

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

**Received:** July 24, 2020  
**Tracking No.** 1k4-9hzs-dyqp  
**Comments Due:** July 30, 2020  
**Submission Type:** Web

**Docket:** EBSA-2020-0004  
Financial Factors in Selecting Plan Investments

**Comment On:** EBSA-2020-0004-0002  
Financial Factors in Selecting Plan Investments

**Document:** EBSA-2020-0004-DRAFT-0351  
Comment on FR Doc # 2020-13705

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Lans Rothfus

---

## General Comment

I am firmly against this proposed regulation. As it applies to the role of fiduciaries, the definition of "solely in the financial interest" must be in the eye of the consumer in consultation with that fiduciary, and not decided by the government a priori. If I and a trusted fiduciary (even through my employer) mutually agree to choose an investment plan which is of benefit to society and the planet, I would see that as being in my financial interest in the long run. Making that choice must be my/our prerogative. Handcuffing fiduciaries because of a strict and dubiously-constructed interpretation of what "financial interest" means is a disservice to consumers who have done their homework. This curious and unnecessary proposal also appears to be a thinly-veiled attempt by the administration to undermine efforts to allow citizens to address climate change and support good governance. For those of us who really care about those things and who work well with their fiduciaries, do not pass this regulation!