



I. Introduction

Our goal is to ensure that our residents can enjoy a safe and humane community. Our residents deserve to be safe from ALL reckless dog owners, regardless of the breed owned. Punishing innocent dogs and discriminating against dog owners because of what their dog looks like does NOT make a safe community and is not good policy.

Effective policies put the responsibility on the pet owner. ALL owners, regardless of breed owned, need to be accountable for the actions of their dogs. Singling out only owners of a particular breed leaves an entire segment of the population unaccountable, and leads to unsafe communities.

Sharing physical characteristics or DNA actually have little to no bearing on behavioral similarities. Dr. Amy Marder, director of the Center for Shelter Dogs at the Animal Rescue League of Boston and one of the most renowned behaviorists in the country, reminds us that there is “so much behavioral variability within each breed, even more between breed mixes, that we cannot reliably predict a dog’s behavior or his suitability for a particular adopter based on breed. So we have to go from identifying dogs by breed to identifying dogs as individuals.”¹

Nearly 20 states² have already outlawed breed discriminatory policies, realizing that these policies are incredibly expensive to enforce and do not yield results. Even the Platte Institute for Economic Research has spoken against breed discriminatory ordinances.

The American Bar Association, the National Animal Control Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, and the American Veterinary Society of Animal Behavior, among other national professional groups, do NOT support breed discriminatory ordinances, as they know these ordinances do not keep communities safe, do not tackle the problem of dangerous dogs, and are incredibly costly and difficult to enforce. These professional organizations support breed-neutral laws targeting reckless owners and the behavior of each individual dog, regardless of breed. This is what our residents need in order to build and maintain a safe community.

The American Bar Association Tort Trial and Insurance Practice Section’s Resolution 100 urges “all state, territorial and local legislative bodies and governmental agencies to enact comprehensive breed neutral dangerous dog/reckless owner laws that ensure due process protections for owners, encourage responsible pet ownership and focus on behavior of both individual dog owners and dogs, and to repeal any breed discriminatory/specific provisions.”³

¹ Brewer, Ted. “Beyond Breed, New Research on the Visual Identification of Breeds Calls into Question Breed-Discriminatory Legislation.” Best Friends Magazine, March/April 2011

² Massachusetts, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, California (allows breed-specific spay/neuter laws), Nevada, Connecticut, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Utah. Several of these states may have municipalities with breed discriminatory policies either because they were grandfathered in or because of home rule exceptions.

³ American Bar Association, Tort Trial and Insurance Practice Section, Resolution 100, submitted by Randy J. Aliment, August 2012.



ATTACHMENT 1: PLATTE INSTITUTE



ATTACHMENT 2: ABA RESOLUTION 100



II. Identification of Pit Bull Terrier Like Dogs

Dr. Victoria Voith, professor of veterinary medicine at Western University, has been at the forefront of recognizing the problems with visual breed identification, even by professionals. Her studies have included almost 1,000 trainers, veterinarians, kennel workers, animal control staff and other dog experts who were asked to visually identify mixed-breed dogs. The studies showed about a 25% success rate, revealing that visual identification is often at odds with DNA results.⁴ When professionals are having such little success in visually identifying dog breeds, we cannot expect law enforcement officials in cities with breed discriminatory policies to be able to make these determinations. The same studies show that in almost 90% of the dogs, breeds that were not suggested by the participants were identified by DNA analysis.⁵ It is interesting to note that a very small number of genes affect the morphology of a dog, meaning that dogs who share very little DNA can actually look very similar.⁶

A subsequent study underwritten by Maddie's Fund further examined the identification and labeling of "pit bulls" in four Florida animal shelters. The researchers concluded that shelter staff assigned the "pit bull" label based on physical appearance to twice as many dogs as could be confirmed to have any trace of the pit bull type breeds in their DNA analyses. Also, one in five dogs that were actually genetically identified as pit bull type dogs were missed by shelter staff and labeled as other breeds. There was also a lack of consistency among shelter staff in breed assignments, which further suggests the unreliability of visual identifications.⁷

