DogsBite.org
Some dogs don't let go

Restricted breed legislation FAQ

DogsBite.org | https://www.dogsbite.org/legislating-dangerous-dogs-restricted-breed-faq.php

Q: What is a restricted breed law?

A restricted breed law is a type of dangerous dog law. It is defined as any ordinance or policy that restricts one or more dangerous dog breeds to protect public safety. Proponents of these laws seek to limit public exposure to well-documented high-risk dog breeds by regulating the ownership of them. The objective of legislation that restricts dangerous dog breeds, which primarily involves pit bulls and mastiff fighting breed derivatives, is to prevent severe and fatal dog attacks before they occur.

Dangerous dog laws that do not restrict breeds with well identified risks, only react *after* a damaging or deadly attack; they do not prevent the *first* attack. In parts of the U.S. and 84 countries worldwide, jurisdictions restrict a small group of breeds that have a genetic propensity to attack and inflict severe injuries so that first attacks by these breeds can be averted. First attacks by pit bulls, for instance, almost always result in severe injury. In some cases, the first attack by a pit bull or rottweiler is fatal.

Download: Report: Countries Worldwide that Restrict Dangerous Dog Breeds (2025)

Q: Which dog breeds are most often included?

Restricted breed laws in the U.S. chiefly involve pit bulls, the premier fighting breed. This class of dogs comprises three bull breeds: American pit bull terrier, American Staffordshire terrier and Staffordshire bull terrier. The American bulldog can be included within this class, as they share a common gene pool and are close cousins.[1] The larger variants of the American bully can also be included, as the breed standard of the American bully defines it as a "natural extension of the American pit bull terrier."[2]

> "The American bully began in the late 1980s and early 1990s. At least one line started from champion 'game dogs,' bred to endure repeated severe maiming and still continue to fight to the deadly end. To be a champion they must have killed at least one other dog in brutal combat. To further increase their size and strength, these game dogs were then bred with each other and with other pit bulls."[3] *- Lawrence Newport, Skeptic, 2024*

Less commonly, ordinances that restrict dog breeds include rottweilers, the second most lethal dog breed in America. Some cities also incorporate additional fighting and bull-baiting breeds, such as the dogo Argentino, presa canario, cane corso and other pit bull-mastiff derivatives. Yet, these instances are uncommon. The focal point of restricted breed laws in the United States has always been pit bulls because this class of dogs is the most common and negatively impacts communities the most.

Wolf-dog hybrids fall into a special class due to their mixture of being part undomesticated. The regulation of wolf-dog hybrids often occurs on a state-level for this reason. States like Alaska, Michigan, Massachusetts and Maryland prohibit their ownership.[4] When state law is silent on this issue, some cities do include wolf-dog hybrids in their restricted breed ordinances. Notably, most major military divisions prohibit pit bulls, rottweilers and wolf-dog hybrids in privatized housing.

Visual breakdown

To show how these ordinances are applied across several hundred different dog breeds,[5] we analyzed our 2021 estimated U.S. jurisdictions with breed restriction laws.[6] Of the 1200 cities that regulate specific dog breeds, 96% target pit bulls. The second most regulated breed, rottweilers, were named in 13% of these ordinances. Followed closely by wolf-dog hybrids, named in 11%. Presa canarios, cane corsos and other mastiff fighting breed derivatives were designated in 4% or fewer of these laws.

Analysis of 1120 Cities with Breed Restrictions

Dog Breed	Named in Ordinances	% of All Ordinances
Pit bull	1148	96%
Rottweiler	153	13%
Wolf-dog hybrid	133	11%
Doberman pinscher	64	5%
Presa canario	48	4%
Chow chow	43	4%
American bulldog	28	2%
Cane corso	25	2%
Mastiff variations	24	2%
Dogo argentino	23	2%

*Breeds named in 1% or fewer ordinances were excluded from our analysis.

The central breeds are depicted here: 2023 Fatal Dog Attack Breed Identification Images

Q: Do restricted breed laws work?

Strongly, moderately and even *poorly* enforced restricted breed laws reduce damaging attacks by these breeds. In our ongoing report about cities with successful breed-specific laws, we document these results in North America. The most dramatic results are often seen in jurisdictions that prohibit pit bull ownership because a ban ordinance reduces the future breeding and importation of new pit bulls into a community. There have been excellent results with other types of ordinances as well.

