

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Received: December 16, 2023 Tracking No. lq8-094k-xlhy Comments Due: January 02, 2024 Submission Type: API

Docket: EBSA-2023-0014
Definition of an Investment Advice Fiduciary

Comment On: EBSA-2023-0014-0001
Retirement Security Rule: Definition of an Investment Advice Fiduciary

Document: 1210-AC02 comment 00077 Richter 12162023

Submitter Information

Name: Sami Richter

General Comment

The Honorable Lisa M. Gomez
Assistant Secretary of Labor
Employee Benefits Security Administration
U. S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210

RE: RIN 1210-AC02

Dear Honorable Gomez,

Introducing myself, Sami L Richter, an independent agent and Financial Advisor in Jacksonville, Arkansas. This letter will express my fears over the new U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) proposed fiduciary rule. This rule will threaten my ability as a financial professional to continue serving the lower -income and the blue collar middle-income Main Street families. These citizens of the USA are currently able to access, from me and my colleagues sound, UN-conflicted financial advice to advance their financial and retirement security. This agency, COMPASS

FINANCIAL GROUP of JACKSONVILLE, currently provide educational workshops that allow question and answer sessions as well as one-on-one personal assistance. Both forums allow both the advisor and client to find what is best for that client un-inhibited by extra cost red tape the proposed fiduciary rule would bring. This would be a hardship on the citizens in these income brackets, as well as cause the advisor to impose fees to cover the extra expense.

This new rule proposes to revise the current fiduciary rule under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), governing the advice that financial advisors provide their clients. This proposed revision largely resurrects the failed 2016 DOL “fiduciary-only” rule that limited savers’ choice of advisors and investments by imposing excessive amounts of costly red tape and duplicative administrative requirements on the investment transactions they make for their retirement.

With this proposed revision, DOL ignores the real-world experience decisively demonstrating that the 2016 DOL fiduciary rule significantly harmed lower and middle-income workers before being thrown out in 2018 by a federal appeals court. The adoption of the 2016 fiduciary rule resulted in more than 10 million smaller retirement accounts owners losing the ability to work with their preferred financial professionals. Main Street savers could simply not afford to retain advisors under the fiduciary-only model of regulation. Moreover, if DOL adopts a new rule that is like the 2016 rule, recent research concludes the retirement savings of 2.7 million individuals with incomes below \$100,000 would plummet by \$140 billion over ten years.

Why would DOL impose such a rule? Black and Latino retirement account owners would be among the hardest hit, increasing the racial wealth gap by 20 percent or more!!!

Since the 2016 fiduciary rule was invalidated, regulators at the federal and state levels have adopted significant new regulations that directly address the conflicts of interest that DOL asserts it is seeking to address with its new proposed rule. The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) adopted Regulation Best Interest (Reg BI), which requires all broker-dealers and their registered representatives to always act in their client’s best interest without putting their own interests first. In addition, more than forty states have now enacted an updated National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC) model regulation that requires insurance producers to satisfy a best interest standard that aligns well with Reg BI. In addition, DOL adopted its own new rule in 2020 that complements the federal and state regulatory regime.

Would Americans be better served by leaving millions of Main Street investors on their own to try to achieve retirement security for themselves and their families without the guidance that is now readily available? Adoption of this proposed rule is DANGEROUS. This would be dangerous!! This entire rule is UNNECESSARY!!

It is unnecessary because there are already federal and state regulatory structures to protect consumers, and DOL has provided no evidence that consumers are not being protected by the existing rules.

PLEADING with you - please withdraw the proposed final regulation and proposed amendments!! Please PROTECT the interest of Main Street Americans!!

Sincerely,
Sami I Richter, LUTCF, CSA, CEPP
State of Arkansas