Most importantly, however, is that a connection between physical traits and behavior has not been made.^{8,9} Even if breed can be identified through DNA analysis, Janis Bradley, renowned dog training expert and author, argues that breed is not an accurate predictor of behavior, even among purebred dogs. There is yet to be credible evidence that any physical trait is linked to any behavioral characteristic and even a small proportion of a particular breed in a dog's ancestry can lead to a strong physical resemblance to that breed.¹⁰

⁴ Brewer, Ted. "Beyond Breed, New Research on the Visual Identification of Breeds Calls into Question Breed-Discriminatory Legislation." *Best Friends Magazine*, March/April 2011

⁵ Voith, V, Ingram, E, Mitsouras, K, et. al, "Comparison of Adoption Agency Identification and DNA Breed Identification of Dogs," *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, July 2009.

⁶ Boyko, AR, et. al. "A simple genetic architecture underlies morphological variation in dogs." *PLoS Biol.* 2010 Aug 10;8(8):e1000451. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1000451.

⁷ Olson, Kimberly, Julie Levy, and Bo Norby, "Pit Bull Identification in Animal Shelters," <http://www.maddiesfund.org/Documents/Resource%20Library/Incorrect%20Breed%20Identification%20Study%20Poster.pdf>

⁸ Bradley, Janis. "The Relevance of Breed in Selecting a Companion Dog," National Canine Research Council, 2011.

⁹ Veterinarians are becoming increasingly aware of the problems associated with trying to visually identify dog breeds. Statements similar to the following are increasingly being used: "Because new scientific evidence has called into question the accuracy of visual breed identification of dogs, our hospital has adopted a policy to not identify canine patients by predominant breed unless the dog is purebred, the predominant breed of the dog's parents is known, or the dog's lineage has been established through the use of DNA analysis." See Robert John Simpson, DVM; Kathryn Jo Simpson, DVM, MPH; Ledy VanKavage, JD, "Rethinking dog breed identification in veterinary practice," November 1, 2012, Vol. 241, No. 9, Pages 1163-1166.

¹⁰ Bradley, Janis. "The Relevance of Breed in Selecting a Companion Dog," *supra*.



ATTACHMENT 3: MIXED BREED POSTER



ATTACHMENT 4: DR. VOITH POSTER



III. Flawed Data Replaced by New Study that Reveals Actual Factors in Dog Bites

A data set published in 2000 by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) titled “Breeds of Dogs Involved in Fatal Human Attacks in the US Between 1979 and 1998” pointed out that pit bull type dogs caused 66 of the 238 human fatalities reported in that time period, though more than 25 breeds of dogs were involved in fatal attacks. Proponents of breed discrimination have referenced this study since it was published, which has greatly frustrated the authors. For example, the CDC has stated that the data did not identify specific breeds that are more likely to bite or kill and should not be used as support for policies that assume such.¹¹ Similarly, in a letter accompanying the 2000 report, the AVMA states:

In contrast to what has been reported in the news media, the data contained within this report CANNOT be used to infer any breed-specific risk for dog bite fatalities (e.g., neither pit bull type dogs nor Rottweilers can be said to be more ‘dangerous’ than any other breed based on the contents of this report). To obtain such risk information it would be necessary to know the numbers of each breed currently residing in the United States. Such information is not available.¹²

Dr. Gail Golab of the AVMA was involved in the research for this report and has said, regarding breed discrimination: “the whole point of our summary was to explain why you can’t do that. But the media and the people who want to support their case just don’t look at that.”¹³

The report itself highlights that dogs of any breed may become dangerous when trained to be aggressive and suggests targeting chronically irresponsible dog owners as an effective means of curtailing dog bites. “Several interacting factors affect a dog’s propensity to bite, including heredity, sex, early experience, socialization and training, health (medical and behavioral), reproductive status, quality of ownership and supervision, and victim behavior.”¹⁴ Effective dangerous dog laws take all of these factors into account while breed discriminatory laws take but one.

