilize ratios to normalize scale. Comparing absolute numbers is difficult because of the incomplete dataset at this point. As the dataset grows it will allow for more detailed analysis than we can do today.

MISSION

Shelter Animals Count is the trusted source for collecting and sharing credible and accessible data to positively impact animals and communities.
Definitions

The following definitions and abbreviations will be used throughout this paper:

**SAC**
Shelter Animals Count

**OIE**
owner intended euthanasia

**RBO**
relinquished by owner

**RTO**
return to owner

**RTO RATE**
total RTOs divided by the total of stray intakes

**RTF**
return to field

**LOCATION**
unique address for services
(organizations may have more than one location)

**ADJUSTED INTAKE**
total intake minus transfers in

**ADJUSTED OUTCOME**
total outcome minus transfers out

**LIVE OUTCOMES**
sum of adoptions, RTOs, RTFs, and transfers

**LIVE OUTCOME RATE**
live outcomes divided by all outcomes

**EUTHANASIA RATE**
total euthanasia excluding owner intended euthanasia divided by total outcomes minus owner intended euthanasia

**JUVENILES**
dogs or cats up to 5 months old

**STATES**
Data is included from all 50 US States, as well as US territory Puerto Rico.

**N**
n=Sample size. Organizations included in this paper submitted data for full year 2020: 2,386 organizations.
DEMOGRAPHICS
Of Reporting Organizations
Types of Organizations

- The top two organization types account for 69% of all locations. These included 1,038 (44%) Rescues w/o Government Contract and 594 (25%) Shelters w/o Govt. Contract.

- Shelters w/ Govt. Contract and Government Animal Services represent 31% of all locations with 374 and 364 locations, respectively.

- 16 Rescues w/ Govt. Contract reported a full year of data in 2020 representing 1% of all locations.

Demographics of Reporting Organizations

- Rescues w/ Govt. Contract: 1%
- Shelters w/ Govt. Contract: 15%
- Government Animal Services: 16%
- Shelters w/o Govt. Contract: 25%
- Rescues w/o Govt. Contract: 44%

n=2,386

FIGURE 1 Distribution of Organizations by Type
Geographic Distribution

- **2,386 locations** reported a full year of data in 2020.
- There is sparse reporting for counties in the **Midwest** and the **South**.
- **Los Angeles County, CA** and **Maricopa County, AZ** were the two counties with the most organizations reporting a full year of data for 2020 with 42 and 39 organizations, respectively.

### Table 1: Summary of Jurisdiction Coverage by Organizational Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
<th>STATES</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>CITIES</th>
<th>ZIP CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Organizations</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,386</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>858</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,561</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,167</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Organizations per county**

![Map showing the geographic distribution](image)

**FIGURE 2** Reporting Organizations by County for 2020
Number of Animals Reported by State

- **California** reported the most intakes accounting for **12.6%** of all state intakes.
- **Government Animal Services** accounted for **41.1%** of all animal intakes—the highest number of all the organization types.

**FIGURE 3** States With Highest Number of Animals Reported
Organizational Size

- Most organizations (81.2%) reported less than 2,000 intakes per year.
- 100% of Rescues w/o Govt. Contract reported less than 2,000 intakes per year.
- 57.4% of Shelters w/ Govt. Contracts reported less than 2,000 intakes per year.

![Bar Chart]

**FIGURE 4** Distribution of Organizations by Annual Intake Numbers
INTAKES
Intake Summary

- **Government Animal Services** is the category of shelters with the highest intake numbers, with an average intake that is 18% higher than the second largest category, **Shelters w/ Govt. Contract**.

- The most common type of intakes is **Strays** with 1.5M intakes or 46.9% of all intake sources.

### TABLE 2  Summary of Statistics by Organization Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>AVG. INTAKES</th>
<th>MEDIAN INTAKES</th>
<th>MIN. INTAKES</th>
<th>MAX INTAKES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>23,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2,386</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3  Summary of 2020 Intake Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>STRAY</th>
<th>RELINQUISHED</th>
<th>TRANSFER IN</th>
<th>OIE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>708,365</td>
<td>209,071</td>
<td>19,514</td>
<td>23,247</td>
<td>99,845</td>
<td>1,060,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>458,506</td>
<td>223,768</td>
<td>117,815</td>
<td>25,924</td>
<td>68,861</td>
<td>894,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>189,703</td>
<td>237,452</td>
<td>248,826</td>
<td>18,959</td>
<td>39,434</td>
<td>734,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>109,399</td>
<td>82,504</td>
<td>203,334</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>35,379</td>
<td>431,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>6,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,467,462</td>
<td>753,847</td>
<td>592,291</td>
<td>68,612</td>
<td>244,450</td>
<td>3,126,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Species Distribution by Organization Type