> "Laws can have a beneficial effect, even when there is little enforcement, and some people flout the law."[7] *- David Hemenway, University of California Press, 2009*

After Aurora, Colorado adopted a pit bull ban ordinance in 2005, attacks by pit bulls decreased 73% between 2005 to 2014.[8] After Pawtucket, Rhode Island adopted a pit bull ban in 2004, the city released 13 years of bite data showing that in the 4 years leading up to the prohibition, there were 52 pit bull attacks on people. In the 10 years after the ban, there were only 13. After the city was forced to mute its longstanding ban ordinance in late 2013, pit bull bites increased by over a ten-fold in just 5 years.[9]

The dramatic reduction in pit bull attacks on people and pets are not the only benefits. Over the same period in Aurora, pit bull euthanasia dropped 93%. In Pawtucket, the Rhode Island Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RISPCA) had "regularly" convened vicious dog hearings for pit bulls prior to the ban ordinance. During the ban years, the RISPCA never saw another one from Pawtucket.[10] Other jurisdictions report a substantial reduction in vicious dog designation hearings as well.

After Springfield, Missouri adopted a pit bull ordinance in 2006, impoundments of pit bulls were quickly cut in half, freeing up shelter space. In the year before the ordinance, 502 pit bulls were impounded, by 2007 only 252 and by 2017 only 140.[11] When a breed restriction is combined with an anti-chaining element, as was done in Little Rock's pit bull ordinance, great outcomes also resulted: "The commonality of seeing a pit bull chained in its owner's yard disappeared," the city said.[12]

Peer-reviewed abstracts and studies

In 2017, the first peer-reviewed report evaluating restricted breed laws in the United States showed that from 2001 to 2016, 5.7% of bites in Denver -- the largest jurisdiction in the country that prohibited pit bulls -- were attributed to pit bull-type dogs compared to 54.4%

in the remainder of the country.[13] Peer-reviewed studies from parts of two different countries, Canada and Spain, show that regulations restricting dangerous dog breeds resulted in a significant decrease of dog bite injury hospitalizations.

- A Review of Dog Bites in the United States from 1958 to 2016: Systematic Review of the Peer-Reviewed Literature, by Chad Bailey, MD, Katharine Hinchcliff, MD, and Lee Pu, MD, PhD, FACS, *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery - Global Open*, 2017 Abstract Supplement, Presentations at the American Society of Plastic Surgeons' Annual Meeting: Plastic Surgery The Meeting 2017, 2017 Sep; 5(9 Suppl): 172-173.
- Effectiveness of Breed-Specific Legislation in Decreasing the Incidence of Dog-Bite Injury Hospitalisations in People in the Canadian Province of Manitoba, by Malathi Raghavan, Patricia J Martens, Dan Chateau, and Charles Burchill, *Injury Prevention*, Published Online First, June 30, 2012.
- Decline in Hospitalisations Due to Dog Bite Injuries in Catalonia, 1997–2008. An Effect of Government Regulation?, by Villalbí JR, Cleries M, Bouis S, Peracho V, Duran J and Casas C, *Injury Prevention*, 2010 Dec;16(6):408-10.

Q: Are these laws constitutional?

Well-written laws that restrict dangerous dog breeds have a 100% success rate in appellate courts when faced with constitutional challenges. At least eight state supreme courts have upheld these laws as constitutional, including courts in Arkansas, Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Ohio, Utah, Washington and West Virginia, and seven state appeals courts. A dozen federal courts have also weighed in favorably on the constitutionality of these laws, as recently as 2022 by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Eighth Circuit upheld the constitutionality of the Council Bluffs pit bull ban after the dog owners argued it was "unconstitutionally vague and violated their right to substantive due process, equal protection, and procedural due process." The Eighth Circuit also affirmed the district court's findings regarding rational basis, which stated: "the pit bull ordinance had the required rational relationship to the health, safety, and public welfare interests of the city to survive rational basis review."

