



July 6, 2026

By electronic submission to <https://www.regulations.gov>.

ATF Rulemaking Comments
Mail Stop 6N-518, Office of Regulatory Affairs
Enforcement Programs and Services
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives
99 New York Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20226

Re: Docket No. ATF-2026-004; RIN 1140-AA65
Comment on Proposed Rule on “Removing CLEO Notification Under the National Firearms Act”

To Whom It May Concern:

Everytown for Gun Safety Support Fund¹ (“Everytown”) submits this comment in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking (“NPRM” or “proposed rule”) issued by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (“ATF”) regarding the Chief Law Enforcement Officer (“CLEO”) notification requirement under the National Firearms Act (“NFA”). Under current regulations, those who seek to make or transfer NFA weapons must first notify an appropriate CLEO about the proposed making or transfer by sending the CLEO a copy of a completed NFA application form 5320.1 (“Form 1”), 5320.4 (“Form 4”) or 5320.23 for responsible persons (“Form 23”). The proposed rule would eliminate the requirement to forward a copy of these forms to the CLEO of the locality in which the applicant, transferee, or responsible person is located. **In doing so, the proposed rule would deprive law enforcement information about the presence of particularly dangerous weapons like machineguns, silencers, and short-barreled rifles and shotguns in their jurisdictions.**

We strongly oppose the proposed rule, as it would make our communities and local law enforcement officers less safe. Congress has determined NFA weapons to be particularly dangerous, and for nearly a century, chief officers of state and local law enforcement agencies have been made aware when a person is seeking to make or acquire an NFA weapon in that agency’s jurisdiction. This is both in case the law enforcement agency has information relevant to the vetting of the person, and also so they know if an NFA weapon is present if they are called upon to serve a warrant, answer a domestic violence call, or otherwise engage in a potential

¹ Everytown for Gun Safety Support Fund is the education, research and litigation arm of Everytown for Gun Safety, the largest gun violence prevention organization in the country with nearly 11 million supporters and more than 700,000 donors. The Everytown Support Fund seeks to improve our understanding of the causes of gun violence and help to reduce it by conducting groundbreaking original research, developing evidence-based policies, communicating this knowledge to the American public, and advancing gun safety and gun violence prevention in communities and the courts.

confrontation with the person. In the past, even the gun industry’s trade association acknowledged that maintaining CLEO notification was an important tool for protecting the security of officers.² Eliminating notification for NFA weapons and leaving law enforcement officers in the dark would jeopardize officer safety and put communities at greater risk. For the reasons discussed below, and for the safety of law enforcement officers and our communities, we urge ATF not to proceed with its proposed rule.

I. The National Firearms Act seeks to ensure that only known and carefully vetted persons can make or obtain certain dangerous weapons.

Since 1934, the NFA has regulated the manufacturing, possession, and transfer of certain weapons that Congress has determined to be particularly dangerous, including machineguns, short-barreled shotguns and rifles, silencers, destructive devices, and other weapons such as firearms disguised as objects like pens, umbrellas, or canes.³ Congress enacted the NFA to curtail transactions of weapons that were frequently used in crime and to impose heightened restrictions on the possession, making, and transfer of weapons that pose significant danger to public safety because of factors such as their lethality, concealability, and ability to make it harder for law enforcement or bystanders to identify from where gunshots originated.⁴ The NFA requires those seeking to make or transfer NFA weapons to first submit an application to ATF, which must grant approval before the weapon can be manufactured or transferred.⁵ These applications must include detailed identification information about the firearm and the applicant, including the name, address, fingerprints, and photograph of the person seeking to make or possess the NFA weapon, and the person must also pass a background check.⁶ The law further requires that all NFA weapons be registered in a central registry called the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, including identification of each weapon and the identification and address of the person possessing the weapon.⁷

ATF and the Justice Department have long recognized the importance of the NFA in protecting communities from gun violence, including in recent public statements. In 2025, the Justice Department correctly pointed out in a court filing that the NFA “was Congress’s first major attempt at regulating firearms in the United States, a legislative effort animated by the emergence of armed crime as a major national problem.”⁸ As the Justice Department explained, “[s]eeking to curtail armed crime, the NFA targeted particularly dangerous and easily concealable weapons that could be used readily and efficiently by criminals.”⁹ The Justice Department further explained that Congress designed the NFA as a remedy to deal with the “serious national emergency” of armed crime, with “armed criminals pass[ing] rapidly from

² See National Shooting Sports Foundation [comment letter](#), Dec. 6, 2013, at p. 2 (urging ATF to “consider shifting to a notification process” to “remove the unnecessary burden from CLEO without sacrificing security”).

