



WHY IS POLICY IMPLEMENTATION & OUTCOMES EVALUATION IMPORTANT?

Evaluation of policies both in terms of how they are implemented in the “real-world”, as well as outcomes of these policies are critical to understanding:

- Whether the policy is working as intended (e.g., whether ERPOs are used appropriately in cases of imminent risk)
- Whether the policy has any unintended or unanticipated consequences (e.g., whether segments of the population are disproportionately burdened or negatively affected by the policy)
- How effective the policy is (e.g., whether ERPO policies have effects on reducing suicide risk and/or mass shooting risk)

WHAT DATA IS NEEDED TO BEST EVALUATE THE CURRENT SET OF FIREARM INJURY PREVENTION BILLS?

In order to comprehensively evaluate the implementation and outcomes of the proposed bills. The following data is needed:

- The ERPO casefile, to include the petition, affidavits, documents pertaining to firearm ownership or possession, documents pertaining to the scheduling of a hearing, documents regarding stipulation to the ERPO, and the granting or denial of an ERPO, documents regarding motions to terminate or extend the ERPO, and decisions on those motions
- Documents pertaining to the removal of firearms from ERPO respondent
- Documents pertaining to whether the respondent asked for the return of and received any firearms that were removed by law enforcement.
- Data on violations on each of these laws (police reports, arrests, prosecutions, convictions).
- Identifiers to link individuals under ERPOs to criminal history data
- Ability to access Michigan death certificates to determine if individuals under ERPOs went on to die by suicide or homicide

WHAT EXAMPLES DO WE HAVE FROM OTHER STATES?

[California AB-173 Public Safety. \(2021-2022\)](#)

Existing law outlines the procedures for agencies to follow in the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of personal information, as defined, in order to protect the privacy of individuals. Existing law generally prohibits an agency from disclosing any personal information in a manner that would link the information disclosed to the individual to whom it pertains. Existing law permits the disclosure of that information to the University of California or a nonprofit educational institution, under specified conditions. (Continued on Page 2)

Existing law establishes a center for research into firearm-related violence, administered by the University of California, to research with a mission to provide the scientific evidence on which sound firearm violence prevention policies can be based, as specified. Existing law allows for the collection of various data relating to crimes and firearms, including, among other things, criminal history information, a database of gun violence restraining orders, and a database of firearm precursor parts purchases. Existing law makes the unauthorized furnishing of criminal history information a crime. Existing law, as amended by the Safety for All Act of 2016, an initiative statute approved by voters as Proposition 63 at the November 8, 2016, statewide general election, created a database of ammunition purchases and made that database confidential. Proposition 63 allows its provisions to be amended by a vote of 55% of the Legislature so long as the amendments are consistent with, and further the intent of, the act.

This bill would name the center for research into firearm-related violence the California Firearm Violence Research Center at UC Davis. The bill would generally require that the information above be made available to the center and researchers affiliated with the center, and, at the department's discretion, to any other nonprofit bona fide research institution accredited by the United States Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, as specified, for the study of the prevention of violence. The bill would require that material identifying individuals only be provided for research or statistical activities, and require that information to only be used for those purposes and would prohibit reports or publications derived from that information from identifying specific individuals. By providing access to criminal history information, the unauthorized furnishing of which is a crime, this bill would expand a crime and create a state-mandated local program. The bill would additionally require the Department of Justice to establish procedures for these requests, as specified.

This bill would incorporate additional changes to Sections 11106 and 28220 of the Penal Code proposed by Senate Bill 715 to be operative only if this bill and Senate Bill 715 are enacted and this bill is enacted last. The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement. This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as a bill providing for appropriations related to the Budget Bill.