

greatest value for reemployment outcomes for customers. This, in turn, may point to potential new system designs to improve IT partnerships.

Request for Public Comments

ETA is soliciting input from its stakeholders and the public on any or all of the following categories of information and questions. Response to this request for comments is voluntary. Respondents do not need to address every category or question and may elect to focus their comments on those categories and questions that relate to their expertise or perspective. To the extent possible, please clearly indicate the question(s) addressed in your response. We ask that each respondent include the name and street address of his or her institution or affiliation, if any, and the name, title, email address, and telephone number of a contact person for his or her institution or affiliation, if any.

Questions

As noted above, this Request seeks information concerning any or all of the following categories of information and questions, if applicable:

Operations Process Analysis

1. Information related to the largest operational obstacles that stakeholders encounter when helping jobseekers who might need the supports of more than one program.

a. In particular, what are the largest operational obstacles faced by these stakeholders and jobseekers?

b. What, if anything, has limited coordination and service delivery across programs?

c. In what ways do you believe that technology can best help to alleviate those obstacles?

Technology Implementations

2. Information on areas in which states, territories, or local areas have taken steps to align technology and data systems across programs. In particular, ETA is interested in:

a. How many or which partner programs the efforts have encompassed, among any DOL-funded programs, AJC partner programs, or other public benefit or career advancement programs;

b. Whether the efforts have included comprehensive case management systems integration;

c. Whether the efforts have included agile development solutions that create interoperability among existing systems and leverage modularity, application programming interfaces (APIs), open source technologies and micro services architecture.

d. Where efforts have included full integration with Unemployment Insurance systems;

e. Where human-centered design was integrated into the technology solution;

f. Where system-wide analytic capabilities have been realized;

g. Whether and in what form barriers have prevented success; and

h. Any lessons learned in the process.

3. If full integration of a case management solution across all employment, income maintenance, and career advancement-related programs could not be realized to start, what subset of programs would it make the most sense to align?

Functionality (System Level)

4. In contemplating IT solutions, what functionality and flexibilities would be important to include and why?

5. What functionality would be most important to include to allow for the IT solution to continue to expand and add value to program partners and customers?

Capabilities (User Level Requirements)

6. At an individual user level, what system capabilities would provide a superior customer-centric, outcome driven case management experience as compared to current experiences?

7. What capabilities would generate the most value for program partners and customers?

8. While keeping the burden on the beneficiary as low as possible, what data would an ideal system collect?

Particularly data that would increase our understanding of the impacts of such a system and underlying benefits on under-resourced communities?

Other

9. Preliminary state feedback suggests that an integrated case management solution, as an option for states to leverage and focus across program partners as they see fit, would add the most value in terms of addressing existing technology gaps as well as promote better outcomes for customers. ETA seeks feedback on this initial analysis, including:

a. From your perspective, would an integrated case management solution add value to your program operations, and if so how?

b. What are the pros and cons of a model where a Federal agency or agencies support(s) building a system with a consortium of states, and makes it available to others via open source?

c. What are the pros and cons of a model where a Federal agency or agencies coordinate(s) a system framework and states or local areas can

operate modules within that larger framework?

d. Whether there are other IT gaps or solutions, which would potentially generate more value across programs, for which ETA should analyze solution options?

10. The total cost estimate that a state/territory currently spends to maintain its case management system annually.

a. Is that annual cost for a single module or for an integrated systems across multiple partner programs?

11. Any other general comments not covered above related to comprehensive IT solutions across partner programs.

Suzan G. LeVine,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Labor.

[FR Doc. 2021-10867 Filed 5-21-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

Notice of a Change in Status of the Extended Benefit (EB) Program for Pennsylvania

AGENCY: Employment and Training Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

This notice announces a change in benefit period eligibility under the EB program that has occurred since the publication of the last notice regarding the State's EB status:

- Based on the data submitted by Pennsylvania for the week reflecting April 24, 2021, the state no longer meets the criteria necessary to remain triggered "on" the EB program. The states' 13-week insured unemployment rate (IUR) remains above 5.0 percent, however the 13-week IUR is less than 120 percent of the average 13-week rate of the prior two years during the corresponding 13-week period. Therefore the payable period in EB for Pennsylvania will end on May 15, 2021.

The trigger notice covering state eligibility for the EB program can be found at: http://ows.doleta.gov/unemploy/claims_arch.as.

Information for Claimants

The duration of benefits payable in the EB program, and the terms and conditions on which they are payable, are governed by the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, as amended, and the operating instructions issued to the states by the U.S. Department of Labor. In the case of a state beginning an EB

period, the State Workforce Agency will furnish a written notice of potential entitlement to each individual who has exhausted all rights to regular benefits and is potentially eligible for EB (20 CFR 615.13 (c)(1)).