³ Disguised weapons are known under the NFA as “any other weapons.” See 26 U.S.C. § 5845(e).

⁴ See ATF, “[National Firearms Act](#),” viewed on July 3, 2026.

⁵ 26 U.S.C. §§ 5812, 5822.

⁶ 26 U.S.C. § 5812, § 5822; 27 C.F.R. § 479.63, § 479.85.

⁷ 26 U.S.C. § 5841(a).

⁸ Department of Justice, [Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment and In Support of Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment](#), *Silencer Shop Foundation v. ATF*, No. 6:25-cv-56-H (N.D. Tex), filed 11/20/25, at p. 2 (internal citations omitted).

⁹ *Id.* at p. 3, internal quotes and citations omitted.

State to State.”¹⁰

In short, for nine decades, federal law has imposed requirements to ensure that only known, vetted persons are entrusted with NFA weapons and that the manufacturing and movements of such weapons are carefully monitored given the dangers those weapons pose. State and local law enforcement have been instrumental partners in this effort since the NFA’s beginning, yet ATF’s proposed change would cut them out of the vetting process altogether and deprive them of critical information about NFA weapon activity in their jurisdictions.

II. Informing area law enforcement when applicants seek to bring NFA weapons into local communities is an integral part of the NFA’s process for vetting and ensuring public safety.

When the NFA was enacted in 1934, its implementing regulations required applicants seeking to make or transfer an NFA weapon to obtain a certificate from a CLEO with jurisdiction over the maker or transferee’s address stating that the CLEO had no information indicating that the possession of the firearm by the maker or transferee would be in violation of state or local law or that the person will use the firearm for other than lawful purposes.¹¹ A key goal behind this longstanding CLEO certification requirement was to ensure that law enforcement was aware when a particular person was seeking to make or obtain NFA weapons so law enforcement could help vet and confirm that the person is law-abiding, responsible, and capable of being entrusted with such dangerous weapons. Additionally, requiring that an applicant’s local CLEO be made aware of an NFA applicant can serve as an additional deterrent for someone who may be inclined to obtain (and is able to legally obtain) an NFA weapon for ultimately criminal purposes. In fact, up until 2016, the goal of making sure that CLEOs were aware of, and amenable to, the making or transfer of an NFA weapon in their jurisdiction was considered so important that ATF would not approve the making or transfer without obtaining CLEO certification in writing.

In 2009, ATF received a petition for rulemaking from the National Firearms Act Trade and Collectors Association (“NFATCA”) seeking, among other changes, to revise ATF’s regulations to eliminate the CLEO certification process.¹² ATF gave the matter extensive consideration and review, and ATF issued proposed regulatory changes in 2013 and a final rule in 2016 that converted the CLEO certification requirement into a requirement that applicants provide notification to CLEOs of their application.¹³ ATF acknowledged that the CLEO certification process faced complications including, as NFATCA had pointed out, that some CLEOs had raised liability concerns that “signing an NFA transfer application will link them to any inappropriate use of the firearm,” and also that the process had prompted many applicants “to create trust entities solely for the purpose of avoiding the CLEO certification process,” which then caused challenges with conducting background checks.¹⁴ In light of complications such as

¹⁰ Department of Justice, [Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment and in Support of Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment](#), *Jensen v. ATF*, No. 2:25-cv-00223-Z (N.D. Tex), filed 12/19/25, at pp. 2-3 (internal citations omitted).

¹¹ See 27 C.F.R. § 479.63 and § 479.85 prior to the final rule amending those provisions issued on January 15, 2016; see also 53 Fed. Reg. 10488 (“The requirement has existed in regulations since the National Firearms Act was enacted in 1934.”).

¹² See 78 Fed. Reg. 55016-7.

¹³ 81 Fed. Reg. 2658.

