



CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, November 20, 2025
6:00 PM

Iowa Colony City Council Chambers, 3144 Meridiana Parkway, Iowa Colony, Texas 77583

Phone: 281-369-2471 • Fax: 281-369-0005 • www.iowacolonytx.gov

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF BRAZORIA

CITY OF IOWA COLONY

BE IT REMEMBERED ON THIS, the 20th day of November 2025, the City Council of the City of Iowa Colony, Texas, held a meeting at 6:00 P.M. at the Iowa Colony City Council Chambers, there being present and in attendance the following members to wit:

Mayor Wil Kennedy
Mayor Pro Tem Marquette Greene-Scott
Councilmember Nikki Brooks
Councilmember Arnetta Murray
Councilmember Tim Varlack
Councilmember Kareem Boyce
Councilmember Sydney Hargroder

And none being absent, constituting a quorum at which time the following business was transacted.

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kennedy called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

INVOCATION

Pastor Ed Flemming prayed aloud.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance and Texas Pledge were recited.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Lindsey Koskiemi stated that she believes this action reflects elements of cancel culture and provided information outlining her perspective on that concept. She referenced specific language contained within the censure document and read portions of the wording aloud. She expressed concern that the document is written in a manner she feels is stereotypical, harmful, and unprofessional toward Black women. She stated that she is embarrassed and disappointed that such a letter appears in her community's City Council packet. During her 15 years of experience in local government, she noted that she has not encountered similar actions by any city council with which she has worked. She expressed concern that the public censure is intended to cause humiliation and embarrassment and voiced hope that the matter would be resolved during the meeting. Mrs. Koskiemi further stated that the discussion occurred in executive session and acknowledged that individuals can become passionate about issues they care deeply about. She remarked that elected officials should be able to handle strong or expressive language and suggested that those unable to do so may wish to reconsider holding public office. Additionally, she expressed that she would like the city to provide streaming services.

Cameron Rollwitz stated that he is still learning how to navigate city government and acknowledged that this is a difficult decision. He noted that while the situation may feel like an act of cancel culture to some, a censure is a formal governmental action intended to address instances where elected officials do not adhere to the established code of conduct and guidelines to which they have agreed. He emphasized that these guidelines are not new and have been in place for some time. He expressed support for the decision the Council makes this evening, recognizing that it is not taken lightly. Based on the evidence he has reviewed, he stated that he trusts the Council's judgment. He further noted that he does not believe it is appropriate for elected officials to yell or direct explicit language toward others. Based on the documents reviewed to date, he stated that he is in favor of the censure.

Carolyn Bowen stated that she has lived in the city for 54 years and has served the community for 22 of those years. She expressed disapproval of grandstanding or publicly displaying the City's problems, noting that she has previously watched similar issues unfold on television, where attorneys advised silence despite her understanding of the underlying circumstances. She described that period as a difficult time in her life. She stated that she does not like seeing the City's issues addressed in a public forum such as the Council chambers and expressed her disappointment with the situation. She requested an apology for the conduct in question and an explanation of how the situation escalated to that point. She also emphasized the need to address safety concerns on County Road 48, stating that failure to do so could result in a serious accident.

Brenda Dillon stated that she fully supports the City Council's decision regarding the censure. Drawing on her experience as an auditor, she noted that she regularly works with codes of conduct and established procedures. She shared that a family member contacted her after seeing a social media post regarding City Council business, expressing concern that City matters had been discussed publicly online by Councilwoman Brooks. She stated that if a Councilwoman Greene-Scott felt the censure was necessary, it was not done in an illegal manner or in a way that would jeopardize her professional license as an attorney. She emphasized the importance of addressing matters through proper channels. She further stated that the profanity stated loud regarding the Police Chief was taken personally, noting that there is an appropriate and respectful way to communicate with others. She reiterated her support for the Council's actions and stated that she does not believe Councilwoman Greene-Scott owes anyone an apology. She emphasized that the City Council serves as a governing body responsible for making decisions on behalf of the City.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Consideration and possible action on a resolution to formally censure Councilmember Nikki Brooks regarding her conduct on November 5, 2025, for violations of the Rules of Procedure and Code of Conduct.

Mayor Kennedy read the censure letter aloud.

Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott stated that the request for censure was not made lightly, emphasizing that the integrity of the City Council, staff, and the City as a whole is at stake. She noted that debate should be allowed, but it must always be conducted respectfully. She clarified that the censure was not a personal attack on Councilmember Brooks, but rather a response to her behavior. The terms used to describe the behavior; belligerent, aggressive, and unpredictable—were intended as an accurate characterization of the actions observed. She further noted that four other Black women were present during the discussion, emphasizing that the censure was not based on race. She reiterated that this action constitutes a censure, not a form of censorship, and is not intended to silence anyone. She referenced a Bible verse from Ecclesiastes to underscore her point, asking rhetorically what workplace allows employees to curse coworkers and staff. She concluded by stating that such conduct cannot be allowed to continue.