Persons who believe they may be entitled to EB, or who wish to inquire about their rights under the program, should contact their State Workforce Agency.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Unemployment Insurance Room S-4524, Attn: Thomas Stengle, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20210, telephone number (202) 693-2991 (this is not a toll-free number) or by email: Stengle.Thomas@dol.gov.

Signed in Washington, DC.

Suzan G. LeVine,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training.

[FR Doc. 2021-10873 Filed 5-21-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FW-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mine Safety and Health Administration

Petitions for Modification of Application of Existing Mandatory Safety Standards

AGENCY: Mine Safety and Health Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice includes the summaries of three petitions for modification submitted to the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) by the party listed below.

DATES: All comments on the petitions must be received by MSHA's Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances on or before June 23, 2021.

ADDRESSES: You may submit your comments including the docket number of the petition by any of the following methods:

1. *Electronic Mail:* zzMSHA-comments@dol.gov. Include the docket number of the petition in the subject line of the message.
2. *Facsimile:* 202-693-9441.
3. *Regular Mail or Hand Delivery:* MSHA, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, 201 12th Street South, Suite 4E401, Arlington, Virginia 22202-5452, Attention: S. Aromie Noe, Acting Deputy Director, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances. Persons delivering documents are required to check in at the receptionist's desk in Suite 4E401.

Individuals may inspect copies of the petition and comments during normal business hours at the address listed above.

MSHA will consider only comments postmarked by the U.S. Postal Service or proof of delivery from another delivery service such as UPS or Federal Express on or before the deadline for comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: S. Aromie Noe, Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances at 202-693-9440 (voice), noe.song-ae.a@dol.gov (email), or 202-693-9441 (facsimile). [These are not toll-free numbers.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 and Title 30 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 44 govern the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for modification.

I. Background

Section 101(c) of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (Mine Act) allows the mine operator or representative of miners to file a petition to modify the application of any mandatory safety standard to a coal or other mine if the Secretary of Labor determines that:

1. An alternative method of achieving the result of such standard exists which will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded the miners of such mine by such standard; or
2. The application of such standard to such mine will result in a diminution of safety to the miners in such mine.

In addition, sections 44.10 and 44.11 of 30 CFR establish the requirements for filing petitions for modification.

II. Petitions for Modification

Docket Number: M-2021-007-C.

Petitioner: Mountain Coal Company, L.L.C., 5174 Highway 133, Somerset, Colorado (ZIP 81434).

Mine: West Elk Mine, MSHA ID No. 05-03672, located in Gunnison County, Colorado.

Regulation Affected: 30 CFR 75.507-1(a) (Electric equipment other than power-connection points; outby the last open crosscut; return air; permissibility requirements).

Modification Request: The petitioner requests a modification of the existing standard, 30 CFR 75.507-1(a), as it relates to the use of an alternative method of respirable dust protection for longwall miners at the West Elk Mine in Colorado. Specifically, the petitioner is applying to use the battery-powered 3M Versaflo TR-800 Respirator in return air outby the last open crosscut.

The petitioner states that:

(a) The current 3M Airstream Powered Air Purifying Respirator (PAPR), mining Headgear-Mounted model, is approved by MSHA but has been discontinued by the manufacturer, 3M. The 3M Airstream model allows for constantly filtered air to flow, reducing exposure to respirable dust.

(b) There are no other MSHA-approved PAPRs.

(c) The 3M Versaflo TR-800 PAPR is intrinsically safe and certified under ANSI/UL 60079-11 standard for hazardous locations.

(d) The 3M Versaflo TR-800 PAPR allows for increased movement in tight spaces, while protecting against dust contamination. It is easy to use. It, has interchangeable components for specific applications, audible and visual alarms for restricted flow, a multi speed blower, and long run battery times. It charges quickly.

The petitioner proposes the following alternative method:

(a) The petitioner will use the 3M Versaflo TR-800 PAPR in or inby the last open crosscut to protect miners from exposure to respirable dust during regular longwall mining operations.

(b) When not in operation, batteries for the PAPR will be charged on the surface or underground in intake air and not within 150 feet of a worked out area.

(c) Batteries will be inspected and changed at the surface or underground in intake air.

(d) Battery charging products used will be the 3M TR-641N or the 3M 4-station battery charger TR-644N.

(e) The 3M Versaflo TR-800 will exclusively use the 3M TR-830 battery pack.

(f) Before beginning use, miners will be trained on how to safely use, care for, and inspect 3M Versaflo TR-800 PAPR units per the manufacturer's instructions.

(g) The 3M Versaflo TR-800 will be assessed for physical damage and integrity of the unit's case before each use.

(h) The product will not be used if a methane level is found to be at or above 1.0 percent. If methane levels are higher than 1.0 percent, the equipment will immediately be de-energized and withdrawn from affected areas.

(i) The product will not be used in continuous miner sections alongside proximity detection systems.

The petitioner asserts that the alternate method proposed will at all times guarantee no less than the same measure of protection afforded the miners under the mandatory standard.

Docket Number: M-2021-008-C.