today's **Federal Register**, HUD provides specific POCs at HUD's Home Ownership Centers (HOCs) that holders of liens on HUD single family property may use to present requests for payment. The publication and use of these POCs by the public should help obviate the need for litigation to enforce non-payment of liens against FHA properties. This interpretive rule provides the process for initiating suit against FHA if for some reason payment is not made and the taxing authority or other entity has a lien that it seeks to foreclose.

# B. HOC POCs

Ancillary to the interpretive rule, HUD is providing POCs in each of its four HOCs to receive tax bills and similar billings. Each HOC oversees on average 13 states/jurisdictions for FHA activities and has an REO division that handles the day-to-day oversight of FHA's acquired properties. In most cases, having a known POC to send billings should obviate the need to have to bring suit against HUD to levy on a property.

### C. Jurisdiction

In the unlikely event it becomes necessary for a taxing authority or HOA, CA or special assessment entity to proceed against HUD's property, this interpretive rule explains the exclusive federal jurisdiction for such an action. Section 1 title I, of the NHA provides a limited waiver of sovereign immunity. Under that provision: "[T]he Secretary shall, in carrying out the functions of this title and titles II, III . . . be authorized, in his official capacity, to sue and be sued in any court of *competent jurisdiction*, State or Federal." (Underlining is provided for emphasis). This section was added to the NHA by the Banking Act of 1935, sec. 334, Title III, Public Law 74-305, 49 Stat. 684, approved August 23, 1935). In 1972, Congress passed the Quiet Title Act (QTA) (Pub. L. 92-562, 86 Stat. 1176). The QTA made two changes to Title 28 of the United States Code, which title of the code governs the federal judicial system and judiciary procedures. First, the QTA created a new 28 U.S.C. 2409a, entitled "Real Property Quiet Title Actions.' Paragraph (a) of section 2409a states, "The United States may be named as a party defendant in a civil action under this section to adjudicate a disputed title to real property in which the United States claims an interest." Second, QTA amended 28 U.S.C. 1346,

entitled "United States as defendant" by adding a new paragraph (f), which states, "The district courts shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of civil actions under section 2409a to quiet title to an estate or interest in property in which an interest is claimed by the United States."

The Supreme Court succinctly explained the lack of jurisdiction in state courts and the exclusivity of federal court jurisdiction in QTA actions in *California* v. *Arizona*, 440 U.S. 59 (1979):

[T]he intent of Congress seems reasonably clear. The congressional purpose was simply to confine jurisdiction to the federal courts and to exclude the courts of the States, which otherwise might be presumed to have jurisdiction over quiet-title suits against the United States, once its sovereign immunity had been waived. . . . We find, therefore, that section 1346(f), by vesting 'exclusive original jurisdiction' of quiet title actions against the United States in the federal district courts did no more than assure that such jurisdiction was not conferred upon the courts of any State.

Federal courts have consistently held that 28 U.S.C. 2409a authorizes owners of an interest in real property in which an agency such as HUD holds an interest, including an ownership interest, to bring suit to foreclose the government's interest in the property. The QTA applies to lawsuits involving interests that could cloud title, not just traditional quiet title actions, as the terminology of the QTA by its terms includes any adjudication of a "disputed title" to real property. See, United States v. Bedford Associates, 657 F. 2d 1300, 1316 (2d Cir. 1981), cert. den. 456 U.S. 914 (1982); Robinson v. United States, 586 F. 3d 683, 687 (9th Cir. 2009); Delta Sav. & Loan Ass'n. v. I.R.S., 847 F. 2d 248, 249 n. 1 (5th Cir. 1988); George v. United States, 672 F. 3d 942 (10th Cir. 2012), cert. den. 133 S. Ct. 432, U.S. , 2012 U.S. LEXIS 7933 (2012).

### **III. This Interpretive Rule**

In order to have a uniform process that both the public and HUD can use, and which will ensure that HUD can act in a timely, accurate, and consistent manner to protect properties that are assets of the MMIF, it is HUD's interpretation that the sue and be sued clause in 12 U.S.C. 1702, specifically the words "court of competent jurisdiction" means, for purposes of foreclosing tax, HOA, CA, special assessment (i.e., for sidewalks, septic or water systems and the like), or similar fees and assessments that result in liens on HUD properties, the United States District Court in the jurisdiction where

the HUD property that is to be the subject of the lien foreclosure is situated or in Washington, DC. This interpretation is based on the provisions of the QTA, and the Supreme Court's analysis of the same in *California* v. *Arizona* and similar cases.