One problem with this report is that the researchers only had breed information for approximately 70% of the fatalities documented, and this breed information mostly came from newspaper articles, which over-represents and misidentifies pit bull type dogs. The study also used “pit bull type” without identifying any actual breed, a label that casts an extraordinarily wide net for dogs with certain physical characteristics. Of the cases where no breed was identified, Karen Delise of the National Canine Research Council later located 40 of these. Of those 40 cases, 37 involved dogs other than pit bull types, which confirms the researchers’ concerns regarding differential ascertainment of incidents because of breed bias. The data set

¹¹ Berkey, Jane. “Dog Breed Specific Legislation, The Cost to People, Pets and Veterinarians, and the Damage to the Human-Animal Bond.” Published in Proceedings of Annual AVMA Convention, July 11-14, 2009, Seattle, Washington.

¹² Sacks, J.J., Sinclair, L., Gilchrist, J., Golab, G., & Lockwood, R. (2000). Breeds of dogs involved in fatal human attacks in the United States between 1979 and 1998. JAVMA, 217(6), 836-840.

¹³ Berkey, *supra*.

¹⁴ Sacks, *supra* at 839.



shows a higher number of incidents involving pit bull type dogs because the media reported more of these incidents. When Delise looked into death certificates for cases that did not make it into the news, pit bull type dogs were involved in a much lower percentage than in the overall study.¹⁵ Because of this, the AVMA warns that “witnesses may be predisposed to assume that a vicious dog is of this type.”¹⁶ The unreliability of breed identification alone invalidates using this report in support of breed discriminatory policies, before even acknowledging the small sample evaluated and the limited time period examined, a period during which certain breeds were more popular.

This was the only study of its kind, until December 2013 when the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA) published the “Co-occurrence of potentially preventable factors in 256 dog bite–related fatalities in the United States (2000–2009).” The objective of the study was to “examine potentially preventable factors in human dog bite-related fatalities (DBRFs) on the basis of data from sources that were more complete, verifiable, and accurate than media reports used in previous studies.” Instead of relying on news accounts like in the previous study, the researchers used reports by homicide detectives and animal control agencies, as well as interviews with investigators.

The study found that the major factors in the fatalities studied include: the absence of an able-bodied person to intervene (87.1%), incidental or no familiar relationship of victims with dogs (85.2%), owner failure to neuter dogs (84.4%), compromised ability of victims to interact appropriately with dogs (77.4%), dogs kept isolated from regular positive human interactions versus family dogs (76.2%), owners’ prior mismanagement of dogs (37.5%), and owners’ history of abuse or neglect of dogs (21.1%). Four or more of these factors were present in over 80% of the dog bite related deaths. Considering that over 75% of dog bite related deaths were caused by resident dogs (a dog not kept as a family pet, but isolated from positive human interactions and usually kept for protection and/or chained outside), reducing this practice is a huge factor in preventing dog bites, as is neutering male dogs.

Most dog bite related fatalities had the above preventable factors in common, but nowhere was breed found to be a factor. Dog behavior experts have been recommending prevention techniques based on improved ownership practices, such as learning to read and understand dog behavior signals, teaching children how to safely interact with dogs, and providing dogs with proper socialization and veterinary care, for decades. We all want to live in safe communities, and focusing our animal control laws on the preventable factors identified is the road that will get us there.

The full citation for the 2013 report is:

Gary J. Patronek, Jeffrey J. Sacks, Karen M. Delise, Donald V. Cleary, and Amy R. Marder. *Co-occurrence of potentially preventable factors in 256 dog bite–related fatalities in the United States (2000–2009)*. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, December 15, 2013, Vol. 243, No. 12, Pages 1726-1736. (doi: 10.2460/javma.243.12.1726)

¹⁵ Berkey, *supra*.

