8. *Factors Affecting Delegation:* Should PAS designation include limits or factors (such as the magnitude of the declared disaster or the number of open events) that would affect the level of State responsibility granted by FEMA? If so, what should these limits or factors be?

9. *EHP Requirements and Responsibilities Under PAS:* FEMA seeks input from States and other stakeholders as to which EHP responsibilities should be delegated to States under applicable Federal law. For instance:

a. Should States be able to initiate communication with appropriate agencies such as the USFWS, USACE, or State regulatory agencies (for instance, the State or Tribal Historic Preservation Office) for the purposes of identifying potential project environmental impacts or other considerations within these agencies' jurisdiction?

b. Should States be delegated the responsibility to collect information necessary for performing categorical exclusions and the eight-step floodplain or wetland analyses?

c. Could the States, rather than FEMA, engage other Federal agencies to streamline unified review where possible?

d. What abilities and resources are needed to assume these types of responsibilities?

e. What guidance from FEMA would States need to assume these or other similar EHP responsibilities?

f. What methods or processes from other Federal programs should be considered?

g. Are there existing State processes that perform a similar function?

10. *Performance Evaluation:* FEMA seeks input on criteria to assess performance of those States that receive PAS designations (e.g., grants management, technical and engineering feasibility, cost effectiveness, plan requirements, and EHP responsibilities and requirements):

a. What elements/metrics should be used in this assessment?

b. How frequently should FEMA assess a State's performance under PAS (quarterly, annually, 3 years, 5 years, or other)?

c. What measures should FEMA use to address or correct deficiencies in performance?

d. What level of monitoring or oversight should FEMA use to assess compliance with Federal EHP requirements?

11. *Program Evaluation:* How could the analysis of program benefits (economic, environmental, public health and safety, equity) justifying program costs be an indicator of state performance?

12. *Significant Non-compliance:* FEMA seeks input on what would constitute a significant non-compliance deficiency warranting temporary withdrawal or full termination of PAS designation. Areas of concern include subgrant eligibility determinations, cost effectiveness reviews, grant management, plan requirements, and EHP responsibilities and requirements. Under what circumstances should failure to meet requirements and responsibilities established by FEMA result in removal of a PAS designation? What criteria should FEMA consider using for PAS reinstatement? What other remedies should FEMA consider if a PAS jurisdiction fails to comply with Program requirements?

13. *Electronic Systems:* What, if any, are the States' concerns regarding the use of existing FEMA grant reporting and management electronic systems (such as NEMIS) when mandated for PAS participation?

14. *Participation:* What factors could FEMA consider and use to facilitate and encourage State participation in PAS?

15. *Tribal Considerations:* What factors should FEMA consider and use to encourage Tribal participation in PAS? What are the potential challenges for Tribes in applying for and maintaining PAS designation?

16. *Challenges and Resources:* What are the potential challenges for States in maintaining PAS designation (such as keeping key personnel, covering multiple disaster and recovery needs, or liability concerns)? What resources do States need to successfully implement PAS (management cost support, training, guidance, job-aids, or other resources)?

17. *Program Participants Impacts:* How would program participants be impacted when their State administers HMGP under a PAS designation? What are the potential benefits (increased access to funding, decreased duplication, faster obligation of funding, or other benefits)? What are the potential costs (e.g., increased time and paperwork, longer obligation timeframes)?

18. *State Impacts:* How would States be impacted by administering HMGP under a PAS designation? What are the potential benefits? What are the potential costs?

19. *State Interest:* For FEMA's State, Indian Tribal government and Territory stakeholders: Would your State or Tribe consider applying for the PAS option for your next disaster declaration?

20. *Overall Effect:* Do you think PAS would be beneficial in streamlining the provision of funding under the HMGP? Do you think PAS would be beneficial in implementing more effective hazard mitigation projects? If so, how?

IV. Conclusion

Comments most helpful to FEMA will address one or more of the questions identified above, and will include a detailed explanation of the commenter's views. FEMA also invites comments that relate to the economic, environmental, or federalism effects that commenters believe might result from any PAS program implementation model. All comments received will be considered by FEMA in designing future PAS program implementation regulations.

Dated: March 6, 2014.

W. Craig Fugate,

Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

[FR Doc. 2014–05437 Filed 3–11–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110–13–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 0, 4, and 12

[PS Docket Nos. 13–75 and 11–60; Report No. 3001]

Petition for Reconsideration of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Petition for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: In this document, a Motion for Clarification or, In the Alternative, Petition for Partial Reconsideration (Petition) has been filed in the Commission's Rulemaking proceeding by Intrado, Inc., on behalf of itself and its affiliate, Intrado Communications, Inc.

DATES: Oppositions to the Petition must be filed on or before March 27, 2014. Replies to an opposition must be filed on or before April 7, 2014.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric P. Schmidt, Attorney Advisor, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, (202) 418–1214 or *eric.schmidt@fcc.gov<mailto:eric.schmidt@fcc.gov.>*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of Commission's document, Report No. 3001, released February 27, 2014. The full text of Report No. 3001 is available for viewing and copying in

Room CY–B402, 445 12th Street SW., Washington, DC or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc. (BCPI) (1–800–378–3160).

Subject: Improving 9–1–1 Reliability; Reliability and Continuity of Communications Networks, Including Broadband Technologies, FCC 13–158, published at 79 FR 3123, January 17, 2014 and at 79 FR 7589, February 10, 2014, in PS Docket Nos. 13–75 and 11–60. Published pursuant to 47 CFR 1.429(e). *See* § 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rules.

Number of Petitions Filed: 1.

Federal Communications Commission.

Marlene H. Dortch,

Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Office of Managing Director.

[FR Doc. 2014–05261 Filed 3–11–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–P