OREGON ERPO IMPLEMENTATION

OREGON EXTREME RISK PROTECTION ORDER (ERPO) BASICS

What is it? Oregon's Extreme Risk Protection Order (ERPO) law went into effect in January 2018. An ERPO is a civil order that temporarily prohibits individuals who present a risk in the near future of suicide or causing physical injury to another person from purchasing and possessing firearms.

Who can request an ERPO? Family and household members (including spouses, intimate partners, parents, children, or siblings) and law enforcement officers may petition for an ERPO.

How does it work? When the court issues an ERPO, the subject of the order (the respondent) must turn over all firearms, as well as any concealed handgun permit, to law enforcement, a gun dealer, or a third party. The respondent must turn over these items within 24 hours of the ERPO being served.

RESEARCH & DATA – ERPO USE IN OREGON

Researchers from the Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) Gun Violence Prevention Research Center at the OHSU-PSU School of Public Health have studied ERPO use in Oregon, including reviewing court records and interviewing key stakeholders involved in ERPO implementation and use. **Here are some of their key findings:**

1. **From 2018 to 2024, 1,039 ERPO petitions were filed in Oregon,** 78% of which were granted at the initial hearing. Petitions were filed in 32 of 36 counties (89%, range 0-174 per county, median 21). Most petitions were filed by law enforcement (62%), followed by family/household members (27%). Threats or concerns motivating petitioning included assault or homicide (87% of petitions), self-harm or suicide (64%), domestic violence (39%), harm to children (17%), mass violence (12%), and threats to schools or universities (4%). Most petitions cited threats of harm to both self and others (51%). Documentation of weapons surrender or declarations that the respondent did not possess weapons were only available for 30% of granted ERPOs.
    - *Five years of Extreme Risk Protection Orders in Oregon: A descriptive analysis (2026) (data from 2018-2022)*[1]

[1] Researchers from the OHSU Gun Violence Prevention Research Center provided updated statistics for the years 2018-2024, which are presented here throughout.

- *OHSU fact sheet on the use of Oregon's Extreme Risk Protection Order law (data from 2018-2024)*[2]

2 **Mass violence** risk was cited in 12% (n=124) of all ERPO petitions filed from 2018-2024. Risk of mass violence to schools or college campuses, specifically, was cited in 36 petitions. Most petitions citing risks of mass violence were filed by law enforcement (89%) and most were granted (89%).

- "Our findings suggest that **Oregon's ERPO law is being used as intended to address firearm injury risk, including mass violence risk and risk to schools and college campuses…**Further research on the use of ERPOs is needed to fully understand the barriers and facilitators to effective implementation of these laws to prevent mass violence."
  - *Use of Oregon's Extreme Risk Protection Order law to prevent mass violence: A descriptive study (2025) (data from 2018-2023)*[1]

3 **Risk of suicide or self-harm** was cited in 64% (n=665) of all ERPOs filed from 2018-2024. Threats to others were also cited in the majority of suicide-related petitions. Fewer than half of suicide-related petitions stated that the respondent was hospitalized or referred to services.

- "**Oregon's ERPO law is being used to try to prevent suicide**, but implementation gaps exist, including missed opportunities for service connections. Further research should examine barriers and facilitators to ERPO use for suicide prevention, best practices for connecting respondents to services, and individual health and safety outcomes among respondents."
  - *Use of Oregon's extreme risk protection order law to address risk of firearm suicide (2026) (data from 2018-2023)*[1]
  - *OHSU fact sheet on use of ERPOs for suicide prevention (data from 2018-2024)*

4 **Risk of harm to children and adolescents** was cited in 17% (n=181) of all ERPOs filed from 2018-2024. Petitions citing risks of harm to children were less likely to be granted (66% granted) than those without such risks (81%). Ex-spouses/ex-intimate partners, who do not have standing to file under Oregon's ERPO law, made up a larger proportion of petitioners citing risks of harm to children (14%) than petitions without risks to children (4%). Most of these ex-spouses/ex-intimate partners shared children with the respondent.

[2] Additional fact sheets and resources about ERPOs in Oregon are available on the OHSU Gun Violence Prevention Research Center website. For additional information on ERPO implementation, please visit the National ERPO Resource Center at erpo.org.