> The City had a conceivable basis to believe banning pit bulls would promote the health and safety of Council Bluff citizens. After reports that a disproportionate number of dog bites were attributed to pit bulls, the City exercised its police power to regulate the ownership of dogs ... The City had to decide where to draw the line on which breeds to ban. While the resulting ordinance may be an imperfect fit, this court cannot second guess or judge the fairness of legislative choices on rational basis review ... The equal protection analysis "is not a license for courts to judge the wisdom, fairness,

> or logic of legislative choices." ... "[T]he Equal Protection Clause does not require that a State must choose between attacking every aspect of a problem or not attacking the problem at all." ... "A rational basis that survives equal protection scrutiny also satisfies substantive due process analysis." ... Because the dog owners failed to negate every conceivable basis for the Ordinance's rationality, the Ordinance satisfies rational basis review and substantive due process analysis.[14] *- Danker v. City of Council Bluffs, Iowa, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, 2022*

United States Supreme Court agrees

In 2008, nearly two decades ago, the United States Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal of the Supreme Court of Ohio's decision in *City of Toledo v. Tellings*, (2007-Ohio). Pit bull owners had argued the ordinance was unconstitutional on multiple grounds, all of which the Supreme Court of Ohio rejected. By denying the appeal, the United States Supreme Court declared Toledo's ordinance, which restricted "dogs commonly known as pit bulls," constitutional, and the case cannot be appealed further.

Also see: High Courts Rule a Dog Owner of 'Ordinary Intelligence' Can Identify a Pit Bull

Q: Are there different types of breed restrictions?

Breed ban

Legislation that restricts dangerous dog breeds falls into several categories. The most publicized is a "breed ban," which prohibits the ownership and reproduction of a specific dog breed, chiefly pit bulls. Well-written pit bull ban ordinances always allow existing pit bulls to remain with their owners. The goal of a pit bull ban is to eliminate "future" breeding and dramatically reduce the number of pit bulls within a community. This is why existing pit bulls must be sterilized once the ordinance is enacted.

Over 500 cities across the country,[15] from medium-sized to small, have enacted ordinances prohibiting pit bulls. A handful of these cities include: Council Bluffs, Iowa; Williston, North Dakota; Fort Thomas, Kentucky; Leawood, Kansas; North Little Rock, Arkansas; Pagedale, Missouri; Sparta, Tennessee; and Fall River, Wisconsin. Entire counties have as well, primarily in the Midwest region. To learn more about well-written pit bull ban ordinances that protect public safety, visit our Model & Noted Laws page.

Prima facie legal designations

Another type of restricted breed law is an ordinance that prima facia designates a breed "potentially dangerous" or "dangerous," which triggers various requirements for the dog's owner to prevent a first attack from occurring. Both definitions vary by state, but the former

usually has fewer requirements. Shared provisions can include: higher registration fees, microchipping for identification purposes, mandatory spaying and neutering, muzzling when off-property and fencing requirements.

When a dog breed is prima facia designated "dangerous" or "vicious," which is a higher designation than "potentially dangerous," additional requirements apply. These often include: liability insurance ranging from $100,000 to the recommended $300,000, secure confinement in a locking pen that prevents the canine from escaping and from a child entering, requiring a secure top, sides and flooring, and displaying visible "Beware of Dangerous Dog" warning signs on the premises.

Mandatory spaying & neutering

The most modern type of restricted breed ordinance is a mandatory pit bull spaying and neutering ordinance. Nearly all open-admission shelters across the U.S. are plagued with a similar reality: pit bulls occupy 45% or more of animal shelter space,[16] pit bulls have the highest euthanasia rates[17] and there are a high number of pit bull biting incidents. San Francisco enacted the first mandatory pit bull sterilization law in 2005. Results in 2013 continued to show a strong reduction in all three areas.[18]

Many California cities and counties have followed in the footsteps of San Francisco. California is a mixed-preemption state and only allows jurisdictions to regulate specific dog breeds via spaying and neutering status. Prior to San Francisco's ordinance, a statewide preemption law prohibited local governments from enacting any type of restricted breed law. State-level legislation was passed in 2005 that partially repealed this preemption law, allowing San Francisco to adopt its ordinance.[19]

More examples: Model & Noted Laws and Mandatory Spaying & Neutering Laws

Q: How does a city enforce one of these laws?

The model for most cities is "enforce as you go." Authorities act when they become aware of an infraction or when a complaint is received. For example, after San Francisco adopted a mandatory pit bull sterilization ordinance, officers issued a "Fix It" ticket if they encountered an owner keeping an unaltered pit bull. The owner then had two-weeks to show proof of the surgery or face a $500 fine.[20] This model allows officers to check for ordinance violations in the course of their everyday duties.