- The number of intakes excludes transfers in.
- Cat intakes account for 50.7% of all intakes while Dog intakes account for 49.3%.
- The largest difference between dog and cat intakes occurs in Shelters w/o Govt. Contract with 35.1% more cat than dog intakes.
- The second largest difference occurs in Government Animal Services with 21.8% more dog than cat intakes.

**FIGURE 5**  Adjusted Intake by Species and Organization Type
Community Need Indicator

- The number of juvenile animals entering the system serves as a proxy for community need by suggesting a higher birth rate in the local animal population.

- The juvenile ratio is calculated by dividing puppy/kitten intakes by total dog/cat intakes.

- The ability for facilities to absorb homeless animals is assumed to be compromised when juvenile ratio is high.

- **Rescues w/ Govt. Contracts** reported the highest juvenile ratio, at 55.2%.

### TABLE 4  Summary of 2020 Intake Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>ADJ. CAT INTAKE</th>
<th>ADJ. KITTEN INTAKE</th>
<th>KITTEN RATIO</th>
<th>ADJ. DOG INTAKE</th>
<th>ADJ. PUPPY INTAKE</th>
<th>PUPPY RATIO</th>
<th>JUVENILE RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>469,661</td>
<td>186,368</td>
<td>39.70%</td>
<td>570,867</td>
<td>78,609</td>
<td>13.80%</td>
<td>25.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>413,775</td>
<td>178,310</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
<td>363,284</td>
<td>59,743</td>
<td>16.40%</td>
<td>30.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>306,561</td>
<td>151,477</td>
<td>49.40%</td>
<td>178,987</td>
<td>40,051</td>
<td>22.40%</td>
<td>39.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>113,320</td>
<td>81,071</td>
<td>60.80%</td>
<td>94,444</td>
<td>34,981</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>63.40%</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>38.70%</td>
<td>55.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,325,643</td>
<td>598,700</td>
<td>45.20%</td>
<td>1,208,728</td>
<td>213,827</td>
<td>17.70%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Transfers were excluded from all juvenile ratio calculations to avoid any bias due to oversampling from organizations that take in juveniles from outside their community.
Juvenile Ratios

- Puerto Rico, Mississippi, and New Mexico had the highest puppy ratios suggesting areas of high community need.

- Kitten ratios were substantially higher than puppy ratios across the US.

- 69% of the variability in juvenile ratios across the country is driven by each state’s Kitten Intake Ratio.

**FIGURE 6** Average Puppy Intake Ratio by State

**FIGURE 7** Average Kitten Intake Ratio by State
Seasonality

- There is higher seasonal variability in cat intakes than dog intakes in spite of the rapid decline in both species’ intakes at the beginning of the global pandemic in March and April.

- Dog intakes showed a difference of 109% between the highest and lowest intake months.

- Cat intakes showed a difference of 115% between the highest and lowest intake months.

- Intakes exclude transfers in.

**Figure 8** Adjusted Intake by Month for Cats and Dogs
Transfers In

- **Texas, California, and Illinois** showed the highest numbers of dogs transferred in.
- **California, Texas, and Virginia** showed the highest numbers of cats transferred in.
- It is important to remember that many of these transfers could be **intra-state**.
- When compared to other organizations, **Shelters w/o Govt. Contract** had the largest percentage of animals transferred in at **42.0%**.

---

**FIGURE 9**  
Dogs Transferred In By State

**FIGURE 10**  
Cats Transferred In By State
Relinquishments

- Relinquishments were the second most common form of intake after Strays at 24%.

- The relinquishment rate is calculated by dividing relinquishments by total intake for each species.

---

**FIGURE 11** Relinquishments as a Percent of Total Intake by Species and Organization Type
OUTCOMES
Outcomes by Species & Organization Type

FIGURE 12: Percent of Total Outcomes by Outcome Method

- **Adoption** was the most common outcome at **53.5%** for dogs and **60.7%** for cats.
- **Euthanasia** was a more common outcome for cats at **8.3%** than dogs at **5.3%**.
- **RTO** was more common for dogs at **17.4%** than cats at **2.5%**.

