Bryan E. Brumley, CFP®
4231 SE Long St.
Portland, OR 97206
(503) 954-2590
bbrumley@ProgressiveAssetManagement.com

July 24, 2020

Office of Regulations and Interpretations US Department of Labor

Room N-5655

200 Constitution Avenue NW Washington, DC 20210

RE: Proposed rule on Financial Factors in Selecting Plan Investments (RIN 1210-AB95)

To whom it may concern:

I write to provide comments in response to the Department of Labor's proposed rule, "Financial Factors in Selecting Plan Investments" (RIN 1210-AB95) (the "Proposal").

As a Certified Financial Planner ®, I advise people on Sustainable, Responsible, and Impact (SRI) Investing investors, also known as Environmental. Social and Governance (ESG) investing. For many of my clients, the credo is: "Do Not Profit from Wrecking the World."

In recent years, the financial returns from SRI investments have kept pace with or outperformed the broader markets. For these reasons, the volume of SRI funds under management grew to $12.0 trillion from 2016 to 2018.

The Department of Labor fails to articulate a rational connection between the relevant facts and the proposed rule. The Proposal reveals a fundamental misunderstanding of how professional investment managers use ESG criteria as an additional level of due diligence and analysis in the portfolio construction process. Investment managers increasingly analyze ESG factors precisely because they view these factors as material to financial performance.

A. The proposed rule assumes ESG strategies sacrifice financial returns, but current research findings show ESG strategies' outperformance; (See https://www.blackrock.com/corporate/sustainability/committed-to-sustainability?cid=ppc:sustcommitmentv3:bing:all; see https://www.morningstar.com/articles/992908/trumps-labor-department-really-doesnt-want-you-to-have-esg-options-in-your-401k-plan; See https://www.ussif.org/currentandpast
B. The proposed rule assumes ESG considerations are not widely applied, but there is a history of effective use of material ESG considerations by mainstream investors (cite data on widespread use of ESG considerations by mainstream investors)
C. The proposed rule assumes ESG considerations are not material, but the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board standards adoption process is based on financial materiality legal standard (cite data on SASB standards)
D. The proposed rule assumes ESG considerations could violate fiduciary duty, but other jurisdictions' regulatory interpretations support prudent investor consideration of ESG factors as material and within fiduciary duty (cite data on other jurisdictions' regulations)
E. The proposed rule assumes that ESG considerations are not material to corporate success, but the Business Roundtable Statement on Corporate Purpose demonstrates broad issuer acceptance of materiality as integral to corporate long-term success (cite data on Business Roundtable Statement)

The Proposal is likely to have the perverse effect of dissuading fiduciaries, even against their better judgment, from offering options for their plans that consider ESG factors as part of the evaluation of material financial criteria. As a result, it will unfairly, and harmfully, limit plan diversification and perhaps compel plan participants to choose options that are either more risky or less profitable.

I respectfully request that the Proposal be withdrawn. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Bryan Brumley

Certified Financial Planner ®