Routine duties for animal control officers may include: patrolling assigned areas to enforce the local animal control ordinance; responding to a dangerous dog complaint, carrying out an animal bite investigation or an animal cruelty investigation and assisting police if a hazardous animal is on the scene. Throughout these everyday duties, officers

issue warnings and citations to owners found in violation of the local animal control regulations whether the ordinance restricts certain breeds or not.

Q: Is it expensive to enforce a breed restriction?

This depends upon the chosen method of enforcement and size of the jurisdiction. Most jurisdictions operate on the basis of "enforce as you go." For instance, when Council Bluffs, Iowa (population >60,000) enacted a restricted breed law prohibiting pit bulls in 2004, the animal control department embraced this method. As a result, the department did not see a negative effect on its budget. The duties of enforcing the pit bull ordinance were woven into the course of everyday officer duties.[21]

Larger cities that hire added personnel for enforcement can increase fines for those who violate the restricted breed ordinance to offset costs. In 1996, Prince George's County, Maryland, enacted a pit bull ban with costly fines. Any violation of the ordinance resulted in a fine of up to $1,000, a significant amount. If a legal (grand-fathered in) or illegal pit bull caused severe injury or death of a person or domestic animal unprovoked, the pit bull was destroyed, and the owner also faced a $1,000 fine.[22]

Sham 'fiscal impact' calculator

In 2012, when Miami-Dade County officials voted to place the pit bull ban initiative on the primary ballot, pit bull advocate Dalia Caines testified to committee members that, "taxpayers paid $3 million annually to enforce the ban on pit bulls." Caines' spurious figures came from the bogus "Fiscal Impact Calculator,"[23] commissioned by Utah-based fighting dog advocates, Best Friends Animal Society, and designed by consultant John Dunham, who formerly produced "research" for Big Tobacco.[24]

When commissioners asked the director of Animal Services to verify if the fiscal impact to the county of the pit bull ban was $3 million, director Alex Munoz stated that $3 million was more than the department's entire budget for enforcement and that pit bulls accounted for 2% of the enforcement expenses. The sham "fiscal impact" calculator was funded by the National Canine Research Council,[25] a subsidiary of Animal Farm Foundation. Both are pro-pit bull companies owned by Jane Berkey.[26]

> [Ms. Caines] noted taxpayers paid $3 million annually to enforce the ban on pit bulls ... Commissioner Bovo asked the Animal Services Department Director to verify whether the fiscal impact to the County of the pit bull ban was $3 million. Mr. Alex Munoz, Director, Animal Services, pointed out that $3 million was more than the department's entire budget for enforcement, and that pit bulls accounted for two percent of the enforcement expenses.[27] *- Miami-Dade Legislative Item (120173), 2012*

To break this down more concretely, we examined the 2011-2012 Miami-Dade County Animal Services budget on the county's website.[28] The total budget for the department was $9.36 million. The total budget for Code Enforcement was $2.3 million. Director Munoz stated that pit bulls accounted for 2% of total enforcement costs, which equates to $46,140. The "fiscal impact" calculator, which claimed the ban cost taxpayers $3 million, is an exaggeration by almost two orders of magnitude.

> "We're an economic consulting firm that supports lobbyists," the company said in its very first Tweet, in late 2009. "Want a legislator to listen? Tell them how much its gonna cost..."[29] *- John Dunham & Associates Tweet, 2009*

Learn more about the Five Levels of the Pit Bull Lobby and the overlapping relationships.

Q: When did this type of legislation first begin?

In modern times, legislation that restricted dangerous dog breeds was unveiled in the early 1980s in direct response to the savagery of pit bull attacks. Communities were horrified by the catastrophic and fatal injuries inflicted by these dogs. As stated in the Pit Bull Myths section, the population of pit bulls first erupted in the mid 1970s, when pit bulls began leaking into the general population from the illegal world of dogfighting. By 1987, restricting or banning pit bulls had become a national conversation.

