

**From:** Joe Gillentine  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 04, 2011 5:54 PM  
**To:** Director - GASB  
**Subject:** GASB Amendments to 25 & 27

We have heard that you are considering requiring public agencies to make pension costs a part of a districts on-going liability. I am writing to urge you to either reject the proposal altogether or at a minimum recognize that schools in California are NOT the proper entities to show the retirement fund liability as their own. It may be difficult for the Board to consider treating schools differently than other government entities, but that is exactly what is necessary in California. The State of California is the sponsor of the retirement plans for certificated and classified school employees and it is the State of California that is responsible for the fiscal health of the two retirement systems as they relate to schools. Forcing these requirements onto local school agencies will confuse the public, significantly understate each school entity's own fiscal health and make it difficult for schools to secure long and short term debt. Once one of our employees has retired, we simply have NO RESPONSIBILITY for any future costs related the retiring employee so trying to figure out what they are going to receive in retirement and then showing liability, for which we have none, would be impossible for us. We do not have anything to do with determining how much money a retiree receives in the state of California.

Thank you

Joe Gillentine  
Superintendent, East Whittier City School District