¹⁶ AVMA Animal Welfare Division. “The Welfare Implications of the Role of Breed in Dog Bite Risk and Prevention.” 17 April 2012. https://www.avma.org/KB/Resources/Backgrounders/Documents/dog_bite_risk_and_prevention_bgnd.pdf



**ATTACHMENT 5: NCRC POTENTIALLY PREVENTABLE HUSBANDRY FACTORS
CO-OCCUR IN MOST DOG BITE-RELATED FATALITIES**



IV. National and International Evidence

There is no evidence that cities or counties that have enacted breed bans or restrictions have had a greater reduction in the number of reported bites than cities or counties without breed bans or restrictions.

In 2003, Prince George's County, Maryland convened a task force to evaluate the effectiveness of its breed discriminatory law, which has been in place since 1997. The task force found that the ban against pit bull type dogs has cost the county more than \$250,000 per year in expenses related to the rounding up and killing of these dogs (not counting other administrative expenses associated with the ban). The task force concluded that the ban was ineffective in curtailing bites and enhancing public safety and ultimately recommended its repeal.¹⁷

Ontario, Canada has had a ban on pit bull type dogs since 2005 and has also not seen any reduction in dog bites. The Ontario Veterinary Medical Association, in a letter to government officials dated May 28, 2012, stated:

Veterinarians, by their nature and training, take a science-based approach to any issue, including aggressive behavior in dogs. Based on an extensive review of available research on the subject, OVMA has concluded that BSL is not an effective method of reducing the number of dog bites in humans, and that it has resulted in significant negative consequences for both people and dogs in Ontario.

The letter goes on to describe how recent statistics show no decrease in dog bites after the ban and that other breeds are responsible for more bites overall than pit bull type dogs were prior to the ban. The letter then offers a solution:

There is a better way: Research clearly shows that a more effective approach to dealing with dangerous dogs includes improving bite prevention education and implementing non-breed-specific dangerous dog laws, enacted to place the primary responsibility for a dog's behavior on the owner, regardless of dog's breed.¹⁸

A 1996 study in the United Kingdom examining the pattern of injuries at an Emergency Department before and after the implementation of the 1991 Dangerous Dogs Act banning pit bull type dogs concluded that the Act had not had an impact on the rate of injuries caused by dog bites.¹⁹

In 2000, the government of Lower Saxony, Germany ruled certain breeds of dogs especially dangerous and placed restrictions on their ownership. The breeds included Bull

¹⁷ The task report may be found here: <http://www.understand-a-bull.com/BSL/Research/PGCMD/PGCMTOC1.htm>

¹⁸ Letter from Ontario Veterinary Medical Association to the Honorable Dalton McGuinty, Mr. Tim Hudak, and Ms. Andrea Horwath, dated May 28, 2012. Available at http://www.ovma.org/pdf/oeplnletter_bill16_may12.pdf

¹⁹ B. Klaassen, J.R. Buckley & A. Esmail, *Does the Dangerous Dog Act Protect Against Animal Attacks: A Prospective Study of Mammalian Bites in the Accident and Emergency Department*, 27(2) *Injury* 89-91 (1996).



Terriers, American Staffordshire Terriers, Pit Bull Terriers, and Staffordshire Bull Terriers, among others. Interesting to note is that the law did allow for an exception from the restrictions if the owner and dog passed a temperament test. Over 400 dogs of the targeted breeds were given temperament tests, along with 70 Golden Retrievers who were volunteered by their owners for comparison. Researchers found no significant difference between the Golden Retrievers and the dogs from the targeted breeds in showing inappropriate aggression. This study led to the repeal of the breed discriminatory law in Lower Saxony.²⁰

A report published in the Netherlands in 2010 at the behest of the government eventually led to the abolition of the country's breed discriminatory law. The researchers for this report concluded that the view that aggressive potential is linked to dog breed is of "serious concern," as experience, socialization, training, health, and victim behavior all play roles in a dog's potential for aggression.²¹