¹⁴ 81 Fed. Reg. 2661, 2675.

these, and after soliciting and carefully considering thousands of stakeholder comments, ATF amended its regulations and removed provisions requiring that applicants obtain a written CLEO certification before an application could be approved. Everytown did not agree with this decision, as we felt that CLEO certification provided an important safeguard that benefitted law enforcement and overall public safety by helping ensure that prohibited persons did not obtain NFA weapons. It remains Everytown's position that the certification requirement should be restored; however, we recognize that the process ATF used at the time to reach this decision was transparent and thorough.

When making this previous regulatory change, ATF emphasized the importance of making sure that state and local CLEOs were still notified when a person submitted an NFA application, and that these law enforcement agencies had the opportunity to provide federal authorities with information they may not otherwise have about the applicant or transferee's fitness for possessing NFA weapons. CLEOs often are aware of information about individuals in their community who may be prohibited by federal or state law from eligibility to possess firearms, and that information should certainly be shared with ATF before an NFA application is approved. In fact, the 2016 final rulemaking made clear that the elimination of the CLEO certification requirement was only made because the alternative of CLEO notification was available to provide a safety net. As ATF said, "[t]his notification will provide the CLEO an opportunity to conduct any inquiries required by State law, and provide ATF with appropriate input regarding the lawfulness of the individual's or responsible person's acquisition or possession of a firearm."¹⁵ ATF elaborated on this point, stating that:

In conjunction with the mandatory background check required of all applicants, including responsible persons of trusts and legal entities, the requirement of CLEO notice fulfills the primary objectives that have supported the certification requirement: It provides the CLEO awareness that a resident of the CLEO's jurisdiction has applied to make or obtain an NFA weapon and affords the CLEO an opportunity to provide input to the ATF of any information that may not be available during a Federal background check indicating the applicant is prohibited from possessing firearms. As noted in the NPRM, although the NICS provides access to a substantial number of records to verify if an individual is prohibited from possessing firearms, CLEOs often have access to records or information that has not been made available to NICS. Providing notice to the CLEO of a prospective NFA transfer with instructions on how to relay relevant information to ATF will help fill possible information gaps in NICS by affording the CLEO a reasonable opportunity to provide relevant information to ATF.¹⁶

There are additional ways in which CLEO notification helps state and local law enforcement maintain public safety. For example, numerous states give law enforcement agencies discretionary authority to weigh in when a potentially dangerous or prohibited individual seeks a state permit to purchase a firearm or carry one concealed. If a CLEO has been notified of that individual's attempts to make or obtain NFA firearms, it better informs law

¹⁵ 81 Fed. Reg. 2664.

¹⁶ 81 Fed. Reg. 2682.

enforcement's decisionmaking during the state permitting process.¹⁷ Further, if law enforcement is aware of a person in the community who has a history of dangerous conduct or mental instability and is notified that the person is seeking to make or obtain an NFA weapon, it will help inform the way in which law enforcement approaches potential interactions or confrontations with that person. For example, if law enforcement knows that a dangerous person has sought to make a short-barreled shotgun, they can adjust their tactics if they have to respond to a domestic violence call at that person's residence.

Accordingly, the final rule in 2016 revised ATF regulations in 27 C.F.R. § 479.62 and § 479.84 to require applicants to send a copy of completed Forms 1, 4, and 23 to the appropriate CLEO in order to provide notification that the NFA application was being submitted to ATF and also to require applicants to note in their application form the name and location of the CLEO to whom the form was sent.¹⁸ This notification requirement has proved to be a minimal burden on applicants, with the applicant merely needing to send to the CLEO a copy of an application form which the applicant was already required by federal law to complete. In fact, the NPRM identifies this burden as taking 15 minutes for a person to accomplish.¹⁹ Further, ATF clearly had the authority to require such CLEO notification in lieu of CLEO certification. As ATF explained in its final 2016 rule:

Sections 5812 and 5822 give the Department broad authority to promulgate regulations governing application forms, including regulations pertaining to the identification of a firearm and its maker or, in the case of a transfer, its transferee and transferor The notification requirement thus falls within the Department's authority to request information from individuals who seek to make or transfer NFA firearms that helps it to fulfill its statutory mandate to prevent prohibited individuals from obtaining NFA firearms.²⁰

