authorized users (AU), and Radiation Safety Officers (RSO) are sufficient to assure that the radiation safety of the public, patients, human research subjects, and workers is maintained. Therefore, we deleted the requirement for an examination from all the training and experience sections. Instead of an examination, we will rely on the preceptor's certification that an individual has completed the required training and experience and has achieved a level of competency sufficient to function independently as an AMP, ANP, AU, or RSO.

Further, under the revised 10 CFR part 35, NRC will continue to rely on health care professionals who are required to meet certain NRC training and experience criteria to protect the health and safety of the public and patients.

The NRC staff has already responded to Requested Action 5 regarding the structure of regulations for the medical use of byproduct material in nuclear medicine (i.e., there are different requirements for training of AU's under §§ 35.100, 35.200 and 35.300) in SECY–00–0118, Attachment 6, **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**, III. Summary of Public Comments and Responses to Comments, Part II—General Issues, E. *Training and experience,* 2. Training and experience—unsealed byproduct material, *Issue 5,* as follows:

The NRC recognizes that there is a certain degree of basic radiation safety knowledge that is common among all the types of use, e.g., use of the decay formula and decontamination techniques. However, we also believe that there are some basic differences between the uses of byproduct material under §§ 35.100, 35.200, and 35.300 that warrant additional training and experience, e.g., increased potential for exposures in excess of part 20 limits and the potential for adverse biological effects. For example, AUs [authorized users] handling byproduct material for imaging and localization studies, as compared to uptake, dilution, and excretion studies, are generally handling larger quantities and many different radionuclides. Also, AUs meeting the training and experience requirements in § 35.190 are not authorized to prepare radioactive drugs using generators and reagent kits, but AUs under § 35.290 are authorized to prepare drugs using generators and reagent kits. Finally, AUs under § 35.390 are handling material in quantities that can cause deterministic effects.

The NRC staff has already addressed the cost figures (i.e., over $100,000,000/year to $1 billion/year) presented by the petitioners in SECY–00–0118, Attachment 6, **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**, III. Summary of Public Comments and Responses to Comments, Part II—General Issues, G. *Costs of the revision, Issue 5,* as follows:

In evaluating the costs of regulatory compliance and implementation, the NRC has used detailed information whenever it is available. We have sought data from a number of sources, including medical speciality groups, manufacturers, members of the ACMUI, the National Institutes of Health, and various published sources. However, certain necessary data are treated as proprietary. Other data are not collected or are available only in a disaggregated form. Many of the compliance costs will vary substantially from licensee to licensee, depending on the number and type of modalities and procedures that they use and perform. Other compliance costs will be dependent on numerous interrelated variables. We believe that an effort to collect the necessary data and/or develop necessary models to provide substitutes for missing or unavailable data would require very considerable time and expense. We are concerned that at the conclusion of such an effort, because of many remaining gaps and uncertainties in the underlying data, an estimate of the total cost of the regulations would still fall within such broad confidence bounds that it would be fundamentally flawed.

In addition, the NRC has prepared a regulatory analysis for the final rule which shows a net *decrease* in the cost to licensees of implementing the final rule as compared to the current rule. NRC has also submitted an estimate of the cost associated with the recordkeeping and reporting to OMB for its approval. This document, currently under review by OMB, shows a decrease of approximately 30 percent in costs associated with the recordkeeping and reporting requirements as compared to the current part 35.

For the reasons cited in this document, the NRC denies the petition in its entirety.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 16th day of April, 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Annette Vietti-Cook,**

*Secretary of the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 01–9824 Filed 4–19–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590–01–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

## Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight

## 12 CFR Part 1710

**RIN 2550–AA20**

## Corporate Governance

**AGENCY:** Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, HUD.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO) is withdrawing its notice of proposed rulemaking on Corporate Governance that was published in the **Federal Register** on April 10, 2001. The proposal is withdrawn at this time due to the possible confusion it could create as to the standards applicable to anticipated appointees to the Boards of Directors of the Enterprises.

**DATES:** The proposed rule published on April 10, 2001 (66 FR 18709) is withdrawn as of April 20, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Alfred M. Pollard, General Counsel, telephone (202) 414–3788 (not a toll-free number); Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Fourth Floor, 1700 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20552. The telephone number for the Telecommunications Device for the Deaf is (800) 877–8339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On April 10, 2001, the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight proposed a regulation to set forth minimum requirements with respect to corporate governance policies and procedures of the Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (collectively the Enterprises). The proposed rule would, among other things, delineate the legal role and responsibilities of the members of the board of directors of the respective Enterprises. In light of the anticipated appointment by the President of the United States of new members to the boards of each Enterprise, the proposed rule is withdrawn at this time as likely to result in untimely confusion for the appointees as to the standards applicable to their positions. OFHEO anticipates reissuing the proposal. OFHEO requests that preparation and filing of any comments on the withdrawn proposal be withheld pending such reissuance.

### Withdrawal of Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Accordingly, for reasons stated in the preamble, the notice of proposed rulemaking that was published in the **Federal Register** on April 10, 2001 (66 FR 18709) is withdrawn.

Dated: April 16, 2001.

**Armando Falcon, Jr.,**

*Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.*

[FR Doc. 01–9788 Filed 4–19–01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4220–01–P**