At the turn of the 20th century, when dogfighting was still legal but largely frowned upon, cities across the country began calling for and enacting "bulldog" ordinances, singling out this fighting breed. Up until the mid 1900s, pit bulls were called "bulldogs" or "bull terriers." Some of these cities included: Sacramento, CA (1896), Richmond, VA (1904), Ogden, UT (1911), Washington DC (1911) and Maysville, KY (1912).[30] Attacks by pit bulls at that time, over 100 years ago, were just as violent as they are today.

One of the earliest fatal pit bull attacks that our nonprofit has on record -- through researching the Library of Congress and historical newspaper archives -- occurred in the city of Baltimore in 1844. John A. Dubernard, a respected aging citizen, was so badly bitten by a pit bull while visiting the dog owner's home that he died. An article published by the *Baltimore Sun* just after his death describes how Baltimore society felt about this dog breed at that time. The article is simply titled, "Dead."

We regret to state that the apprehensions express by the physicians on Wednesday evening, have proved true, and Mr. John A. Dubernard, who was so badly bitten by the dog of Mr. Roszell, on Saturday last, now lies dead ... His death is a melancholy comment upon the impolicy, we might also say the criminality of keeping dogs, so ferocious in the character as this one was, in the yards of private dwellings. The bull terrier, and this dog was one of that species, is perhaps the very worst description of dog with which we are beset in our

community. They are always fierce, and it is a rare circumstance that even their masters have control over them -- when they once take hold, death has been frequently found necessary to make them loosen their grasp.[31] *- Baltimore Sun, 1844*

Learn more about early restricted breed laws, social attitudes and vicious attacks by pit bulls in testimony by DogsBite.org for the Maryland Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee. Provided in the document is an 1897 woodcut illustration published in *The San Francisco Call* of a policeman "strangling a savage bulldog into releasing his hold" of a child.[32]

Q: What is a state preemption law in this context?

A state preemption law prohibits local governments from regulating a specific dog breed. In 2015, our nonprofit posted a detailed explanation of state preemption laws and their history. Wave I of these laws arose in the late 1980s, just after cities began adopting ordinances restricting pit bulls and ended in 1992. Wave II began in 2012, chiefly driven by Utah-based fighting dog advocates, Best Friends Animal Society, and dog breeder interests, and continues today. Currently, 22 states have passed one.[33]

Jurisdictions in Colorado can fully supersede a preemption law under home rule authority. But home rule authority varies among states, as do preemption laws. Preemption laws primarily center upon prohibiting local governments from declaring a specific dog breed "dangerous" or "vicious." California is a mixed-preemption state. It allows local governments to regulate specific dog breeds via spaying and neutering status, but prohibits specific dog breeds from any prima facie legal designation.

Big industry interests are typically the force behind state preemption laws. These laws were historically pursued by the tobacco industry to impede local tobacco laws.[34] This state-level strategy by Big Tobacco was so successful that today a range of powerful industry groups pursue similar "coercive methods" to substitute state priorities for local policymaking. Grassroots public health movements often suffer the most, as these state laws extinguish the motivation to organize and act locally.[35]

Please see: State Preemption Map | Deaths After Preemption | Fighting Preemption Laws

Q: Why not just enforce the laws we already have?

Most cities have laws that take effect *after* a person has been bitten or attacked, in some instances, only after a *second person* has been bitten or attacked. In these jurisdictions, a pit bull can maul two separate victims, leaving each with severe injuries before

any substantial penalties are triggered. Such antiquated state and local laws were designed to address "common" dog bites that result in minor injuries, not a pit bull "mauling event" that often results in life-altering damage and even death.[36]

Most current state and local dangerous dog laws insufficiently penalize a dog owner after a damaging or deadly mauling, or fail to penalize the owner at all. Cases abound where the dog owner is given a minor infraction for failure to leash or vaccinate his dog after a victim is airlifted to a Level I trauma center or killed. The phrase, "just enforce the laws we already have" is deceitful given how paltry many existing laws are, not to mention how few states have a meaningful felony dog attack statute.

> "What we found is that at the federal level and at the state level there was no true culpability as to the animal owner," State Representative Bobby Payne (R-Palatka) said after the mauling death of USPS letter carrier Pam Rock.[37] *- Florida Rep. Bobby Payne, Action News Jax, 2023*

> "A final gut-punch to our family: The dog owner walked away with no charges whatsoever. No one was held accountable," Tom Rock said after his sister Pam was killed by five pit bulls.[38] *- Tom Rock, Newsweek, 2023*

The solution is not to enforce the inadequate laws we already have, often further hindered by existing legal systems that offer insufficient routes to civil and criminal recourse for victims. The solution is to create preventative laws that greatly reduce the risk of dangerous dog breeds, primarily pit bulls, from ever inflicting a first attack. This radically reduces grave injuries and the need for mauling victims to endure both deficient legal processes. These are the two primary goals of restricted breed laws.

