

Pam Bonczyk's Letter

Read at September 8, 2025 Monthly Board Meeting

There are a few items that I would like to speak on tonight. These instances have been building for quite some time within our town and need to be directly addressed.

Every citizen has the right to their own opinion and to voice that opinion. However, once the line is crossed with deceit, disrespect, and aggression, it must be addressed. I can only speak for myself as an elected board member for the Town of Stubbs. Over the past several months, meetings have increasingly gotten worse and out of control despite the chairman's best efforts to manage them. This is no way to conduct any type of meeting. Actual town business is not able to be done because of the arguing, disagreements, yelling profanity, shouting, and disruptions that continually go on. It is an embarrassment that the county sheriff's department has to attend the meetings to control the situation. I have carefully listened to all sides of each issue and have assessed what is best for our town. Some may agree with my decisions, and some may not. However, that is the process of our government, and the reason we have open and free elections.

I would first like to start with the confusion surrounding the oath of Office. I was sworn into my third term on the Stubbs Town Board in April of this year, after being voted in from the Spring election. If there is doubt about that, reference the town website for the official April 15th meeting minutes. Though these meeting minutes are official, Mrs. Donahue took it upon herself to invite Elizabeth Kitzman to the July 14th regular board meeting. Ms. Kitzman proceeded to read some script to the board during the public comment section – I am unsure exactly where that script came from and/or if it was the oath of office again. However, I was asked if I agreed to follow and support the Constitution and abide by the oath of office. Furthermore, it was written in the Ladysmith news this past week questioning my oath and allegiance to the constitution and our laws. Well, Mrs. Donahue, I'd like to explain something to you about taking an oath.

Many may or may not know, but I took an oath over 24 years ago when I volunteered for military service to uphold and defend the Constitution. I have signed that blank check to our Nation and have taken that oath multiple times since. This is nothing new to me, or a new set of rules to live my life by. My allegiance is, and has always been, to follow the laws and uphold the constitution. Not only being a member of the military, but as a field grade officer, I have always had to hold myself to a higher standard. I also pride myself on my integrity, which is one of the core military values. The definition of integrity that is embedded into my life is: to do the right

thing, even when no one is watching. This is what I have done, and what I will continue to do. This involves taking the path of the 'hard right' instead of the 'easy wrong'. I defended everyone's right in this room to have the ability to freely voice their opinion and live in a free country. Which I am grateful you can all do. Mrs. Donahue, I am unsure of what you were trying to prove by bringing in Ms. Kitman to read the oath again to us and by questioning my values, behavior, and integrity in your opinion article in the Ladysmith news. However, to question my allegiance to the Constitution and my integrity is shameful. Just because you personally don't like the way this board is being ran or the decisions it is making. Again, disgraceful. Along with most of your comments in this past week's opinion piece in the newspaper. Your article only gave one small side of the 'town show'... The show that you continue to fuel, along with your cohorts.

Next, I'd like to address the conflict of changing out the WM negotiation members. When asked why I wanted to remove Mr. Lorkowski and Mr. Weirzba from the negotiating committee, I stated it was because of inappropriate gestures that were made towards the board at prior meetings. How can we successfully negotiate with WM to get the best outcome for our town with people that are acting in such an inappropriate manner. Furthermore, Mr. Lorkowski has repetitively spoken out over the board members during official meetings and has not listen to the board when asked to stop interrupting. Thus resulting in him being physically asked to leave one meeting by the Rusk County Sherriff's deputy. Additionally, I have witnessed Mr. Lorkowski holding up hand-written signs to the public during official meetings when the board was trying to conduct business and causing a scene when he did not agree on what the board doing. Furthermore, he took it upon himself to physically approach the board members (addressing specifically myself and the chairman) during a meeting, and set down a small toy Jesus. He stated that we should go find Jesus. Again, another example of his inappropriate actions when the conversations/voting is not going in his favor.

Mr. Lorkowski, I will not be bullied or intimidated by you or your actions. Each decision I make is what I feel is in the best interest of this town, at that time. If you'd like to be the one making those decisions, then run for the board. Do not think that because of your reputation and status, that you can influence me into doing what you think is best for this town. Obviously, you have already convinced a number of residents to follow you. However, I am not a sheep and will not concede.

Mr. Lorkowski, you also stated when you were being escorted out of the hall, that you were very disappointed in me. Why Mr. Lorkowski? Because I was not feeding into what you think is right for the town?