**TABLE 5** Summary of Outcomes by Organization Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>ADOPTION</th>
<th>RTO</th>
<th>TRANSFER OUT</th>
<th>RTF</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>DIED</th>
<th>LOST</th>
<th>EUTH</th>
<th>OIE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>407,185</td>
<td>167,932</td>
<td>266,400</td>
<td>63,804</td>
<td>17,043</td>
<td>15,011</td>
<td>5,431</td>
<td>103,044</td>
<td>21,733</td>
<td>1,067,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/Govt. Contract</td>
<td>501,139</td>
<td>109,835</td>
<td>133,039</td>
<td>26,436</td>
<td>19,478</td>
<td>16,006</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>77,429</td>
<td>23,793</td>
<td>908,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>591,334</td>
<td>30,199</td>
<td>44,222</td>
<td>10,828</td>
<td>7,385</td>
<td>11,192</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>29,034</td>
<td>17,916</td>
<td>742,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>337,687</td>
<td>3,902</td>
<td>65,673</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>10,677</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>5,517</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>437,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/Govt. Contract</td>
<td>5,687</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,843,002</td>
<td>311,948</td>
<td>509,808</td>
<td>111,051</td>
<td>47,036</td>
<td>53,033</td>
<td>7,785</td>
<td>215,114</td>
<td>63,610</td>
<td>3,162,387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Euthanasia and RTO figures represent the outcomes as a percent of total outcomes. Euthanasia and RTO rates are calculated by the following formulas: Euthanasia/(Total Outcomes – OIE) and RTO/Stray Intakes.
Live Outcomes

- **Live outcomes** are considered **adoptions**, **RTO**, **transfer out**, and **RTF**.
- **Live outcome rate** was calculated by dividing live outcomes by total outcomes.
- **Rescues w/Govt. Contract** had the highest live outcomes at **96.3%**.
- **Shelters w/Govt. Contract** had the lowest live outcomes at **84.79%**.
- **North Dakota** had the highest live outcome rate at **96.4%**.
- **Puerto Rico** had the lowest live outcomes at **54.4%**.

![Live Outcome Rates by State](image)

**FIGURE 13**  Live Outcome Rates by State

**TABLE 6**  Summary of Live Outcomes and Rates by Organization Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>DOG LIVE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>CAT LIVE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>TOTAL LIVE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>TOTAL LIVE OUTCOME RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>517,229</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>388,092</td>
<td>80.90%</td>
<td>905,321</td>
<td>84.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/Govt. Contract</td>
<td>379,495</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>390,954</td>
<td>82.70%</td>
<td>770,449</td>
<td>84.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>290,599</td>
<td>91.80%</td>
<td>385,984</td>
<td>90.60%</td>
<td>676,583</td>
<td>91.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>212,412</td>
<td>96.70%</td>
<td>204,792</td>
<td>94.20%</td>
<td>417,204</td>
<td>95.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/Govt. Contract</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>98.30%</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>94.70%</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>96.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1,402,660</td>
<td>89.70%</td>
<td>1,373,149</td>
<td>85.90%</td>
<td>2,775,809</td>
<td>87.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Adoptions

FIGURE 14  Total Annual Adoptions by County

- Los Angeles County, CA and Maricopa County, AZ had the highest number of adoptions at 52,169 and 38,139, respectively.
- The number of adoptions by county is highly skewed with 50% of counties reporting less than 753 annual adoptions.
Community Adoption Rate

FIGURE 15  Annual Community Adoption Rate by County

- **Community adoption rate** is calculated by dividing total adoptions by intakes minus OIE and transfers in.¹

- Counties with high community adoption rates indicate a higher demand for adoptions than the community can supply.

- Regions of high community adoption rate include the East Coast, parts of TX, CO, and Northern CA.

¹ Community adoption rate = total adoptions / (intakes - OIE - transfers in)
The transfer rate is calculated by dividing transfers out by total intakes.

Dogs represent 59.0% of all transfers.

Cats represent 41.0% of all transfers.

Government Animal Services had the highest transfer rate at 25.1%.

High rates of transfer signify the importance of transfers as a mechanism to maximize live outcomes.

