SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Table S1. Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of survey respondents, metropolitan Atlanta, United States, 2022 (n=1,006).

	Number	Percent
Gender		
Male	426	42.4
Female	574	57.1
Non-binary/third gender	4	0.4
Prefer not to say	2	0.2
Race		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	17	1.7
Asian	12	1.2
Black or African American	544	54.1
Hispanic	38	3.8
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	4	0.4
White	431	42.8
Other	13	1.3
Olivi	13	1.5
Age		
18 – 24 years	123	12.2
25 – 34 years	194	19.3
35 – 44 years	208	20.7
45 – 54 years	165	16.4
55 – 64 years	117	11.6
65 years and older	199	19.8
Education		
High school graduate (includes GED)	168	16.7
High school, no diploma	37	3.7
Some college, no degree	282	28.0
Associate degree	131	13.0
Bachelor's degree	257	25.6
Graduate or professional degree	131	13.0
Income		
Less than \$25,000	185	18.4
\$25,000 - \$49,999	286	28.4
\$50,000 - \$74,999	214	21.3
\$75,000 - \$99,999	141	14.0
\$100,000 or more	180	17.9
Household size		
Single owner/renter	121	12.0
2 members	300	29.8
3 members	235	23.4
J HICHIOOIS	233	43.4

4 members	149	14.8
5 members or more	201	20.0
	221	22.0
Children (≤18 years old) in household	231	23.0
Type of home		
House	686	68.2
Apartment / Condominium	244	24.3
Townhouse or semi-detached house	51	5.1
Trailer / Manufactured home	15	1.5
Other	10	1.0
	- 4	-1.
Yard	675	67.1
Lawn/sod	589	58.6
Shrubs/bushes	533	53.0
Trees	532	52.9
Flowering plants	417	41.5
Paved area/concrete	360	35.8
\leq 25% of yard	295	29.3
26 - 50% of yard	53	5.3
51 - 75% of yard	10	1.0
≥ 76% of yard	2	0.2
Landscaping around residence	256	25.5
Zanascaping around residence	200	20.0
Control over landscaping		
Control over landscaping Yes	594	59.0
	594 120	59.0 11.9
Yes		
Yes I have some say in landscaping	120	11.9
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood	120 217	11.9 21.6
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year	120 217 108	11.9 21.6
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years	120 217 108 200	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years	120 217 108 200 227	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years	120 217 108 200 227 140	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years	120 217 108 200 227	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years	120 217 108 200 227 140	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years County of residence ^a	120 217 108 200 227 140 331	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9 32.9
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years County of residence ^a Barrow	120 217 108 200 227 140 331	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9 32.9
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years County of residence ^a Barrow Bartow	120 217 108 200 227 140 331	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9 32.9
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years County of residence ^a Barrow Bartow Carroll	120 217 108 200 227 140 331	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9 32.9
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years County of residence ^a Barrow Bartow Carroll Cherokee	120 217 108 200 227 140 331	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9 32.9
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years County of residence ^a Barrow Bartow Carroll Cherokee Clayton	120 217 108 200 227 140 331 13 15 22 39 43	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9 32.9 1.3 1.5 2.2 3.9 4.3
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years County of residence ^a Barrow Bartow Carroll Cherokee Clayton Cobb	120 217 108 200 227 140 331 13 15 22 39 43 136	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9 32.9 1.3 1.5 2.2 3.9 4.3 13.5
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years County of residence ^a Barrow Bartow Carroll Cherokee Clayton Cobb Coweta	120 217 108 200 227 140 331 13 15 22 39 43 136 22	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9 32.9 1.3 1.5 2.2 3.9 4.3 13.5 2.2
Yes I have some say in landscaping No Length of residence in neighborhood Less than 1 year 1-2 years 3-5 years 6-10 years 11 or more years County of residence ^a Barrow Bartow Carroll Cherokee Clayton Cobb	120 217 108 200 227 140 331 13 15 22 39 43 136	11.9 21.6 10.7 19.9 22.6 13.9 32.9 1.3 1.5 2.2 3.9 4.3 13.5

Fayette 17	1.7
Forsyth 11	1.1
Fulton 229	22.8
Gwinnett 121	12.0
Henry 74	7.4
Newton 17	1.7
Paulding 21	2.1
Pickens 8	0.8
Rockdale 15	1.5
Spalding 7	0.7
Walton 18	1.8
Pets owned 562	55.9
Birds 26	2.6
Cats 228	22.7
Dogs 424	42.2
Fish 64	6.4
Herpetofauna (e.g., lizards, snakes, turtles) 18	1.8
Small mammals (e.g., ferrets, guinea pigs, hamsters, 12	1.2
hedgehogs, rabbits)	
Invertebrates 1	0.1

^a We focused on these 20 counties within metropolitan Atlanta because they are the focal area for the GADNR Urban Wildlife Program.

Table S2. Respondents' risk sensitivity to wildlife diseases. Respondents answered the question "How concerned are you that wildlife in your neighborhood may transmit diseases to (1) yourself, (2) members of your community, (3) your pets, and (4) members of your household."