Notably, as ATF considered the NFATCA's rulemaking petition on the CLEO certification requirement, the National Shooting Sports Foundation ("NSSF") specifically urged ATF to "consider shifting to a notification process" to "remove the unnecessary burden from CLEO without sacrificing security" in a comment letter submitted in response to the 2013 proposed rule.²¹ The NSSF argued that "[s]hifting to a notification process from a certification process will provide local law enforcement officials with an opportunity to object to a transfer, without requiring the CLEO to use scarce time and resources."²² The NSSF urged that "[t]he current forms could be revised to merely require that the CLEO be notified by the submission of a copy of the form."²³ That is exactly what ATF did in its 2016 final rule.

¹⁷ See, e.g., C.R.S. § 18-12-203; Conn. Gen. Stat. § 29-28; 430 ILCS § 66/20; Minn. Stat. § 624.714, subd. 6(a); N.J.S.2C:58-4; 18 Pa.C.S. § 6109; HRS § 134-2; MCLS § 28.422; Minn. Stat. § 624.7131, subd. 4; NY CLS Penal § 400.00.

¹⁸ 81 Fed. Reg. 2682.

¹⁹ 91 Fed. Reg. 24474.

²⁰ 81 Fed. Reg. 2680.

²¹ See National Shooting Sports Foundation [comment letter](#), Dec. 6, 2013.

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*

III. ATF's proposed rule change reflects a flawed process and, if implemented, would increase the risk of harm to law enforcement officers and to public safety.

Even though ATF had already accommodated the NFATCA's rulemaking petition and the NSSF's suggestion to convert the CLEO certification requirement into a notification requirement in 2016, ATF now proposes to eliminate even the minimally burdensome CLEO notification requirement. This means local law enforcement would not be made aware of NFA weapons being made or brought into their jurisdictions and would not have the opportunity to alert federal authorities or state permitting authorities about the suitability or dangerousness of those seeking to possess such weapons. It also means local law enforcement agencies would not know which individuals in their jurisdictions possess NFA weapons when agencies are, for example, serving warrants or responding to domestic violence calls. Eliminating CLEO notification would, in the NSSF's own words, be "sacrificing security" and putting law enforcement and communities at greater risk.

With respect to process, ATF appears to have prejudged the outcome of the notice-and-comment process, as ATF already published information collection requests on October 30, 2025, that proposed altering ATF forms to remove CLEO notification requirements "in anticipation of upcoming regulatory changes."²⁴ Thus, it seems that ATF has made its decision on this matter before considering any views and comments ATF might receive during the notice-and-comment rulemaking process from law enforcement and others involved in protecting public safety. This disregard for the comment submission process stands in stark contrast to the thorough and transparent process ATF undertook after it received NFATCA's petition for rulemaking in 2009, which included issuing a proposed rule in 2013 and issuing a final rule in 2016 after considering and incorporating extensive feedback received from thousands of commenters. Furthermore, ATF declares in this NPRM that "ATF has no information that the CLEO notification meaningfully aids criminal investigations or serves a significant purpose for law enforcement," but in the same NPRM ATF appears to concede that it has not yet actually sought this information from CLEOs and "encourages public comments from CLEOs on whether these notices provide a benefit to them."²⁵ The views of law enforcement, public safety officials, and other stakeholders on this matter should be fully considered and respected before ATF makes any final decision to change the decades-long requirement that CLEOs be notified when NFA weapons are introduced into their communities.

Substantively, the risks that ATF's plan to eliminate CLEO notification would create to officer safety and to the public outweigh any benefits of the plan. As the NPRM shows, the historical number of NFA applications and CLEO notifications more than tripled between 2015 and 2024, meaning that there are a growing number of NFA weapons present in local communities and a growing likelihood that when law enforcement must interact with a member of the community, that person may possess an NFA weapon.²⁶ It is minimally burdensome for CLEOs to receive notification about the making or transfer of NFA weapons in their jurisdictions, and that information may prove life-saving for law enforcement to know in advance of a potential confrontation. When the CLEO's agency must respond to a domestic violence call, serve a warrant, carry out an extreme risk protection order, or otherwise interact

²⁴ 90 Fed. Reg. 48901, 48902, 48904.