I have known Mr. Lorkowski my whole life in growing up in the Weyerhaeuser school district. All of the students at the school looked up to you and your wife for being such great people, successful business owners, and giving back to the community. I held both of you on a very high

pedestal. However, this past year has shown a different side of you. Mr. Lorkowski, I am the one that is disappointed in you. I'm disappointed in the person I thought you were and the values I thought you held. I respected that person. However, your actions and words of the past year have proven otherwise. I thought you had more dignity and respect for fellow residents, to not look down upon others that didn't have the same status or success as you have had. However, that doesn't seem to be the case at all. This is the reasoning why I believe it was the correct decision to remove Mr. Lorkowski from the WM negotiation committee.

I'd like to now address the Site Plan Ordinance public hearing. The public hearing was posted properly per statute 30 days prior to the hearing. Due to the climate leading up to the public hearing as mentioned previously, with disruptions, arguing, and high emotions... providing a sign-up sheet to reduce conflict and let everyone's voice be heard was a way to do just that.

There was a sign up sheet provided for anyone who wanted to speak, could do so. Mrs. Donahue stated (during the August regular meeting during public comment) that the only people that had prepared statements for the hearing were Brad & Heidi Bartels and John Bonczyk. Insinuating that there must be secret discussions outside of public view pertaining to these issues. Mrs. Donahue, if you have ever watched the news and saw clips of a public school board meeting/hearing with a contentious subject, you would have noticed that those who speak during these hearings often have pre-written speeches as some are not good speaking on their feet. This is the same reason I have this speech written up, so I don't forget points I am trying to make. Therefore, your accusations concerning the pre-written statements for the hearing are totally false.

Next, I'd like to discuss the issue of doing what is right, versus doing what has 'always been done this way.' If any of you haven't noticed, times have changed and the state of the world has changed. It was wonderful when we could rely on our neighbor to help in time of need or help clear a down tree off the road. However, that isn't the case anymore. Laws continue to evolve and change, and insurance agencies and stipulations continue to become more stringent. One minute we can't say 'well, we've always done it this way, so why change it now'.... Because as soon as something happens and private property is damaged (or worse) the town will be held liable. I want to take as much liability off the town as possible. It is not 'rules for thee, but not for me'... We are so caught up in contacting lawyers to even correct the minutes of the monthly meetings (for example).. and now we are going to turn a blind eye to the legal advice of lawyers and insurance companies concerning turning around in private driveways with the snowplows? That makes zero sense at all. I've tried to say that at past meetings, but am shut down by being talked over, or yelled at. I'm not here to get into a screaming match or get proven wrong with any and every statement I make.

Finally, I'd like to address Mr. Weirzba accusations and comments on the following topics.

- Site Plan Ordinance: The towns comprehensive plan was reviewed in 2019 and at that time, the recommendation was to implement a Site Plan Ordinance to compliment the Comprehensive plan. This was only a recommendation, it was not mandatory to do. This recommendation was not acted upon until years after it was made. What prompted the Site Plan ordinance to be drawn up in May of 2024? Could it have been that word had gotten out that there was interest in a solar project within the town? This is when some individuals on the Comprehensive committee sprang into action. Coincidence? I think not. I was present at many of the Comprehensive committee planning meetings and Mr. Weirzba made it well known that he volunteered much of his time (along with Mr. Lorkowski) to put together this proposed site plan ordinance. I questioned the Committee if the proposed Site Plan Ordinance was in response to the potential solar field project. The immediate response was no. It was in response to the 2019 review of our Comprehensive plan. However, it seemed strange that after years of waiting, now the committee is going to try to quickly implement this ordinance. The town hired a lawyer to assist with the creation of a residential and commercial site plan ordinance. This lawyer was used by both Mr. Weirzba and Mr. Lorkowski to help create the ordinance. One of the invoices that was sent to the town listed a charge on 7/23/24 for research on the regulation of solar energy systems and a draft memo composed for the Board providing legal opinion regarding moratorium on installation of solar panels. This is what prompted the site plan ordinance to be enacted. Therefore, the proposed site plan ordinance was initiated and proposed in direct response to the assumed solar panel project. Mr. Weirzba and Mr. Lorkowski didn't like the idea of a solar panel field in the town, and acted upon that to implement policy to stop it.

After the public hearing in July 2025, Mr. Weirzba, approached Andy Bonczyk, a landowner in Stubbs, outside of the hall after the hearing and told him that this whole situation could have been avoided if Andy would have asked each landowner around the proposed solar panels site if they would approve of him putting up the solar field. Since when does a private land owner have to ask permission from neighbors to start a project on their own personal property. To me, this is an intrusion on people's private property.

Again, this is another instance where a few people within the town try to use their status and assumed importance to create, establish, and pass policies they are in favor of. And they twist words and speak falsely to get others to follow them and support their personal beliefs.