Legislation that restricts high-risk dog breeds recognizes the cost and severity of victims' injuries and the difficulties of receiving compensation after a violent attack. Many owners of dangerous breeds have insufficient insurance coverage or none at all. Proactive restricted breed laws require owners of these breeds to carry liability insurance in the baseline amount of $100,000 or the recommended amount of $300,000. So, if an attack does occur, the victim at least has a clear path to recourse.

See: Ohio's Weak Dangerous Dog Laws: 4-Part Investigation by Ohio News Organizations

Q: I own a German shepherd; will my breed be next?

Pit bull owners, kennel clubs, humane and veterinarian groups often use scare tactics in their fight against laws that restrict dangerous dog breeds, of which 96% involve pit bulls, distantly followed by the second top-killing breed, rottweilers, at 13%.[39] They claim if pit bulls are banned, "your breed will be next." Former Lucas County, Ohio Dog Warden Tom Skeldon

was the leading authority of pit bull regulations during his tenure (1987-2009). In a 2005 article, he highlights this age old scare tactic:

> "Some humane groups have been manipulated by these pit bull factions to where they fight breed-specific legislation using scare tactics like 'your breed will be next.' And for 13 years, their breed hasn't been next."[40] *—Tom Skeldon, Toledo Blade, 2005*

Communities that enact restricted breed laws usually do because a single class of dogs -- pit bulls -- constitutes a small percent of the registered dog population, but inflicts a disproportionate number of bites. This is compounded by the fact that many pit bull bites result in permanent disfigurement. The rational basis for regulating pit bulls, as opposed to virtually all other breeds, is that selective breeding for illegal dogfighting produced a dog breed with a bite style and attack traits unlike any other.

About Us

DogsBite.org is a national dog bite victims' group dedicated to reducing serious dog attacks. Through our work, we hope to protect both people and pets from future attacks. Our website, www.dogsbite.org, was launched in October 2007 and contains a wide collection of data to help policymakers and citizens learn about dangerous dogs. Our research focuses on pit bull type dogs. Due to selective breeding practices that emphasize aggression and tenacity, this class of dogs negatively impacts communities the most. Our website hosts important dog bite studies, U.S. dog bite fatalities and other key bibliographies. In the Legislating Dogs portion of our site, we offer examples of model laws that restrict dangerous dog breeds and documentation of their constitutionality. The Victim Realities section provides a glance into the unforgettable stories victims leave behind and much more. DogsBite.org operates out of Austin, Texas.

DogsBite.org
P.O. Box 12443
Austin, TX 78711

www.dogsbite.org
info@dogsbite.org

End notes:

[1] American Bulldog, molosserdogs.com, Accessed: January 31, 2010. Also there is a 2005 Johnson-Scott declaration that talks about the former name of the American bulldog, the American pit bulldog. Johnson states in no uncertain terms that the pit bull terrier and his "preserved" American bulldog Johnson-type variance is nothing more than the latter being a larger dog -- both dogs share the "exact" same heritage of bull-baiting and dogfighting. Johnson is simply one of many who want to take credit for "preserving" the "original" bull-baiting and fighting bulldog. Johnson even goes as far as saying in an online-posted interview (1997) that the American pit bull terrier gained all of its "gameness" from the "original" bulldog that he later "preserved." American dogfighters would highly disagree, but also rarely make any distinction and simply call their dogs "100% bulldogs."

[2] American Bully Breed Standard, United Kennel Club, accessed: March 17, 2025 (ukcdogs.com)

[3] When Our Best Friend Becomes Our Worst Enemy: The Story of American Bully XL Attacks and the Campaign That Banned the Breed in Britain, by Lawrence Newport, *Skeptic*, December 20, 2024 (skeptic.com).

[4] Hybridlaw.com, Accessed: October 13, 2018.

[5] How Many Breeds of Dogs Are There in the World?, by Stanley Coren, *Psychology Today*, May 23, 2013 (psychologytoday.com).

