

Dear Superintendent Olhausen, School Board President Tom Hinkeldey,  
Jennifer Kaskey, Katie Meyer, Brad Rohwer, & Nicole Weathers:

We, Alta-Aurelia Citizens For Progress, would like to make a sincere apology. We had misread the date on the current boiler inspection document- we thought it said the same date as the document that Superintendent Olhausen provided us, but the date had been changed since the boiler repairs. This was also an easy mistake to make, since the document itself says that the boiler does not pass inspection. We are glad to know that you had the particular necessary repair made last fall in order to pass inspection and glad to know it had the proper Certification For Operation for this year, which does not expire until December 2024. We are thankful that you corrected us on this point, as we want to get all our facts straight.

Thank you for engaging in the content of the flier. Additionally, yes, the boiler inspection document is on our website- and has been weeks before you corrected us, indicating that it really was an honest mistake, and no attempt to falsely accuse you whatsoever. Also, we now see that we asked for email communications with Rasmussen from January 1<sup>st</sup> onward, so we have not seen the emails from December. **Please send us the December 2023 communications with Rasmussen so we can more thoroughly understand the situation.**

Back in March in our letter to Hinkeldey, and also in our April flier, we wrote about the boiler not passing inspection, because we honestly didn't know that it had. We read the date on the inspection report from Olhausen, and though we saw the note that it had been worked on, we didn't recognize that the date on the updated boiler inspection report was different. Why did you not correct us on this detail back then? If you didn't know about it then, why not tell us about it once you found out? **Why wait until we have left the school board meeting to bring it up to the community, and then also post it on Facebook, instead of coming directly to us?**

Additionally, we would like you to consider the content of the flier, including particularly the questions we want investigated. **Could you clarify or answer any of these questions (listed below) which were also listed in the flier?** The questions are ones that we wanted the Sheriff to investigate, but if you can answer them, or if you can tell us why they are unreasonable or wild, we'd certainly appreciate it.

**Knowing schools routinely do boiler repairs during seasons when heating is not needed, why was Rasmussen doing repairs in January?**

**Who left a water faucet on, overnight behind locked doors in December? And why?**

**Who opened valves on 3rd floor around January 17th, resulting in significant damage to the building?**

**Who cracked the windows on the coldest days of the year when the boiler was off?**

**Why did Olhausen have this work done in the bitter cold January, when Rasmussen said in their proposal that it would have to be shut off 2 days before, and that the work would take 8-10 business days to complete?**

**Why was there no adequate alternative heat source provided when the boiler was off?**

**Would you be willing to cooperate with a Sheriff's investigation to explore the events in January and find answers to these questions above?**

We'd also like to ask another question: **Why is the Rasmussen proposal that we received through a records request from Superintendent Olhausen dated January 9<sup>th</sup>, and why was the email from Rasmussen that Olhausen recently sent us a clearer copy of dated January 9<sup>th</sup>, when, by our records, the boiler was shut off for repairs on the 7<sup>th</sup>?** Generally, we would think that the proposal would be received, signed, and returned to Rasmussen before the work began on the boiler. We just don't understand why the dates are as they are, and we want our timeline to be correct. **Also, may we have a signed copy of the Rasmussen proposal, if it exists?**

Also, to address your logo concern: We thought that it was legal for us to use the logo on the flier, since it was for non-commercial purposes. We used it for editorial purposes, and we actually still think that's legal. But, understanding from your Facebook post and your letter from your legal team, we understand that you are offended by this. We do not mind refraining from the use of the logo, in order to not offend you.

**If any of you intend to attend our community meeting, would you please let us know if there is a date in May or June that does NOT work for you to attend our meeting? Also, could you let us know if you will allow or not allow a civil engineer of our choice to have a tour of the Former High School building?** This engineer, obviously, would not charge the school for his services. We understand that you don't need or desire for an engineer of our choosing to tour the building, but we thought that the voters in our district may appreciate it. **If you will not allow him to tour the building, why not?**

Thank you for your consideration.

Alta-Aurelia Citizens For Progress