As the exclusive venue for foreclosing a lien on HUD-owned property is a United States District Court, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) must be followed. Rule 4(i) sets out the procedures to serve Federal agencies. Under that rule, the head of the agency or his or her designee must be served, as well as the United States Attorney General and the United States Attorney in the applicable district. HUD, by separate notice in today's Federal **Register**, pursuant to previously published delegations of authority, authorizes Regional Counsel in each of HUD's 10 Regional Counsel Offices to redelegate to staff within their operational jurisdictions the authority to accept service of process in those cases where FHA owns a property, a taxing authority, HOA, CA, or other entity purports to bring suit due to a nonpayment of taxes or other fees and assessments, and the entity seeks to foreclose its lien in order to obtain title to the property.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Accordingly, HUD interprets the "sue and be sued" clause of section 1 of title 1 of the NHA as requiring suit to be brought exclusively in the Federal District Court where the property is located (or in the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia) if a lienholder wishes to enforce a lien against a single family property owned by HUD as the result of the payment of a mortgage insurance claim.

Dated: October 7, 2015.

#### Helen R. Kanovsky,

General Counsel. [FR Doc. 2015–26160 Filed 10–14–15; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

# PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

# 29 CFR Part 4022

# Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. ACTION: Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This final rule amends the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's regulation on Benefits Payable in

This interpretive rule is issued pursuant to these statutory mandates.

Terminated Single-Employer Plans to prescribe interest assumptions under the regulation for valuation dates in November 2015. The interest assumptions are used for paying benefits under terminating singleemployer plans covered by the pension insurance system administered by PBGC.

DATES: Effective November 1, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Catherine B. Klion (*Klion.Catherine@ pbgc.gov*), Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20005, 202–326– 4024. (TTY/TDD users may call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1–800– 877–8339 and ask to be connected to 202–326–4024.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: PBGC's regulation on Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans (29 CFR part 4022) prescribes actuarial assumptions—including interest assumptions—for paying plan benefits under terminating single-employer plans covered by title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974. The interest assumptions in the regulation are also published on PBGC's Web site (http://www.pbgc.gov).

PBGC uses the interest assumptions in appendix B to part 4022 to determine whether a benefit is payable as a lump sum and to determine the amount to pay. Appendix C to part 4022 contains interest assumptions for private-sector pension practitioners to refer to if they wish to use lump-sum interest rates determined using PBGC's historical methodology. Currently, the rates in appendices B and C of the benefit payment regulation are the same.

The interest assumptions are intended to reflect current conditions in the financial and annuity markets. Assumptions under the benefit payments regulation are updated monthly. This final rule updates the benefit payments interest assumptions for November 2015.<sup>1</sup>

The November 2015 interest assumptions under the benefit payments regulation will be 1.25 percent for the period during which a benefit is in pay status and 4.00 percent during any years preceding the benefit's placement in pay status. In comparison with the interest assumptions in effect for October 2015, these interest assumptions are unchanged.

PBGC has determined that notice and public comment on this amendment are impracticable and contrary to the public interest. This finding is based on the need to determine and issue new interest assumptions promptly so that the assumptions can reflect current market conditions as accurately as possible.

<sup>^</sup> Because of the need to provide immediate guidance for the payment of benefits under plans with valuation dates during November 2015, PBGC finds that good cause exists for making the assumptions set forth in this amendment effective less than 30 days after publication.

PBGC has determined that this action is not a "significant regulatory action" under the criteria set forth in Executive Order 12866.

Because no general notice of proposed rulemaking is required for this amendment, the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 does not apply. See 5 U.S.C. 601(2).

## List of Subjects in 29 CFR Part 4022

Employee benefit plans, Pension insurance, Pensions, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

In consideration of the foregoing, 29 CFR part 4022 is amended as follows:

# PART 4022—BENEFITS PAYABLE IN TERMINATED SINGLE-EMPLOYER PLANS

■ 1. The authority citation for part 4022 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 29 U.S.C. 1302, 1322, 1322b, 1341(c)(3)(D), and 1344.

■ 2. In appendix B to part 4022, Rate Set 265 is added to the table to read as follows:

### Appendix B to Part 4022—Lump Sum Interest Rates for PBGC Payments

\*

\* \*

Rate set	For plans with a valuation date		Immediate annuity rate	Deferred annuities (percent)					
	On or after	Before	(percent)	<i>i</i> 1	i <sub>2</sub>	i <sub>3</sub>	n <sub>i</sub>	<b>n</b> <sub>2</sub>	
*	*		*	*	*		*	*	
265	11–1–15	12–1–15	1.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	7	8	

■ 3. In appendix C to part 4022, Rate Set 265 is added to the table to read as follows:

# Appendix C to Part 4022—Lump Sum Interest Rates for Private-Sector Payments

\* \* \* \* \*

Rate set	For plans with a valuation date		Immediate annuity rate	Deferred annuities (percent)					
	On or after	Before	(percent)	<i>i</i> 1	<i>i</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>i</i> <sub>3</sub>	<i>n</i> <sub>1</sub>	<b>n</b> <sub>2</sub>	
*	*		*	*	*		*	*	
265	11–1–15	12–1–15	1.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	7	8	

#### <sup>1</sup> Appendix B to PBGC's regulation on Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans (29 CFR part 4044) prescribes interest assumptions for valuing

benefits under terminating covered single-employer plans for purposes of allocation of assets under

ERISA section 4044. Those assumptions are updated quarterly.