[6] At the time of our analyses, the count was 1200. Previous updates to this document include the dates: 10/12/2011 (originally compiled), 12/28/2012 (630 jurisdictions), 12/03/2014 (860 jurisdictions), 01/09/2016 (937 jurisdictions), 12/23/2016 (1052 jurisdictions), 12/31/2017 (1098 jurisdictions), 12/20/2018 (1138 jurisdictions), 12/20/2019 (1160 jurisdictions) and 02/01/2021 (1200 jurisdictions).

[7] While We Were Sleeping, Success Stories in Injury and Violence Prevention, by David Hemenway, University of California Press, 2009, Pg. 10.

[8] "City lawmakers uphold Aurora's ban on pit bulls," *The Sentinel*, March 3, 2014 (sentinelcolorado.com)

[9] Pit bull attacks on the rise since ban overturned, by Ethan Shorey, *The Valley Breeze*, October 15, 2019 (valleybreeze.com).

[10] Local ACOs oppose removal of ban on pit bulls, by Russ Olivo, *The Call*, June 27, 2013 (woonsocketcall.com) (Archived by WebCite at https://www.webcitation.org/6ayl7Pr0o).

[11] Pit Bull Statistics, Springfield-Greene County Health Department, July 2018 (insight.livestories.com) (Archived by DogsBite.org)

[12] Indianapolis ordinance puts restrictions on pit bull breeds, by Mary Milz, WTHR 13, April 7, 2009 (wthr.com) (Archived by the Wayback Machine)

[13] A Review of Dog Bites in the United States from 1958 to 2016: Systematic Review of the Peer-Reviewed Literature, by Bailey C, Hinchcliff K, Pu L, *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery - Global Open,* 2017 Abstract Supplement, Presentations at the American Society of Plastic Surgeons' Annual Meeting: Plastic Surgery The Meeting 2017, 2017 Sep; 5(9 Suppl): 172-173.

[14] *Rachel Danker v. City of Council Bluffs, Iowa*, United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, No. 21-3794, November 2022

[15] Estimated U.S. Cities, Counties, States and Military Facilities with Breed-Specific Pit Bull Laws, compiled by DogsBite.org annually, last updated February 1, 2021.

[16] Future of animal welfare intertwined with veterinary profession, by Malinda Larkin, American Veterinary Medical Association, August 29, 2018 (avma.org)

[17] Rising from the Pit, Dr. Emily Weiss, ASPCA Professional, May 19, 2017 (aspcapro.com) (Archived by the Wayback Machine)

[18] Often no warning signs in pit bull attacks, by Henry K. Lee, *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 19, 2013 (sfgate.com) (Archived by WebCite at https://www.webcitation.org/6Hm1oNyhj)

[19] Senate Bill 861, sponsored by then Senator Jackie Speier, was signed by the governor on October 7, 2005 (leginfo.ca.gov)

[20] S.F. Sterilization Law Successful in Reducing Pit Bull Population, by Marisa Lagos, *San Francisco Chronicle*, August 28, 2007 (sfgate.com) (Archived by WebCite at https://www.webcitation.org/6aylqzunN)

[21] Information supplied by Council Bluffs Animal Control Services (March 2008).

[22] Pit Bulls, Ordinance No. CB-106-1996, 1996 Legislative Session, County Council Of Prince George's County, Maryland, October 29, 1996 (princegeorgescountymd.legistar.com)

[23] The calculator continues to be operational on an unsecure website (http://bestfriends.guerrillaeconomics.net)

[24] John Dunham served as the manager of Fiscal Issues and Chief Domestic Economist at Philip Morris from 1995 to 2000, according to SourceWatch.org. The JDA website explains Dunham's role as, "producing research and information on key issues facing all of the company's divisions." There are over a thousand documents referencing Dunham in the publicly available archive of tobacco industry materials. Dunham continued authoring studies funded by Philip Morris after starting JDA in 2002, including, The Economic Incidence of Smoking Restrictions, by Dunham J and Marlow M, *Applied Economics*, 35:1935-1942, December 2003 and The Private Market for Accommodation: Determinants of Smoking Policies in Restaurants and Bars, by Dunham J and Marlow M, *Eastern Economic Journal,* Volume 30, Issue 1, Summer July 1, 2004, pages 377-391.