- "This research indicates that **Oregon's ERPO law is being used to try to prevent harm to children and adolescents,** including domestic violence, school shootings, and harm perpetrated by youth. . . . Review of these petitions citing risks of harm to children and adolescents identified potential gaps in Oregon's current ERPO statute, including limited petitioner eligibility and the lack of explicit policy on the use of ERPOs for minors. Future research should examine the benefits and risks of expanding petitioner eligibility, best practices for engaging minors as ERPO respondents, and the potential role of pediatricians in the ERPO process."
    - *Addressing risks of violence to children and adolescents through Oregon's extreme risk protection order law (2026) (data from 2018-2023)*[1]

5 **Accounts and recommendations from Oregon law enforcement, judicial, legal, and suicide and violence prevention professionals**:

- "Implementation challenges identified by professionals included insufficient funding and resources, time constraints on petitioning, safety and timeliness of ERPO service, and limited enforcement mechanisms. While professionals shared the strategies they use to overcome these barriers, such as conducting risk assessments and using a non-confrontational approach to increase safety of ERPO service, they also identified **potential policy and practice changes that may bolster implementation.** Such changes included cautiously expanding petitioner eligibility, allowing LEOs to petition at any time of the day or week, and requiring ERPO respondents to file a declaration of firearm surrender form with the court and attend compliance hearings."
    - *Barriers and facilitators to implementation of Oregon's Extreme Risk Protection Order law: A qualitative study of professionals involved in implementation (2025)*
- "Interviewees indicated an overall low level of public knowledge about the ERPO law, both among professionals in their fields and among the public more broadly. **To increase knowledge and support, interviewees highlighted a need for more professional training, especially for LEOs, and public education on ERPOs. Most interviewees saw ERPOs as effective tools for reducing firearm violence,** but some noted a need to incorporate more trauma-informed practices and connections to services for ERPOs to be viewed as a suicide prevention tool."
    - *Professional training and public education can support Extreme Risk Protection Order utilization: A qualitative study of professionals in Oregon (2025)*

- *Understanding the implementation and use of Oregon's Extreme Risk Protection Order law through interviews with professionals involved in implementation [Report] (2024)*
- *OHSU fact sheet summarizing key takeaways from interviews with professionals involved in ERPO implementation*

6 **Accounts and recommendations from civilians who previously petitioned for an ERPO in Oregon:**

- "Civilian petitioners described their decision-making process when deciding to petition, the emotional and logistical challenges they faced as petitioners, resources that helped them petition, and the outcomes or impacts of the ERPO on the crisis situation and on their relationship with the individual for whom they filed. **Interviewees also identified ways to support future civilian petitioners and to strengthen implementation of ERPOs.** While some interviewees highlighted continued concerns related to risks of retaliatory harm or limitations in the ability of an ERPO to truly prevent access to firearms, **the majority of interviewees described feeling a sense of relief after the ERPO took effect**."
  - *Learning from the experiences of civilian petitioners to strengthen implementation and use of Oregon's Extreme Risk Protection Order law [Report] (2025)*
  - *OHSU fact sheet summarizing key takeaways from interviews with civilian ERPO petitioners*

OREGON ERPO SUCCESS STORIES

Mass Violence Prevention

- ***Portland (2026):*** In May 2026, a man drove a rental car packed with explosives into the Multnomah Athletic Club (MAC). The 49-year-old man had the subject of two ERPOs—one in 2022, and one obtained by Portland police in February. Police sought this ERPO after he allegedly became fixated on the club, "terrorizing members and threatening violence." He surrendered two firearms. The Oregonian reported that this ERPO **"may have been a key safeguard** in [this] case . . . and a reason no one other than the suspect died in his alleged attack." (Source)
- ***Portland (2023):*** An ERPO was obtained by law enforcement against a Portland man who **allegedly plotted a mass shooting** at a rock climbing event. The order was granted and law enforcement seized three handguns and an AR-15. (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