²⁵ 91 Fed. Reg. 24473.

²⁶ 91 Fed. Reg. 24474.

with a community member in a potentially confrontational situation, it is relevant and important for that law enforcement agency to know beforehand if that person possesses an NFA weapon. NFA weapons, such as short-barreled rifles and silencers, can significantly elevate the danger to law enforcement of responding to domestic violence calls, serving warrants, and other similar interactions. For example, last year three law enforcement officers were shot and killed and two others were wounded as they tried to serve a warrant during a domestic violence investigation in North Codorus Township, Pennsylvania. The gunman reportedly fired upon the officers using an AR-15-style rifle with a silencer.²⁷

In addition to the threats that NFA weapons pose to law enforcement officers, NFA weapons also pose an elevated risk of harm to public safety. Machineguns and destructive devices have dramatically enhanced capacity to cause mass death and harm in a short time frame. Weapons like disguised firearms and short-barreled rifles and shotguns combine firepower and concealability in a way that leaves targets and law enforcement particularly vulnerable to surprise attacks. And silencers make it more difficult for both law enforcement and bystanders to recognize gunfire and determine the location of the shooter by suppressing the sound of gunshots and masking muzzle flash. A recent Everytown analysis found that silencers have been used in over 100 violent incidents and planned attacks and over 400 federal cases involving serious crimes, and eight states and D.C. have banned silencers altogether in light of the dangers they pose.²⁸ The more time it takes law enforcement officers to learn of and respond to gunshots, the more time a shooter has to cause harm or to escape.²⁹ Short-barreled rifles and shotguns, disguised guns, and silencers also reduce the likelihood that there will be witnesses to a shooting and actionable intelligence for law enforcement to act on in an investigation. The risks that these NFA weapons pose to law enforcement and to the public are why the NFA has sought to ensure that only known and vetted persons have access to such weapons.

There is simply no compelling justification for ATF to go out of its way to cut local law enforcement off from receiving notifications about NFA making and transfer applications which have been provided to CLEOs for decades. The current CLEO notification requirement is valuable for law enforcement and minimally burdensome for applicants: all applicants have to do is simply send in a copy of a form that they are already required by law to complete. ATF notes in the NPRM that some CLEOs have expressed confusion about what to do with notifications they receive, but the rational response to that confusion would be to provide clarifying guidance for those CLEOs rather than cutting off notifications for all CLEOs, including those who find the notifications valuable for law enforcement and public safety.³⁰ CLEO notification also has not slowed down the processing of NFA applications. In fact, processing times have shortened dramatically in recent years, and ATF reported that in March 2026, the processing of an

²⁷ Rhian Luvin, "[Rural Pennsylvania horror: Suspect named after three cops shot dead and two wounded while serving a warrant](#)," The Independent, Sept. 18, 2025.

²⁸ Everytown report, "[Quiet Killers](#)," June 11, 2025; the states are California, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York and Rhode Island.

²⁹ For example, in February 2013, a gunman used silencers to shoot and kill four, including two police officers, and wound several others in a 10-day shooting spree targeting law enforcement in Southern California. The silencers helped the gunman avoid witnesses, evade detection, and ambush police several times during the spree, including when he used an AR-15 with a silencer to fire 29 shots at one police car and 13 shots at another. See Police Foundation, "Southern California Law Enforcement Response to the Attacks by Christopher Dorner," (2025), <https://www.policinginstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Police-Under-Attack.pdf>.

³⁰ 91 Fed. Reg. 24475.

electronically submitted Form 4 took a mere six days.³¹ Additionally, Congress has repeatedly emphasized the importance of strengthening communication between federal, state, and local law enforcement in situations where a person's prohibited status as a firearm possessor may pose a danger, such as with the enactment of the bipartisan NICS Denial Notification Act in 2022.³² But this new proposed rule would take a significant step backward in keeping law enforcement agencies apprised of critical information that helps protect the safety of their officers and the communities they serve.

