

Hi Tom;

Here are our responses to your letter.

Hello,

Thank you for your letter. I have called Drew several times and I have had at least one 45-minute call with Pam. I have called your hotline. I have demonstrated commitment and care for my position. You have ducked me at all corners, and we all know why - you do not sincerely believe any crime was committed.

No, that is not the case. Drew's phone shows one missed call, while he was working, and FYI he prefers that you communicate to him through written word. Our previous letter was signed by Pam and David. Pam called you, but that was months ago. You did respond to our group email promptly – so promptly that we wondered if you had not read the supporting docs. We don't see that you have ever attempted to contact David Fordyce individually. You left one message on our group cell after 10PM. **If you are trying to reasonably discuss the details of the evidence we have found, we can't tell.**

And false- we do sincerely believe that crime was committed, and we desire that you would humbly call the sheriff, for the sake of the community. **If you don't want to call the Sheriff, could you explain to us what actually happened to the Former High School in January?**

It's merely an event you have latched onto in an attempt to discredit our administration's credibility in having a robust conversation around future facility needs in the district.

Why do you so quickly divert to AACCS's "future facility needs" while refusing to constructively respond to the **evidence** we've provided? Your pattern of doing this may make some people think that you fear what may be learned in an investigation.

You have contacted our heating and plumbing people, and they have given you answers you didn't want to hear.

We are glad that you are now actually referring to a detail of the Former High School situation in January! But why be abstract? Tell us what you know, and try to explain to us what it is that you think we didn't want to hear.

My belief is that you have already contacted the sheriff, And if you haven't, your "evidence" is completely public now and the sheriff has all of it. We are not in charge of our police - they have the ability to investigate all crimes without our call or consent. Perhaps you should've learned that in the law school you attended (or Paul). So I sincerely ask - what is it you want this board to do?

"Without our consent"? A property owner has the right to challenge any affidavit of evidence supporting an application for a county attorney investigative subpoena. Especially an application which was not generated by their own complaint. The school can seek the authority to require all school employees who receive notice to be interviewed, to only comply with the district's attorney sitting next to him/her during the interview. Common sense says this serves to intimidate any of your employees. None of this would be an issue if you would file the complaint with the Sheriff's office. We think the community would like to know- **didn't you learn this all in law school already?**

Pam has sent me text messages indicating her very overt intent which is that Alta should be a school on its own and should utilize the old school for that purpose. Drew and Sarah hate public education period. I do not know Dave's position. But it appears you are all aligned in one area - making sure ALTA AURELIA public school does not advance in any way. Our board will viciously fight a group that has that at the center of their intent for "progress".

You speculate as to the personal motives of the executive officers of the larger committee... but this is not really about us. You seem to be distracting from our request: **Can you tell us why you won't call the sheriff?**

We are united in that we think one 'advancement' for this district would be to faithfully maintain the buildings we have (as this seems to be an issue at present). When you say 'advancement', could that involve significant increased debt/taxes for the property owners? We think that 'advancement' for any district could

refer to improving the quality of education within the schools, which, **in our opinion, is not dependent upon the age of the facilities.**

You did not address this issue in good faith. You approached this board with a wild, defamatory, conclusion from no credible "evidence".

There was nothing 'wild' about our request of March 14, 2024. In fact, back then you labeled it 'unreasonable.' How did it now become wild? Is it because you want those reading this to think that it is wild? Also, again, we did not attempt to defame anyone, nor do we believe that we did unintentionally. And it was not conclusive, as we are asking that you ask the Sheriff to reach some conclusions. **Could you tell us why you think the evidence is not credible?**

It is reasonable to make an argument that we could have managed the old boiler differently.

Please don't diminish the matter with the boiler as mere poor management.

You used the word "we". If you could let everyone know who all took part in management of the boiler, that would be much appreciated by AACFP, and likely by many others in this district.

It is reasonable to disagree with our decisions on discontinuing the use of part of a building that no longer serves our district, and then to voice that concern. These are hard decisions and there are competing ideas and concerns. We do the best we can with available evidence when we make decisions - and sometimes they do not go the way we hoped. Knowing what we know about the boiler failure, maybe we would have done a more extensive repair in the summer, but now we have the benefit of hindsight.