A study on the effectiveness of Spain's breed discriminatory law published in 2011 concluded that their pit bull and other breed bans had no effect on stopping dog attacks. The study found that breeds designated as "dangerous" under Spanish law were no more likely to behave aggressively than other breeds.²²

²⁰ S. Ott, et al. (2008). Is There a Difference? Comparison of Golden Retrievers and Dogs Affected by Breed-Specific Legislation Regarding Aggressive Behavior. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*. 3, 134-140.

²¹ Cornelissen, Jessica M.R. and Hans Hopster. Dog bites in The Netherlands: A study of victims, injuries, circumstances and aggressors to support evaluation of breed specific legislation. *The Veterinary Journal*, 186.3 (Dec. 2010): p292.

²² Martinez, A.G., Pernas, G.S., Casalta, J.D., Rey, M.L.S., Palomino, L.F.DIC, "Risk Factors Associated with Behavioral Problems in Dogs," *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical Applications and Research*, July 2011, Vol. 6, Issue 4: Pages 225-231.



V. Federal Government

The White House issued an official statement in August 2013 against breed discrimination:

“We don’t support breed-specific legislation — research shows that bans on certain types of dogs are largely ineffective and often a waste of public resources.”

This is not the first time that the Federal Government has taken a hard stand against breed discrimination. The US Department of Justice has refused to allow federal legislation to fall victim to local breed discriminatory policies. In regards to the Americans with Disabilities Act, the DOJ states:

“... if an individual uses a breed of dog that is perceived to be aggressive because of breed reputation, stereotype, or the history or experience the observer may have with other dogs, but the dog is under the control of the individual with a disability and does not exhibit aggressive behavior, the title II entity cannot exclude the individual or the animal from a State or local government program, service, or facility.”²³

The use of the words “reputation” and “stereotype” further support the truth that scientific support for breed discrimination is lacking. The DOJ takes an even bigger bite out of breed discrimination by affirming:

“The Department does not believe that it is either appropriate or consistent with the ADA to defer to local laws that prohibit certain breeds of dogs based on local concerns that these breeds may have a history of unprovoked aggression or attacks. Such deference would have the effect of limiting the rights of persons with disabilities under the ADA who use certain service animals based on where they live rather than on whether the use of a particular animal poses a direct threat to the health and safety of others.”²⁴

The DOJ’s focus on whether a particular animal poses a threat sets a good example. The same Order also allows for state and local governments to determine on a case-by-case basis whether a particular animal poses a threat based on that animal’s actual behavior and history, “not based on fears or generalizations about how an animal or breed might behave.”²⁵ This is a great model for any locality – each dog is an individual and should be evaluated as such. And again, the DOJ using words such as “fears” and “generalizations” shows how scientifically baseless these policies are.

²³ 28 CFR Part 35, CRT Docket No. 105; AG Order No. RIN 1190-AA46, Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability in State and Local Government Services, http://www.ada.gov/regs2010/titleII_2010/reg2_2010.html

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ *Id.*



VI. Actual Problem – Dog Bites (and media)

The AVMA highlights that controlled studies have never been able to identify the pit bull type breed group as disproportionately dangerous. Neither has it been demonstrated that breed affects the rate or severity of dog bites.²⁶ More importantly, the AVMA has recognized that the underlying factor in breed correlations is likely the owner's behavior.²⁷ This is where the focus needs to be in order to solve the dog bite problem: owner behavior and accountability.