- *Portland (2019):* The FBI initiated an ERPO against a man who said, "I'd slaughter [antifa] and I have a detailed plan on how I would wipe out antifa." The former Marine had already sent a letter saying that unless Congress declared "antifa" a terrorist organization, he and other veterans would have no choice but to begin systematically killing its members **"until we have achieved genocide."** The man's father said, "I can't say that he won't kill someone." After the ERPO was served, he surrendered four guns and was placed under psychiatric observation at a VA hospital, after which he volunteered to remain there for another two weeks. (Source)

- *Portland:* An ERPO was obtained against a man who posed for photos with a semi-automatic rifle and spoke openly about planning a **school shooting**. (Source)

- *Beaverton:* An ERPO was obtained against a veteran who threatened to **shoot people at his church.** (Source)

Domestic Violence Prevention

- *Brookings (2018):* The day after learning his wife was leaving him, a 35-year-old man went out and purchased a handgun. After returning home with the gun and consuming alcohol, he began arguing with his wife. As the argument escalated, he took out the gun. His wife made a phone call to another man, letting him know her **husband would not let her leave**. Her husband then threatened to kill the other man. Police arrived minutes later and the man relinquished his handgun. The next morning, a judge issued an ERPO. (Sources: 1, 2)
- *Washington County:* An ERPO was obtained against a man who pointed a gun at his wife and said, **"maybe I'll take us both out."** (Source)
- *Josephine County:* Law enforcement sought and obtained an ERPO against a man who, according to the petition, owned approximately 30 firearms—including assault weapons and body armor—after he **pushed a loaded pistol into his wife's chest** so hard that it left a bruise. (Source)

Suicide Prevention

- One ERPO respondent told a family member that they **had plans to purchase a firearm to harm themselves** and reported hearing voices telling them to harm themselves. A law enforcement officer located the respondent at a gun shop mid-purchase and placed them on a police officer hold. The respondent told the officer that they would buy a gun upon release from the hospital. The officer petitioned for an ERPO while the respondent was hospitalized, which was granted. (Source)

- Another ERPO respondent had previously purchased a firearm with the intention of harming themselves, but their plan was interrupted when their spouse came home unexpectedly. A few months later, the respondent was experiencing another mental health crisis and **planned to harm themselves with a firearm**, so their spouse brought them to the hospital. The respondent began outpatient treatment but was still having intense suicidal ideation. Their spouse petitioned for an ERPO, which was granted. (Source)
- ***Carlton (4 days after the law took effect):*** Law enforcement was granted an ERPO after a man **threatened to kill his dog and then himself,** according to the affidavit filed by police. He texted his girlfriend: "OK, murder suicide it is." When she tried to call 911, he got a loaded pistol and cornered her in the bathroom. Police officers arrived and, with the man's permission, seized 10 guns for safekeeping. The ERPO filed by law enforcement and granted days later kept the man from getting them back. *"'It was really good timing,' [the law enforcement officer who had petitioned] recalled in a recent interview at the town's tiny police station. He had just been trained on the new no-guns orders at a meeting of local law enforcement officials, he said. 'Such a good tool.' . . . the town police chief, said he believes a life was saved by its use in the case."* (Source)
- An Oregon man became suicidal after breaking up with his girlfriend. He shot himself in the leg in February, and initially he told his mom and sister it was an accident—but on the way to the hospital, he said that he was **trying to kill himself**. Doctors suggested that his mom remove the five guns that Josh owned. But without his consent, this proved impossible. In April, a police officer performing a wellness check at their home told Josh's mom about ERPOs, and she filed and obtained one shortly thereafter. Josh got sober and started seeing a therapist, and his mom was able to lift the order early. (Source)
- ***Josephine County:*** A father obtained an ERPO for his son after numerous **threats to kill himself escalated to self-harm and violence** towards his family members. (Source)

About This Resource

Researchers from the Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Violence Solutions provided expertise in Extreme Risk Protection Orders (ERPOs), collaborating on drafting, review, revision, and design of this resource with the researchers from Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) Gun Violence Prevention Research Center at the OHSU-PSU School of Public Health.

For more information about Extreme Risk Protection Orders in Oregon, including fact sheets, reports, and research briefs, visit ***https://ohsu-psu-sph.org/gun-violence-prevention-research/center-resources/.***

For more information about Extreme Risk Protection Orders nationwide, including state overviews and resources for attorneys, judges, law enforcement, and family members, visit ***https://erpo.org/.***