available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

Dated: May 12, 1999.

**William E. Burrow,**

*Acting Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

*Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs*

*Type of Review:* Extension.

*Title:* Applications for Grants under Emergency Immigrant Education Program.

*Frequency:* Annually.

*Affected Public:* State, local or Tribal Gov't, SEAs or LEAs.

*Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden:*
Responses: 57.
Burden Hours: 9,177.

*Abstract:* This application is used by State educational agencies to apply for formula grants authorized under the Emergency Immigrant Education Act (Title VI of Pub. L. 98–511 as amended by Pub. L. 103–382).

[FR Doc. 99–12432 Filed 5–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation Policy Proposed Subsequent Arrangement

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Subsequent Arrangement.

**SUMMARY:** This notice is being issued under the authority of Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2160). The Department is providing notice of a proposed ''subsequent arrangement'' under the Agreement for Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy Between the United States of America and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil Concerning Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.

This subsequent arrangement concerns the approval of RTD/BR(EU)–10 which involves the retransfer of nuclear components in the form of a secondary neutron source from Germany to Brazil for use in the Angra-2 nuclear power plant. The secondary neutron source, specially designed for use in nuclear reactors, contains 1,400 U.S.-origin antimony beryllium pellets.

The Federative Republic of Brazil has provided assurances that these components will only be used in the Angra-2 nuclear power plant and that the components will not be retransferred to the jurisdiction of any other nation or group of nations without prior consent of the United States.

In accordance with Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, we have determined that this subsequent arrangement will not be inimical to the common defense and security.

This subsequent arrangement will take effect no sooner than fifteen days after the date of publication of this notice.

For the Department of Energy.

Dated: May 12, 1999.

**Edward T. Fei,**

*Deputy Director, International Policy and Analysis Division, Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation.*

[FR Doc. 99–12499 Filed 5–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Withdrawal of Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Transfer of Certain Operations From the Department of Energy (DOE) Mound Site

**AGENCY:** Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice of withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** On October 2, 1998, DOE announced its intent to prepare an EIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the proposed transfer of the Heat Source/Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generator (HS/RTG) operations at the Mound Site near Miamisburg, Ohio, to an alternative DOE site. The Mound Site was to be cleaned up and eventually turned into an industrial park. However, after additional studies, the Secretary of Energy announced on March 22, 1999, that DOE has now decided to cancel the proposal to transfer these operations. Therefore, DOE is withdrawing its Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. The decision not to pursue the proposed transfer of the HS/RTG operations from the Mound Site does not affect DOE's ongoing NEPA review of the proposed production of plutonium-238 for use in advanced radioisotope power systems for future space missions.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For general and technical information associated with the HS/RTG assembly and test operations at the Mound Site, please contact: Timothy A. Frazier, U.S. Department of Energy, P.O. Box 66, Miamisburg, OH 45343–0066. Telephone: (937) 865–3748; facsimile (937) 865–4219; electronic mail: *Tim.Frazier@OHIO.DOE.GOV.*

For general information on the DOE NEPA process, please contact: Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance, EH–42, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585–0119. Telephone: (202) 586–4600 or leave a message on (800) 472–2756.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Mound Site, located in Miamisburg, Ohio, was established in 1946 as part of the Atomic Energy Commission. For the past 35 years, DOE (or its predecessor) has been developing HS/RTGs at the Mound Site and supplying them to user agencies. Until the early 1990s, the Mound Site also manufactured critical nuclear weapons components. The site is currently being environmentally restored under a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liabilities Act (CERCLA) § 120 Agreement. DOE and its site restoration contractor had planned to complete the environmental restoration and exit the site, including the HS/RTG operations, by February 2003. DOE believed that leaving the HS/RTG operations at Mound by itself may not have been feasible for various programmatic reasons or cost effective.

On October 2, 1998, the DOE published in the **Federal Register** a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in compliance with the NEPA for the proposed transfer of the HS/RTG operations at the Mound Site to an alternative DOE site. Six public scoping meetings were held in November 1998 in the vicinity of the Mound Site and the following alternative locations: Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN; Pantex Plant, near Amarillo, TX; Hanford Site, Richland, WA; Nevada Test Site, near Las Vegas, NV; and Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID. The Draft EIS was in the initial stage of preparation.

DOE has decided to withdraw the proposal to transfer the HS/RTG assembly and test operations from the Mound Site. The decision to withdraw the proposal is based on a detailed cost analysis of alternate site proposals and several additional reviews by various departmental elements to determine the reasonableness and acceptability of maintaining the HS/RTG assembly and test operations at the Mound Site. The cost analysis indicated that the Department would not realize cost savings by transferring the HS/RTG assembly and test operations from the Mound Site. The review by various