According to the National Canine Research Council, 97% of dogs involved in fatal attacks in 2006 were not spayed or neutered, 78% were resident dogs, not family dogs (kept for guarding, image enhancement, fighting, or irresponsible breeding), and 84% were maintained by reckless owners who abused or neglected the dog, failed to control or contain the dog, or failed to supervise the dog with children. Studies have shown very little difference in aggression between breeds, with the greatest variation actually between small breeds (more aggressive) and large breeds (less aggressive). Aggression towards humans, however, is extremely low across all breeds.²⁸

²⁶ AVMA Animal Welfare Division. "The Welfare Implications of the Role of Breed in Dog Bite Risk and Prevention." 17 April 2012. https://www.avma.org/KB/Resources/Backgrounders/Documents/dog_bite_risk_and_prevention_bgnd.pdf.

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ Bradley, Janis. "The Relevance of Breed in Selecting a Companion Dog," National Canine Research Council, 2011.



ATTACHMENT 6: NCRC MEDIA BIAS REPORT



ATTACHMENT 7: WHEN DOGS BITE



ATTACHMENT 8: NCRC RESIDENT DOG VS. FAMILY DOG



**ATTACHMENT 9: AVMA ROLE OF BREED
IN DOG BITE RISK AND PREVENTION**



VII. Solutions – How to Achieve Safe Communities

There is widespread support among professional organizations and animal experts for breed-neutral dangerous dog laws that target irresponsible owners and promote proper and humane care and control of dogs. Anti-chaining and proper leash laws, ownership restrictions on previous offenders, enforcement of dog fighting and animal cruelty laws, and public education are all common themes. Proper dog safety should be encouraged across all breeds, as well as proper animal care, proper human-animal interactions, and proper owner or parent supervision of children. Teaching children how to act around dogs, and never leaving children unsupervised around dogs, can make a big difference in preventing dog bites. Even one 30-minute lesson in school has been shown to reduce high-risk behaviors around unfamiliar dogs in school children.²⁹

The AVMA convened a task force on canine aggression and human-canine interactions after the publication of the fatality report discussed previously. The task force formulated a community involvement model for dog bite prevention and warns that singling out one or two breeds can result in a false sense of accomplishment, ignores the true scope of the problem, and does not protect the community.³⁰ The AVMA supports the enforcement of non-breed-specific dangerous dog laws that focus on chronically irresponsible owners, enforcement of animal control ordinances such as leash laws, prohibition of dog fighting, promotion of spaying/neutering, and education programs for both children and adults that cover pet care and responsibility and bite prevention.³¹

The National Animal Control Association, recognizing the undue burden that breed discrimination imposes on responsible owners and that any animal may display aggressive behavior regardless of breed, recommends that “dangerous and/or vicious animals should be labeled as such as a result of their actions or behavior and not because of their breed.”³²

Section III of this packet already discussed the preventable factors associated with dog bite fatalities. Some of those factors include failure to neuter dogs, keeping dogs on chains or otherwise without positive human interactions, failure to teach children how to interact with dogs and to supervise these children when interacting with dogs, and owners’ mismanagement, abuse, or neglect of dogs. If we can target those factors through community outreach, education, and breed-neutral animal control laws, then we will be on our way to safer communities.

²⁹ Bradley, Janis. “The Relevance of Breed in Selecting a Companion Dog,” National Canine Research Council, 2011.

³⁰ American Veterinary Medical Association, Task Force on Canine Aggression and Human-Canine Interactions, “A Community Approach to Dog Bite Prevention.” *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, Vol 218, No. 11, June 1, 2001, p. 1732-1749.

³¹ Sacks, J.J., Sinclair, L., Gilchrist, J., Golab, G., & Lockwood, R. (2000). Breeds of dogs involved in fatal human attacks in the United States between 1979 and 1998. *JAVMA*, 217(6), 836-840.

³² National Animal Control Association Guidelines, “Extended Animal Control Concerns - Dangerous/Vicious Animals,” <http://www.nacanet.org/guidelines.html>



ATTACHMENT 10: SOLUTIONS SLIDE



StubbyDog™

Rediscover the pit bull. 20

ATTACHMENT 11: A COMMUNITY APPROACH TO DOG BITE PREVENTION



ATTACHMENT 12: DOG BITES: PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS



ATTACHMENT 13: OUT OF THE PAST



VIII. Conclusion

In a national survey commissioned by Best Friends Animal Society and released in early 2014, researchers found that 84% of those polled believe that neither local, state, nor federal governments should be able to dictate which breed of dog a person has the right to own.

