**Data behind Extreme Risk Protective Order Policies**

A Look at Connecticut's Risk-Warrant Law

Law enforcement and families are in desperate need of tools to temporarily suspend firearms access for at-risk individuals during periods of crisis. *Extreme Risk Protective Order* policies fill this need.

**Risk-Warrant in Connecticut**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **States with ERPO-type laws[[1]](#endnote-1)** | |
| California | Gun Violence Restraining Order |
| Connecticut | Risk-warrant |
| Indiana | Proceedings for the Seizure and Retention of a Firearm |
| Washington | Extreme Risk Protection Order |

In 1999, Connecticut became the first state to pass a law granting law enforcement the clear legal authority to temporarily remove firearms from individuals when there is probable cause to believe they are at a significant risk of harm to self or others (called a *risk-warrant*).

Indiana, California, and Washington have similar laws, though California and Washington also allow family members to petition for these orders.

A recent analysis of Connecticut’s risk-warrant law by Dr. Jeffrey Swanson of Duke University, with a team of nine other researchers, adds to the evidence for risk-based firearms removal laws by demonstrating that such policies are promising and effective tools to save lives. Their findings are detailed below.[[2]](#endnote-2)

**Reaching high-risk people and saving lives**

In the first 14 years of Connecticut’s risk-warrant law (1999-2013):

* 762 risk-warrants were issued, with increasing frequency after the 2007 Virginia Tech shooting.[[3]](#endnote-3),[[4]](#endnote-4)
* Police found firearms in 99% of cases.
* Police removed an average of seven guns per subject.

**Suicide Prevention**

* Typical risk-warrant subject was a middle-aged or older man - the same demographic that, nationwide, is most at risk for firearm suicide.[[5]](#endnote-5)
* Suicidality or self-injury was a listed concern in ≥61% of cases where such material was available.
* 21 risk-warrant subjects went on to die by suicide, a rate about 40 times higher than the adult suicide rate in Connecticut.
* 6 of 21 suicides were by firearm. Known case fatality rates[[6]](#endnote-6) of suicide methods were used to estimate that the 21 suicides likely represent 142 attempts, mostly by means less lethal than guns.
* **In the absence of a risk-warrant and if firearms had been available and used in more of the risk-warrant subjects’ attempts, more would have died by suicide.**

**How did the researchers reach this conclusion?**

Since attempted suicide with a firearm has such a high case fatality rate, reducing the percentage of suicide attempts with a firearm saves lives. The researchers developed a model to estimate how many suicides would likely be averted by limiting access to guns through risk-warrants.

**Access to Health Care**

* *Before risk-warrant:* Most risk-warrant subjects (88%) were not known to Connecticut’s public behavioral health system when the warrants were served – despite their elevated risk of self-harm.
* *After risk-warrant:* Nearly one-third (29%)[[7]](#endnote-7) of subjects received treatment in the state system
* *Significance:* Risk-warrants provided a portal to critical mental health and substance abuse services.

**Conclusion**

This analysis by Swanson and colleagues shows that risk-warrants:

* Reached individuals who were at a dangerously elevated risk of suicide.
* Prevented additional suicide deaths by intervening in crises.
* Provided safe periods for subjects to obtain much-needed treatment services.
* Saved lives by shifting suicide attempt methods from firearms to less lethal means.

**Research shows for every 10-20 risk-warrants issued, one life is saved.**
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