Mississippi, West Virginia, and Oklahoma had the top 3 transfer out rates at 46.7%, 33.4%, and 29.7%, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>TRANSFER RATE DOG</th>
<th>TRANSFER RATE CAT</th>
<th>TOTAL TRANSFER RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>25.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>20.60%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>17.70%</td>
<td>12.30%</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Organizations</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Return to Owner

Return to Owner rates were calculated by dividing RTO by total number of stray intakes.

- RTO rate for dogs was 40.7%.
- RTO rate for cats was 5.1%.
- Rhode Island had the highest RTO rate at 61.6%.
- Puerto Rico had the lowest RTO rate at 2.9%.

### TABLE 8 RTO Rates by Organization Type and Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>RTO DOG</th>
<th>RTO RATE (DOG)</th>
<th>RTO CAT</th>
<th>RTO RATE (CAT)</th>
<th>TOTAL RTO</th>
<th>RTO RATE (TOTAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>152,140</td>
<td>40.40%</td>
<td>15,792</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>25.10%</td>
<td>23.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>94,909</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
<td>14,926</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>21,189</td>
<td>40.20%</td>
<td>8,342</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Organizations</td>
<td>271,189</td>
<td>40.70%</td>
<td>40,759</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 17 RTO Rates by State
Return to Field

- Cat RTF accounted for 98.5% of all RTF outcomes.
- Large number of RTF outcomes for cats is an indication of growth in RTF programs around the country.
- In 2020, Rhode Island had the highest RTF percentage at 39.2%.
- National RTF Rate for 2020 is 13.7%.
- Rescues w/o Govt. Contracts had the highest RTF rates at 18.8%.

![Feline RTF Rates by State](image)

**FIGURE 18**  Feline RTF Rates by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>FELINE RTF OUTCOMES</th>
<th>FELINE RTF RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>62,533</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>9,914</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>26,082</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>10,790</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,360</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.70%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 RTF rate = RTF/stray intakes
Euthanasia Rate

The **euthanasia rate** was calculated by dividing the number of animals euthanized by the total number of outcomes.

**Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Alabama** had the top three euthanasia rates at 26.1%, 24.3%, and 18.7%, respectively.

**Government Animal Services** and **Shelters w/ Govt. Contract** had the highest euthanasia rates at 13.1% and 10.5%, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION TYPE</th>
<th>CANINE</th>
<th></th>
<th>FELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puppy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Animal Services</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/ Govt. Contract</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters w/o Govt. Contract</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Organizations</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COVID-19 Impact\(^1\) - Intake Impact

- Full year over year (Yoy) impact of COVID-19 (2020 vs. 2019).
- The largest percentage decline in intakes YOY was in the category of Strays, with a 27% reduction.
- The smallest percentage of change YOY was in the category of Transfers In, with an 8% reduction.
- Total Intakes decreased by 22% from 3.71M in 2019 to 2.89M in 2020.

\(^1\) Data for page 27 & 28, COVID-19 Impact reports, came from a subset of SAC data: all organizations with full year data for 2019 AND 2020. The rest of the report reflects all organizations that had full year data for 2020 only.
COVID-19 Impact – Outcomes Impact

- Adoptions experienced the largest absolute decline YOY in 2020 outcomes at (340,516) or (17%).

- Euthanasia saw the largest percentage decline at (49%).

- Total Outcomes declined by 21% from 3.70M in 2019 to 2.92M in 2020.
Summary

The 2020 Shelter Animals Count dataset highlights the importance and significance of continuing to grow The National Database of animal sheltering statistics. The current dataset has both an organization type and geographic bias which is evidenced from the distribution of size and number of organizations.

A key point to make about the dataset and its use is that it has limitations in analysis as it is not comprehensive of all animal sheltering organizations. Its primary value comes from seeing the macro and geographic trends in things like juvenile intake ratio and transfer volumes.

There are important trends that can be seen throughout the country ranging from species differences to geographic differences. As the database continues to grow, we anticipate be able to do much more detailed analysis and assessments of key community trends across the country.
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Appendix

SHELTER ANIMALS COUNT
https://www.shelteranimalscount.org

BASIC DATA MATRIX
https://www.shelteranimalscount.org/data/basic-data-matrix

EXPLORE THE DATA
https://www.shelteranimalscount.org/data/explore-the-data

REQUEST THE DATA
https://www.shelteranimalscount.org/data/request-the-data

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS
https://www.shelteranimalscount.org/who-we-are/about

CONTACT US
info@shelteranimalscount.org or
Stephanie Filer, Executive Director, stephanie@shelteranimalscount.org