
From: Andrew Schoener [mailto:andrew.schoener@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 3:55 PM
To: EBSA, E-ORI - EBSA
Subject: RIN 1210-AB33

To Whom It May Concern:

I work for a large IT firm named Sungard, and we have a typical 401k plan with company match.

With regard to your request for information, I am deeply troubled about the proposal, specifically:

13. Should some form of lifetime income distribution option be required for defined contribution plans (in addition to money purchase pension plans)? If so, **should that option be the default distribution option**, and should it apply to the entire account balance? To what extent would such a requirement encourage or discourage plan sponsorship?

Lifetime income as a required option is a giant step towards central planning. If a lifetime income option is offered as a true option, then that would give investors (savers) a choice. And choices are good. But as soon as any portion of my savings are *required* to be directed towards a lifetime income option is the day that I will *discontinue fully* my participation in my company's 401k. Period.

Please be sensible and give savers more choices. Likewise, please be sensible and do force savers into certain instruments, as benign as you may believe the instruments to be.

Regards,
Andrew Schoener
Sudbury, MA
Citizen
Who actually saves,
Living below my means
Currently being punished for Wall Street's errors