[25] The High Costs of Breed Discriminatory Legislation, by Sandy Miller, Best Friends Animal Society, May 20, 2009 (web.archive.org) | Related diagram showing the pit bull propaganda machine

[26] Animal Farm Foundation, Wikipedia, Accessed: May 21, 2024 (wikipedia.org); Animal Farm Foundation's subsidiary, National Canine Research Council, Wikipedia, Accessed: May 21, 2024 (wikipedia.org)

[27] Miami-Dade Legislative Item, File Number 120173. Straw Ballot Pit Bull Dogs, Committee Meeting 2/14/2012 (miamidade.gov) (Archived by WebCite at https://www.webcitation.org/6aymZjGBD)

[28] FY 2011-12 Adopted Budget and Multi-Year Capital Plan, by Miami-Dade County Animal Services Department, Accessed: September 1, 2015: http://www.miamidade.gov/budget/FY2011-12/adopted/volume2/animal-services.pdf (Archived by DogsBite.org)

[29] New to Twitter, John Dunham & Assoc, @GuerrillaEcon, November 10, 2009 (twitter.com)

[30] Originally collected by Fatalpitbullattacks.com in the Historic Breed-Specific Ordinance category.

A Savage Dog, *The Record-Union*, April 12, 1896, Library of Congress (chroniclingamerica.loc.gov)

Would Muzzle All Bull Dogs, *The Times Dispatch*, December 1, 1904, Library of Congress (chroniclingamerica.loc.gov)

Bulldogs Are Dangerous, *The Evening Standard*, August 4, 1911, Library of Congress (chroniclingamerica.loc.gov)

Banish Bulldogs Says Mr. Gordon, *The Washington Herald*, September 29, 1911, Library of Congress (chroniclingamerica.loc.gov)

City Council, *Daily Public Ledger*, August 6, 1912, Library of Congress (chroniclingamerica.loc.gov)

[31] "Dead," *The Globe and Commercial Advertiser*, November 18, 1844 (GenealogyBank.com) (Archived by DogsBite.org) and "Local Matters—Dead," *The Baltimore Sun*, November 15, 1844 (GenealogyBank.com).

[32] "Bitten and Torn by a Bulldog -- The Painful Experience of an Eight-Year Old Girl," *The San Francisco Call*, April 15, 1897 (Library of Congress)

[33] Current as of February, 2025.

[34] The Tobacco Industry on Why it Needs Preemption, by Americans for Nonsmoker's Rights, 2005. The group collected a series of statements from Big Tobacco during the 80s and 90s about this issue, one of the most famous is from Philip Morris, "While we're not married to any particular form of preemption language, we're dead serious about achieving preemption in all 50 states." - *Tina Walls, Philip Morris internal document, Bates No.: 2041183751/3790, 1994* (no-smoke.org)

[35] How States Preempt Local Laws, by Christopher B. Goodman, Megan E. Hatch, Bruce D. McDonald, III, National League of Cities, January 14, 2021 (nlc.org)

[36] A "mauling event" is defined as involving, "3 or more bites occurred over 2 or more distinct regional anatomic areas, typically the craniofacial region, back, torso, and extremities." | Dog-Bite Injuries to the Craniofacial Region: An Epidemiologic and Pattern-of-Injury Review at a Level 1 Trauma Center, by Khan K, Horswell B, Samanta D, *MS J Oral Maxillofac Surg*, March 2020 [2019 Nov 14, Epub].

[37] New Florida bill would create 'dangerous dog registry' and require liability insurance, by Jake Stofan, Action News Jax, December 18, 2023, accessed: February 6, 2025 (actionnewsjax.com)

[38] My Sister Was Mauled to Death by Five Pit Bulls in Florida, by Tome Rock, *Newsweek*, June 30, 2023, accessed: February 6, 2025 (newsweek.com)

[39] Estimated U.S. Cities, Counties, States and Military Facilities with Breed-Specific Pit Bull Laws, compiled by DogsBite.org annually, last updated February 1, 2021.

[40] Bulldog Approach to Warden's Job Makes Skeldon a Favorite Target, by Dale Emch, *The Blade*, February 21, 2005 (toledoblade.com) (Archived by WebCite at https://www.webcitation.org/6aynLoiup).