Issued in Washington, DC, on this 7th day of October 2015.

# Judith Starr,

General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. [FR Doc. 2015–26241 Filed 10–14–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7709–02–P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### **Coast Guard**

#### 33 CFR Part 165

[Docket Number USCG-2015-0809]

RIN 1625-AA00

### Safety Zone, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Oak Island, NC

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS. **ACTION:** Temporary final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone on the navigable waters of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway near Oak Island, North Carolina. This action is necessary to provide the safety of mariners on navigable waters due to the transfer of power cables across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. Entry into or movement within the safety zone during the enforcement period is prohibited without approval of the Captain of the Port.

**DATES:** This rule is effective without actual notice from October 15, 2015 until October 20, 2015. For the purposes of enforcement, actual notice will be used from October 12, 2015 until October 15, 2015.

**ADDRESSES:** Documents mentioned in this preamble are part of docket [USCG-2015-0809]. To view documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to http:// www.regulations.gov, type the docket number in the "SEARCH" box and click "SEARCH." Click on Open Docket Folder on the line associated with this rulemaking. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in Room W12–140 on the ground floor of the Department of Transportation West Building, 1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20590, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call or email LT Derek J. Burrill, Waterways Management Division Chief, Sector North Carolina, Coast Guard; telephone (910) 772–2230, email *Derek.J.Burrill@ uscg.mil.* If you have questions on viewing or submitting material to the docket, call Cheryl Collins, Program Manager, Docket Operations, telephone (202) 366–9826.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### **Table of Acronyms**

DHS Department of Homeland Security FR Federal Register NPRM Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

#### A. Regulatory History and Information

The Coast Guard is issuing this temporary final rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment pursuant to authority under section 4(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. 553(b)). This provision authorizes an agency to issue a rule without prior notice and opportunity to comment when the agency for good cause finds that those procedures are "impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest." Under 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(B), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for not publishing a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) with respect to this rule because final project details were not submitted to the Coast Guard until September 4, 2015. As such, it's impractical to provide a full comment period due to lack of time. Delaying the effective date for comment would be contrary to the public interest, since immediate action is needed to ensure protection of persons and vessels transiting the area.

For similar reasons, under 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3), the Coast Guard finds that good cause exists for making this rule effective less than 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register**. Due to the need for immediate action, the restriction of vessel traffic is necessary to protect life, property and the environment. Therefore, a 30-day notice is impracticable. The Coast Guard will provide advance notifications to users via marine information broadcasts and local notice to mariners.

#### **B. Basis and Purpose**

The legal basis for this rule is 33 U.S.C. 1231; 46 U.S.C. Chapter 701, 3306, 3703; 50 U.S.C. 191, 195; 33 CFR 1.05–1, 6.04–1, 6.04–6, 160.5; Public Law 107–295, 116 Stat. 2064; and DHS Delegation No. 0170.1. Under these authorities the Coast Guard may establish a safety zone in defined water areas that are determined to have hazardous conditions and in which vessel traffic can be regulated in the interest of safety.

On October 12, 13, 19, and 20, 2015 Coastal Power will be installing power cables that will run across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway at latitude 33°55′11″ N, longitude 078°03′24″ W in Oak Island, North Carolina. To facilitate the safety of mariners and the public, the U.S Coast Guard will require temporary closures of the channel on October 12, 13, 19, 20, 2015.

### C. Discussion of the Final Rule

The Coast Guard is establishing a temporary safety zone on the navigable waters of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway within a 100 yard radius of latitude 33°55′11″ N, longitude 078°03'24" W in Oak Island, North Carolina. This safety zone will be established in the interest of public safety due to the transfer of power cables across the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. The regulated area for this safety zone includes all the water of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway within a 100 yard radius of latitude 33°55'11" N, longitude 078°03'24" W, a position located north of the Oak Island Fixed Bridge in Oak Island, North Carolina. This rule will be enforced on October 12, 13, 19, 20, 2015 during the times of 09:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 01:00 p.m. to 04:00 p.m. Vessels authorized by the Captain of the Port or his/her Representative to enter or remain in the safety zone during the above listed time frame must have a height clearance of 30 feet and greater and are required to notify on scene Coastal Power and Electric work boats at a minimum of 40 minutes prior to transiting the area on VHF marine radio channels 13 or 16 or via phone at 910-512-1645.

Except for vessels authorized by the Captain of the Port or his/her Representative, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the safety zone during the time frame listed. The Captain of the Port will give notice of the enforcement of the safety zone by all appropriate means to provide the widest dissemination of notice among the affected segments of the public. This will include publication in the Local Notice to Mariners and Marine Information Broadcasts.

#### **D. Regulatory Analyses**

We developed this rule after considering numerous statutes and executive orders related to rulemaking. Below we summarize our analyses based on these statutes and executive orders.

### 1. Regulatory Planning and Review

This rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, as supplemented by Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under