

Mr. David Sturm
411 W 4th St
Salisbury, MO 65281-1425

7-2-17

U.S. DEPT OF LABOR
200 CONSTITUTION AVE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20210

RE: Fiduciary Rules

Sir/Madam,

I am writing this note to express my displeasure / position to the "Fiduciary" rules that went into effect June 9th. While I understand the goal to protect investors from getting ripped off by unscrupulous financial advisors, the result is that for every individual the rule helps, there is an individual (like myself) who is adversely affected.

In my case, I have used the services of several firms and various representatives. I always told them upfront that I was a long-term investor (read "Buy & Hold") and not at all a "Market-Timer". Not one of them refused to take me as a client and, over the 40 years or so, all have earned reasonable commissions for their services.

However, this new rule has now left me with two options, neither of which is in my best interest.
One is to pay an annual fee (approximately 1.08% at the firms that I currently use) which will cost me about \$8,000 - \$10,000/yr. This contrasts to the \$500 - \$1,000/yr that it costs me for my buy & hold each year. Since I would not be making any more or less transactions than I previously did, your rule would ~~have~~ cost me anywhere from \$7000 - \$9,500 MORE EACH YEAR. At my age (or any age for that matter) THAT MAKES MY ACCOUNT MORE RISKY BY FAR THAN IN MOST CIRCUMSTANCES.

The second option is to choose an account that would still be

Commission raised but would only allow me to sell investments (which I thought it to be wise) but not purchase my replacement investments. Thus, I would be limited to whatever interest I could gain on the cash balance (anywhere from .01% to possibly 1 or 1.5%). If I could purchase certificates of deposit (my current advisors are not sure if these new rules would even allow that). In any case that is not a strategy that any intelligent person would think is prudent.

After personally being very adversely affected for many years by Federal Reserve Bank policies (along with many of elderly tax clients) and for the first six or so years of the ACA, I have very small hopes that I will get any relief from this financial rule, although all it would take would be to allow me to "opt-out" at my own risk.

I do not belong to any political party since I don't agree totally with either and vote a split-ticket as an independent (tendency is to vote Democratic at local level but Republican at state + national levels). Therefore, I do not make political contributions and thus have no influence with those elected to office. Thus, my expectations that my opinion will yield any results are very low. However, I do thank any one who takes the time to read this (unfortunately my penmanship is not as good as it used to be).

Sincerely,
W. David Sturm
W. DAVID STURM

W. David Sturm
W. DAVID STURM

cc : President Donald Trump
Sen. Claire McCaskill
Sen. Roy Blunt
U.S. Rep. Sam Graves