This proposed rule must also be viewed in the context of other recent proposals ATF has put forward to loosen regulations implementing the NFA. For example, ATF is currently proposing to authorize spouses to file joint applications to make or transfer a firearm under the NFA, including allowing individuals who currently have an NFA firearm registered to themselves to add their spouse to the registration.³³ If this proposed joint spousal rule were finalized, it would heighten the importance of requiring that CLEOs receive copies of the joint forms before ATF approves them, as local CLEO notification would provide an additional check to help ensure ATF is made aware of any history of domestic abuse incidents or arrests and the possibility of coercion among spouses that file a joint application or registration. Similarly, in the event a jointly registered spouse becomes prohibited from firearm possession under federal, state, or local law and local law enforcement must then take action to remove firearms accessible to that spouse, CLEO notification would make sure local law enforcement is aware of the jointly owned NFA weapons before undertaking that enforcement action. Also, ATF is currently proposing to loosen regulations governing interstate transportation of NFA weapons by owners, allowing owners to transport the weapons for periods of less than one year without receiving advance approval from ATF.³⁴ Elimination of the CLEO notification along with the adoption of this more permissive interstate transport standard would mean that law enforcement agencies in both the NFA weapon owner's home and destination jurisdictions would have less awareness of the potential presence and movement of NFA weapons if an investigation of, or potential confrontation with, the weapon owner is needed.

Additionally, this proposed rule that would eliminate CLEO notification for makings and transfers of NFA weapons is difficult to square with ATF's pending proposed rule that would expand the availability of non-over-the-counter ("NOTC") transfers of all firearms, including non-NFA firearms, while preserving the requirement that such transfers be reported to the CLEO of the transferee's jurisdiction of residence.³⁵ While we recognize that the CLEO notification requirement for NOTC transfers is statutorily required,³⁶ it would nonetheless be incongruous for federal law to require CLEO notification for NOTC transfers of NFA weapons and not for other NFA weapons transfers. Furthermore, it would be hard to justify from a public safety and officer safety standpoint why federal law would require that CLEOs be made aware of certain transfers of non-NFA weapons while preventing CLEOs from being informed about certain transfers of NFA weapons, which Congress has determined to be particularly dangerous.

³¹ [ATF Current Processing Times](#), Average Processing Times for Applications finalized in March 2026, viewed on May 17, 2026.

³² See 18 U.S.C. § 925B (requiring that local law enforcement be notified within 24 hours of firearm purchase attempts that result in a denial by the NICS background check system).

³³ 91 Fed. Reg. 25243.

³⁴ 91 Fed. Reg. 25229.

³⁵ 91 Fed. Reg. 25216.

³⁶ 18 U.S.C. § 922(c)(2).

In short, the proposed rule elevates the risk of serious harm to law enforcement officers and communities for little apparent benefit, and seeks to do so using a pre-judged process where ATF apparently made the decision to eliminate the notification requirement before even considering the views of the public safety stakeholders who are most affected.

IV. Conclusion

As ATF has acknowledged, “NFA weapons are dangerous weapons that can empower a single individual to take many lives in a single incident.”³⁷ For nearly a century, laws have been on the books to carefully regulate and monitor NFA weapons to make sure that they are only in the possession of those who are known, vetted, and trusted to possess those weapons responsibly. But under the new proposed rule, state and local law enforcement will be cut out of the NFA notification loop entirely, depriving them of information that helps them keep their officers and their communities safe.

State and local law enforcement have been, and must continue to be, made aware of and involved in the process of ensuring that NFA weapons are not provided to dangerous persons in their communities. Eliminating the CLEO notification requirement across the board for all NFA weapons, including fully automatic machineguns, short-barreled rifles and shotguns that are easily concealed, firearms disguised as objects such as umbrellas or canes, and destructive devices such as grenades, would deprive these law enforcement agencies of knowing when and where such dangerous weapons are being made or brought into their communities. This puts law enforcement at unnecessary increased risk, especially when law enforcement is called upon to confront a person in a location where an NFA weapon may be present.

For the sake of our law enforcement officers and our communities, ATF must withdraw the proposed rule and maintain the CLEO notification requirement for makings and transfers of NFA weapons.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

Sincerely,

/s/ Justin Wagner

Justin Wagner
Senior Vice President for Law & Policy
Everytown for Gun Safety Support Fund

³⁷ 81 Fed. Reg. 2669.