	Median	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Concerned	Very	N
		concerned	concerned	concerned		concerned	
Yourself	Not at all	520 (51.7%)	165 (16.4%)	135 (13.4%)	97 (9.6%)	89 (8.8%)	1,006
	concerned						
Members of your	Slightly	453 (45%)	236 (23.5%)	169 (16.8%)	88 (8.7%)	60 (6.0%)	1,006
community	concerned						
Your pets	Slightly	203 (36.1%)	138 (24.6%)	110 (19.6%)	63 (11.2%)	48 (8.5%)	562
	concerned						
Members of your	Slightly	419 (47.3%)	178 (20.1%)	113 (12.8%)	103 (11.6%)	72 (8.1%)	885
household	concerned		·				

Table S3. Respondent' self-efficacy pertaining to managing interactions with wildlife. Respondents indicated whether they agreed or disagreed with four statements.

	Median	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	N
				nor agree			
I have the ability to keep myself safe from wildlife	Agree	20 (2%)	20 (2%)	116 (11.5%)	535 (53.2%)	315 (31.3%)	1,006
I have the ability to prevent wildlife entering my property	Neither disagree nor agree	114 (11.3%)	176 (17.5%)	248 (24.7%)	321 (31.9%)	147 (14.6%)	1,006
I have the ability to keep my pets safe from wildlife	Agree	8 (1.4%)	6 (1.1%)	46 (8.2%)	273 (48.6%)	229 (40.7%)	562
I have the ability to keep members of my household safe from wildlife	Agree	23 (2.6%)	20 (2.3%)	148 (16.7%)	435 (49.2%)	259 (29.3%)	885

Table S4. Respondent' trust in the Georgia Department of Natural Resources to manage wildlife and human-wildlife conflicts (n=1,006). Respondents indicated whether they agreed or disagreed with five statements.

	Median	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
They provide adequate information about preventing negative interactions with wildlife	Neither disagree nor agree	16 (1.6%)	41 (4.1%)	548 (54.5%)	297 (29.5%)	104 (10.3%)
They have the appropriate resources to manage wildlife	Agree	13 (1.3%)	30 (3.0%)	436 (43.3%)	386 (38.4%)	141 (14.0%)
They have the necessary expertise to manage negative interactions with wildlife	Agree	11 (1.1%)	22 (2.2%)	411 (40.9%)	398 (39.6%)	164 (16.3%)
They have responded to our requests for assistance on wildlife issues	Neither disagree nor agree	13 (1.3%)	30 (3.0%)	566 (56.3%)	286 (28.4%)	111 (11.0%)
They have been effective in protecting wildlife in Georgia	Neither disagree nor agree	11 (1.1%)	21 (2.1%)	520 (51.7%)	322 (32.0%)	132 (13.1%)

Table S5. Distribution of responses to the Wildlife Value Orientation Scale (n=1,006). These statements loaded onto three factors: mutualism; hunting beliefs; and utilitarian views of wildlife.

induarism, numming ochers, and dimear	Median	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Factor 1: Mutualism				_		
I feel a strong emotional bond with animals	Neither disagree nor agree	77 (7.7%)	152 (15.1%)	300 (29.8%)	334 (33.2%)	143 (14.2%)
Wildlife are like my family and I want to protect them	Neither disagree nor agree	86 (8.5%)	172 (17.1%)	402 (40.0%)	258 (25.6%)	88 (8.7%)
I value the sense of companionship I receive from animals	Agree	50 (5.0%)	100 (9.9%)	254 (25.2%)	395 (39.3%)	207 (20.6%)
We should strive for a world where humans and wildlife can live side by side without fear	Agree	69 (6.9%)	116 (11.5%)	305 (30.3%)	366 (36.4%)	150 (14.9%)
I care about animals as much as I do about other people	Agree	57 (5.7%)	155 (15.4%)	275 (27.3%)	364 (36.2%)	155 (15.4%)
Animals should have rights similar to the rights of humans	Neither disagree nor agree	92 (9.1%)	228 (22.7%)	302 (30.0%)	293 (29.1%)	91 (9.0%)
I view all living things as part of one big family	Agree	51 (5.1%)	159 (15.8%)	282 (28.0%)	381 (37.9%)	133 (13.2%)
Factor 2: Hunting beliefs						
Hunting is cruel and inhumane to animals	Neither disagree nor agree	100 (9.9%)	210 (20.9%)	309 (30.7%)	261 (25.9%)	126 (12.5%)
Hunting does not respect the lives of animals	Neither disagree nor agree	69 (6.9%)	202 (20.1%)	320 (31.8%)	288 (28.6%)	127 (12.6%)
People who want to hunt should be provided the opportunity to do so	Neither disagree nor agree	87 (8.6%)	136 (13.5%)	348 (34.6%)	333 (33.1%)	102 (10.1%)
We should strive for a world where there's an abundance of wildlife for hunting	Neither disagree nor agree	123 (12.2%)	232 (23.1%)	400 (39.8%)	189 (18.8%)	62 (6.2%)

Factor 3: Utilitarian views						
The needs of humans should take	Neither disagree	65 (6.5%)	165 (16.4%)	350 (34.8%)	315 (31.3%)	111 (11.0%)
priority over wildlife protection	nor agree					
Humans should manage wildlife so	Neither disagree	73 (7.3%)	207 (20.6%)	398 (39.6%)	254 (25.2%)	74 (7.4%)
that humans benefit	nor agree					
Wildlife are on earth primarily for	Disagree	194 (19.3%)	337 (33.5%)	307 (30.5%)	135 (13.4%)	33 (3.3%)
people to use		. ,	. ,	. ,	, ,	