

Sarah McTyeire, MSPH
Program Coordinator, Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Violence Solutions

In Support - An Act Relative to Extreme Risk Protection Orders (HB 1642)
Criminal Justice and Public Safety
January 14, 2026

Good afternoon, and thank you, Chair Roy, Vice Chair Rhodes, and distinguished members of the committee, for the opportunity to share my testimony with you today.

My name is Sarah McTyeire, and I serve as the Program Coordinator at the [Center for Gun Violence Solutions](#) (the Center) at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. I am providing this testimony in my individual capacity and the views expressed here are my own and do not necessarily represent those of Johns Hopkins University.

At the Center, my work focuses on advocating for and implementing evidence-based firearm violence prevention policies that measurably reduce gun violence and save lives. As a community and public health policy professional with expertise in school safety, behavioral threat assessment, and gun violence prevention, I have seen firsthand the critical importance of having tools in place to intervene before a crisis turns into a tragedy and lives are lost.

For those reasons, I am testifying today in strong support of HB 1642 and urge you to favorably pass this act to establish an Extreme Risk Protection Order (ERPO) law in the State of New Hampshire.

Gun Violence in New Hampshire

In New Hampshire, the need for ERPOs as a preventive tool for families and law enforcement to intervene when someone is in crisis and at risk of harming themselves or others is urgent. In 2023 alone, [143 people lost their lives to gun violence in this state—and 122 of those deaths were suicides](#). That means, on average, every three days, a New Hampshire family lost a loved one to firearm suicide. These are not just statistics—they are parents, veterans, neighbors, and children. And in many cases, warning signs were present before the loss.

Currently, New Hampshire law does not provide families or law enforcement with a clear legal pathway to act when someone is experiencing a temporary crisis and has access to a firearm. ERPOs fill that gap.

ERPOs Effectively Address Gun Violence

An [ERPO is a temporary civil court order](#) issued by a judge when there is clear evidence that a person poses a danger to themselves or others. It allows firearms to be removed for a limited period during a crisis, with restrictions lasting up to one year. It includes robust due-process protections, such as notice, judicial hearings, court oversight, and the right to petition for early termination.

ERPOs are not permanent bans. They are time-limited interventions designed to reduce risk during moments of crisis, such as threats of suicide, domestic violence, or mass shootings. ERPO laws have now been enacted in 22 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. These laws have been adopted because ERPOs are effective preventive tools that can be used when risks and threats are imminent—allowing timely intervention to stop violence before it happens and save lives, as [demonstrated through research](#).

A large multi-state study found that [one suicide was prevented for every 17 ERPOs issued](#). In cases involving individuals with a history of suicidal ideation, the impact was even greater, with one life saved for every 13 ERPOs.

Research also shows that [81% of school shooters](#) and [47% of mass shooters](#) share their plans in advance. [Family members are often the first to recognize these warning signs](#), and ERPOs enable families and law enforcement to intervene during critical moments before tragedy occurs. Studies have found that [10% of ERPOs are issued in response to mass violence threats](#), often targeting schools, workplaces, or intimate partners. In California, [ERPOs were used in cases involving credible mass shooting threats](#), and none of the individuals went on to commit a mass shooting, homicide, or suicide.

ERPOs Respect Constitutional Rights

Modeled after [Domestic Violence Protective Orders \(DVPOs\)](#), which exist in all 50 states, are widely accepted as a necessary tool to prevent harm before it occurs, and have been routinely upheld against due process challenges. In [United States v. Rahimi \(2024\)](#), the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of firearm restrictions for individuals subject to DVPOs, affirming that civil firearm restrictions for individuals determined by a judicial officer to pose a credible threat to physical safety are [consistent with the Second Amendment](#).

Well-crafted ERPO laws like HB 1642 also uphold [due process](#) rights under the [Fifth Amendment](#) and include:

- [Expedited hearings](#), often available outside regular court hours;
- [Clear evidentiary standards](#); and
- [Time-limited orders](#) that provide respondents with opportunities to present evidence, retain legal counsel, and petition for early termination.

[ERPOs are also bipartisan and widely supported by the public](#):

- 87% of Democrats and 70% of Republicans support ERPO laws;
- 71% of gun owners and 80% of non-gun owners support them.

For New Hampshire, where the overwhelming majority of gun deaths are suicides, ERPOs would give families and loved ones access to a powerful tool to help prevent suicide. They would empower families in their most desperate moments, provide law enforcement with a lawful and targeted way to intervene, and help prevent irreversible loss.

At a time when gun violence continues to devastate families and communities across our country, we cannot afford to abandon tools that work. ERPOs are behavior-based, risk-informed, data-driven, and constitutional. Most importantly, they save lives without compromising fundamental rights.

I urge you to stand with New Hampshire families and vote in favor of HB 1642. Thank you for your time and consideration. I am available for questions at smctyei1@jh.edu.

Respectfully,



Sarah McTyeire, MSPH