We already have nearly 20 states that prohibit their cities and counties from passing breed discriminatory laws and several states considering legislation that would do just that.

Every American who follows the right safety rules as a responsible dog owner should be allowed to own whatever breed of dog they choose,” said Ledy VanKavage, Senior Legislative Attorney for Best Friends Animal Society. “Communities should be protected against any dangerous dog, no matter the breed, and abused or neglected dogs should be protected from abusive owners. Owners and dogs should be judged on their behavior.”

“... instead of punishing innocent dogs for resembling a specific breed, communities should concentrate on holding reckless owners accountable and responsible. The simple truth is that breed discrimination doesn’t work.”

– Ledy VanKavage, Senior Legislative Attorney for Best Friends Animal Society

Even those dogs that are raised for professional dogfighting often refuse to engage other dogs and suffer brutal deaths at the hands of their owners for this failure. Jim Gorant immortalized the 51 dogs seized from Michael Vick’s dogfighting operation in his book, *The Lost Dogs*. Most of these dogs are enjoying their lives as family dogs now. He describes how when the officers entered the premises and approached the dogs, none growled or snapped or showed other signs of aggression, although some did cower in fear. The “Vick dogs,” as they have come to be known, have shown the world that even under circumstances of terrible abuse and torture, just because a dog is a pit bull type dog does not mean that it will want to fight, or that it will be any good at fighting. “The truth, in the end, is that each dog, like each person, is an individual. If the Vick dogs proved nothing else to the world, this would be a significant advance.”³³

According to Dr. Kristopher Irizarry, Associate Professor of Bioinformatics, Genetics, and Genomics at Western University, “these attempts to ‘protect society’ from dangerous dogs are flawed because the inherent assumption in these laws is that anatomical and morphological characteristics in dogs correlate with certain behaviors” and “breed specific legislation targets nothing more than a small subset of morphological characteristics of dogs and does not address behavior at all.”³⁴ There has never been a documented case of a spayed/neutered pit bull type dog, maintained exclusively as a household family dog, involved in a fatal attack on a human in

³³ Gorant, Jim. *The Lost Dogs: Michael Vick's Dogs and Their Tale of Rescue and Redemption*. New York, NY: Penguin Group, 2010, p. 126.

³⁴ Irizarry, Krisopher. “Breed Specific or Looks Specific.” National Canine Research Council. http://nationalcanineresearchcouncil.com/uploaded_files/tinymce/Irizarry%20viewpoint.pdf. Dr. Kristopher J. Irizarry is an Associate Professor of Bioinformatics, Genetics, and Genomics at Western University.



the United States, which proves that “canine behavior is profoundly influenced by the function of the dog and quality of care and control practiced by the owners.”³⁵ The specific breed of dog is the variable that has changed through the decades, but the pattern of behavior is the same. This pattern of behavior is what needs to be targeted through legislation and is the only way to ensure safe and humane communities.

³⁵ Delise, Karen. The Pit Bull Placebo: The Media, Myths and Politics of Canine Aggression. United States: Anubis Publishing, 2007, p. 168.



ATTACHMENT 14: NATIONAL SURVEY



StubbyDog™

Rediscover the pit bull. 26

ATTACHMENT 15: PIT BULL FACTS



ATTACHMENT 16: AFF FEAR VS. FACT



ATTACHMENT 17: AMERICAN TEMPERAMENT TEST SOCIETY



StubbyDog™

Rediscover the pit bull. 29

ATTACHMENT 18: AMERICAN VETERINARY SOCIETY OF ANIMAL BEHAVIOR