- Conflict of Interest
This brings me to my next point of contention. The subject of Conflict of Interest. Mr. Weirzba stated during the August meeting public comments and I quote: 'Why was Pam

allowed to vote on the Site Plan Ordinance, this is an apparent conflict of interest'? The proposed solar project was on the Bonczyk Soft Maple Valley Dairy Farm that has been in the family for many years. You're correct Mr. Weirzba, that was the location of the proposed solar panel project. It was originally owned by my grandparents, purchased by my parents, was the property in which I grew up on. What you have failed to mention is that I have never had any legal or financial interest in the Bonczyk Soft Maple Valley Dairy Farm. Now it is solely owned by my brother Andy Bonczyk and his family. I purchased 1.8 acres of the property, privately from the corporation in 2014, which completely separated that land from the farm, and constructed a home for my own personal use. Hardley enough acreage to install a solar field and profit from it.

Mr. Weirzba, if you would have done your homework before accusing me of unlawfully voting on the issue of the Site Plan Ordinance, you would have found that this situation is NOT a conflict of interest. Let me explain to you why this isn't, for all to hear. First, I did not use my position or vote for any personal financial gain or substantial value for my personal benefit; Second, I did not solicit or accept from any person anything of value reasonably expected to influence my vote; and Third, Statutorily, my brother is not considered an immediate family member and it is extremely unlikely that he receives or contributes more than one-half of his support to or from myself. All of the above points were taken directly from our Town lawyer, Weld/Riely. This is not a personal interpretation of the law, these are the facts obtained from a professional legal source. Not Mr. Weirzba's amateur interpretation of what he'd like the law to state for his own personal advantage.

- Slander

Finally, I'd like to address Mr. Weirzba's accusation of altering meeting minutes. During the August regular board meeting, during public comment section, Mr. Weirzba accused me of taking the meeting minutes for the July 17th Site plan hearing. He stated that I noted in the hearing minutes that the majority of the people were not in favor of the ordinance and asked how I came up with that conclusion and that providing my option in the notes would not be right or legal. Well, again Mr. Weirzba, if you would have done your homework before making false accusations, we wouldn't have to waste all of our time with this nonsense.

I have taken official meeting minutes for the following meetings in 2025:

- Regular Board meeting on July 14th
- Site Plan Ordinance Public Hearing – July 17th
- Lawyer Interview – July 29th

Mr. Weirzba is accusing me of injecting my personal opinion into the official meeting minutes for the July 17th public hearing. He is correct that I did take meeting minutes for

that hearing. However, what he failed to mention is that the personal statement of ‘the majority of the people were not in favor of the ordinance’ was actually in the July 24th meeting minutes. Those official meeting minutes were taken by the clerk. Her name is specifically written in the minutes as being present for the meeting, thus she would have been completing her assigned duty of taking meeting minutes. Therefore, it is totally false and Mr. Weirzba is slandering my name and reputation by this false accusation. Furthermore, he is slandering the longstanding name and reputation of my family – The Bonczyk Soft Maple Valley Dairy Farm – by accusing myself of illegally voting and putting my personal opinion in official meeting minutes. If any of you had been present at the Comprehensive planning commission meetings, you would have witnessed first hand how rude, disrespectful, and condescending he is to anyone that opposes his views of the ordinance, especially my father who has served this town for 68 years of his life and has sold acres of property to the town for expansion of this existing property. Furthermore, trying to intimidate my brother and Brad Bartels from thinking about putting in a solar field for the sole purpose of bettering their own livelihoods. All because he didn’t like it.

If anyone is tearing this town apart by lies and falsehoods, it is Mr. Weirzba himself. If he can lie at official town meetings, who knows what kind of untruthful information he is spreading outside of the public eye.

Mr. Weirzba, the board already discussed and provided their opinion and official vote concerning the Site Plan ordinance during the July 24th meeting. I for one am not changing my vote. I will stand up for what is right for the private landowners of this town.

I find it very interesting what levels people will go to when they don’t get what they want. How they will bully others into attempting to get them to think a certain way, and when that doesn’t happen, they will go to any means to drag their name through the mud. It’s quite unfortunate really what has become of this town. I have seen sides of people that I never thought I would. It’s a shame really. Anyone can run their mouth with lies, run off to the newspaper to try to sway public opinion, scream and yell to disrupt government meetings, or even go to the lengths of thinking it is okay to lay their hands on another person in disagreement. This is not a popularity contest and if it was, I am fine with coming in last place. I am here to follow the laws, take advice from our town lawyer, and do what I feel is in the best interest of this town. It is fine if you don’t agree with that, but don’t question my integrity, my oath to my country, feel disappointed in me by not bending to your influence, try to turn a blind eye to the rules you don’t want to follow, spread false information and accusations about me or my families reputation, or try to physically lay your hands on me. I was voted in by the public to do a job, and that is what I plan to continue to do.