We sharply disagree, Tom. Probably every school district in Iowa has the benefit of foresight, the experience of others and just plain common sense. Nearly all homeowners know it is irresponsible to shut the boiler off and not provide an alternative heat source, in January in Iowa. "Boiler failure" you say... **didn't you all know ahead of time that boilers fail to heat a building when they are OFF? But, also, are you saying you and the rest of the board actively participated in the decision to shut the boiler down in January?**

What your group decided to do was insane.

Is it insane to keep leadership accountable? How do you suggest that the community keep the superintendent and school board accountable to steward the Former High School well?

Coupled with attaching board members personal cell phone numbers and private work email addresses - you should be horribly horribly ashamed of your actions. So do not for one second warn me about my behavior in an upcoming public meeting. Hypocritical doesn't even begin to describe your group.

What we decided to do was to counter the newspaper's unfortunately inaccurate description of "boiler blew" with the fact that the "boiler was shut off" for what we understand to be non-urgent repairs. We informed the public of several other details as well.

We hear that some public officials are trying to hide behind limited government-issued email accounts as their only contact information. What harm is done by providing the public with several ways to get in touch with you, especially all those you cite below who called to *commend* you?

Make no mistake, I take all of my obligations incredibly seriously, and our board is no different.

We are very satisfied with the job Denny has done as superintendent and we will continue leading this district into the future with all of our stakeholders interests in mind. We will not be threatened or intimidated.

Why are you "very satisfied" with a superintendent that ordered the boiler to be shut off, did not provide supplemental heat, and let the building freeze in January? 4 Seasons invoice was over \$10,000 to the plumber alone (1.15.24-2.7.24). If there is reason why this is not Superintendent Olhausen's error, please explain. We think he is generally in charge of the building, but we could be wrong. Or, rather, if the board was involved in the decision, could you explain how you all failed to prevent this damage to the Former High School?

I have been so uplifted by the community response to your flier. I have had hours of conversations over the past 5 days. So far it's roughly 40+ phone calls and probably 20+ in person conversations. Every single one was positive towards our intent and our leadership of this district.

Our consultant anticipated that you would get many positive calls. We think that those who reached out to you are not a representative sample. There are approximately 2,235 registered voters in AACCS district.

I know you have spent significant effort in encouraging your supporters to call me, but none of them have. You haven't.

We contacted you back in March, supplying you with a two-page letter and 8 supporting documents.

I am not trying to rub anything in here, just simply stating that our community disagrees with your position, and you have damaged your reputations as a result. I look forward to anyone from your group returning a call from me or calling me on their own accord. I very honestly haven't heard from a single person that shares your perspective.

"Our community disagrees", from such a small sample? You must know that **most members of the public are not comfortable with openly confronting elected representatives** nor appearing to disagree with school board policy, even though they do. They usually demonstrate their disagreement when they can do it confidentially. Some community members agree with our position- enough to give their contact information on a petition.

It is for these reasons that I respectfully decline your invitation to attend any meeting you decide to put on. Thank you for your attention and concern. We look forward to your attendance at our upcoming meeting. The public may wonder why you skip this meeting, when, as you say, you take your position so seriously. It would likely be best for you to attend, or better yet, to call the sheriff. We welcome you to change your mind.

-Tom Hinkeldey.

We have a few questions for you, Tom, regarding the school board meeting next Monday, May 13th, 2024:
At this meeting, will members of the public have their time to speak limited? If so, how do you determine time limitations?

Will members of the public be limited to public comment only and will their comments be left to stand without response from you or any other board member?

Do you and other board members reserve the right to make comments or "answer" members of the public without the same member allowed to "rebut" or question board member's response?

If rebuttal by member of the public will be allowed, what time limitation will be placed on that?

Clearly, we think it unfair for any member of the public to "grandstand" on school board time, but at the same time, we think it fair for substantive rebuttal to be granted adequate time.

Please confirm the location of this school board meeting, and will it be handicapped accessible?

God bless,

Pamela Henderson & David Fordyce, Co-chair

Alta-Aurelia Citizens For Progress

Drew Lietz