Councilmember Tim Varlack stated that he concurs with the Mayor Pro Tem, noting that this decision was not taken lightly and, in fact, was made with great difficulty. He emphasized that, as elected officials, members are held to obligations, rules, and procedures that the general public is not, and while it is acceptable to disagree, the City Manager taught Councilmembers that disagreements must be expressed without being disagreeable. He noted that Councilmembers are required to work through difficult issues and stated that he has reviewed Councilmember Brooks' response. He emphasized that interactions with the public, staff, and each other require adherence to a higher standard. Unfortunately, in this incident, the matter could not remain private, as it extended beyond the executive session and required action from a staff member who was not part of that session. For these reasons, the matter needed to be addressed by the Council and brought before the City. He indicated that he does not see a significant need for further discussion. He quoted from Councilmember Brooks' response to the censure. He clarified that he does not question her integrity, dedication to protecting the Council, or commitment to the City; there is nothing about her personally that he questions. He stated that what is before the Council is the behavior that occurred and the necessity to ensure it does not happen again. He expressed hope that the matter can be resolved in a manner that is respectful to all parties involved.

Councilmember Brooks presented a PowerPoint in response to the censure and began by thanking everyone in attendance. She addressed the use of social media, noting it may reflect generational differences, and stated her intention was to explain what happened and why. She asserted that the executive session in question was not properly qualified under Texas law. She explained that Texas law requires specific conditions to be met for an executive session regarding an employee, including providing the employee proper notice, the right to attend, and the right to request that matters related to their job be made public. She stated that these policies were not followed, and therefore the executive session was not properly convened, meaning the Texas Open Meetings Act did not apply. She provided direct quotes to clarify the context of prior statements, asserting that partial quotes previously presented misrepresented the situation and maligned her character. She noted that this pattern of misrepresentation is consistent with conduct she has observed from some colleagues since joining the Council. She emphasized that she was providing accurate context to information that was already public. She stated that the censure is not about a lack of quorum but about her refusal to participate in improper conduct. She provided background on her professional experience and training, including Sarbanes-Oxley, Whistleblower Act training, anti-retaliation protocols, and disciplined leadership standards. She explained that she is required by law to report unethical behavior or procedural violations and had notified other Councilmembers that certain actions violated multiple statutes, including Sarbanes-Oxley, the Texas Whistleblower Protection Act, and the Texas Penal Code. She explained the Whistleblower Act and stated that her refusal to participate in improper solicitation was her legal right. She addressed statements regarding Chief Bell. She described feeling shocked and overwhelmed by the level of hostility, noting that no explicit language was used but the behavior was intimidating. At one point, she stated, out of fear and professional concern, that she would not put herself at legal risk for the Council. During this time, a recess was called, and all staff except one employee were sent home. The employee was then brought back into executive session, where aggressive and discriminatory behavior occurred toward the individual, requiring her repeated intervention. She noted that the meeting lasted over five hours, ending after 12:30 a.m., and she subsequently contacted the Texas Municipal League (TML) and a personal attorney. She documented her observations in an affidavit. She emphasized that the Council's role is to set policy and hire the City Manager and City Attorney, not to oversee staff. She sought clarity from the Mayor and HR the following day, and the Mayor advised her to contact TML. She obtained written advice from TML and shared it with the Mayor and Interim City Manager, but she stated the guidance was not followed. She emphasized that social media

was not the issue. She created a petition advocating for streaming Council meetings to increase transparency and accountability. She described additional “red flags,” including pressure to act outside legal authority and misuse of attorney-client privilege, noting she was unsure of the legal counsel involved. She expressed concern over employees being disparaged and subjected to inappropriate comments, including references to mental health. She cited specific incidents involving the IT Manager, including this meeting held without HR present that she described as an illegal executive session. Finally, she noted that she signed her affidavit prior to the censure being issued to protect herself and reduce potential liability for the City.

Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott emphasized that no one was being interrogated. She noted that she holds two bar licenses, one in Louisiana and one in Texas, and stated that serving as an elected official is done out of dedication to the City. She expressed concern about social media posts suggesting that the Council was engaging in illegal activity, which she does not appreciate. She explained that she had requested a contract from an employee on November 5 and followed up on November 17 and November 20, noting that the contract had still not been provided. She added that Chief Bell remained at the building until all others had departed that night of the meeting. Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott emphasized that the focus is on behavior, not the individual. She noted that the document in question, which some claim was handled illegally, was only received by Councilmember Brooks; no other Council members, including the Mayor, have seen it. She stated that without access to the document, it is not possible to interrogate anyone or fully understand the situation. She described visiting City Hall to sign checks and inquiring about a particular check. Finance directed her to an individual who indicated that the check was related to a contract provided when Robert was City Manager. She requested the contract in order to obtain the necessary information and ensure proper review, emphasizing that the Council is simply performing its duty by asking questions. She noted that there was a significant amount of profanity used during prior discussions, making it difficult to recall all details. She reiterated that the Council is not privy to the document upon which certain claims rely and stated that they have no knowledge of any formal complaint or whistleblower issue.

Councilmember Varlack asked whether a copy of the presentation displayed on the screens by Councilmember Brooks had been provided to the Council prior to the meeting. Councilmember Brooks responded that it had not, stating that the presentation consisted of her personal notes. Councilmember Varlack noted that the Code of Conduct requires that information germane to Council deliberations not be withheld from the Council, and stated that this constituted another breach of the Code of Conduct. He addressed claims that the Council held an illegal personnel meeting, clarifying that the executive session was identified as a departmental review. He stated that he initiated the request for an IT department review after a neighboring city experienced a cyberattack and explained that the purpose was to review strategy and preparedness, regardless of whether the IT Manager was present. He noted that the Interim City Manager recommended reviewing all departments as part of this process. Councilmember Varlack cited the City Charter, which requires the City Manager to consult with the City Council prior to taking action regarding department heads. He stated that, based on consultation with attorneys, while an individual may have a whistleblower claim, Texas law does not require the subject of a complaint to have their supervisor present during such discussions. He further explained that the purpose of an executive session is to consult with legal counsel on matters that may be private or protected. He stated that he respects Councilmember Brooks as both a colleague and a friend, but noted that she acknowledged making the statements referenced in the censure. He stated that during the meeting, Councilmember Brooks indicated she did not leave the session, initially citing fatigue and later referencing personal challenges. He concluded by stating that when emotions escalated, the conduct extended beyond the executive session into the Council chambers, at which point the matter became public, which is why we are having this meeting.

Councilmember Brooks responded to the questions that had been raised. When asked how the council became aware of the email, she explained that the mayor stated he was unable to open it. Because she had forgotten her iPad, her husband brought it to her that night before the meeting. She then asked the IT Director to open the email so it could be discussed. The email was received by three individuals: the Mayor, Councilmember Boyce, and Councilmember Brooks. She has signed an affidavit and stated that she acknowledged everything to the best of her recollection, as she was advised to do. She expressed concern that public attention was focused on her use of profanity, while there was little concern for how the employee was being treated. She felt the situation was an attack. She stated that the council is frequently at City Hall instructing the employee, and she notified them that this was not within the council's purview. She explained that she made the presentation so the public could follow along and to promote transparency. She believes the council needs to address de quorum. She stated that profanity used in a moment of shock is not the core issue. Rather, the issue is that the council is not behaving in a manner consistent with a governing body. She noted that she undergoes extensive professional training, yet when she offers suggestions, the council becomes offended. When she shares information, she is later notified by attorneys that she has violated some rule or restriction. She stated that a great deal was said during the executive session. Although the employee was initially brought in to discuss an invoice, the discussion shifted to other matters. She stated that the first person she contacted the following morning was an attorney, followed by the mayor and Human Resources, because she was terrified by what had occurred during the session. She further stated that they were instructed to shred the attorney-client privilege folder on their way out the door. She concluded by stating that the reason they are in this situation is a lack of transparency.

Councilmember Hargroder stated that she has served on the council for some time and, during her tenure, has not become complacent. Instead, she has continually challenged herself through ongoing education. She volunteers throughout the city, serves as a staff member for a sister city, and actively seeks out external training because of her passion for public service. She expressed that she is offended by any implication that her commitment is questionable. She acknowledged that everyone present, in their own way, cares about the city. She shared that she spoke with a colleague about the situation and felt embarrassed by it. After ending the call, her daughter; who had overheard the conversation; asked whether the same woman who had publicly told her to calm down had also yelled at her in private. She stated that she had to answer yes, noting that this was not the first time matters had escalated on the dais. She emphasized that this issue is not about the "why," but about the "what." There are established rules, procedures, and a code of conduct that must be followed. She referenced George Washington's Farewell Address in support of this point. She stated that she is not privy to the whistleblower complaint being discussed. She wanted the audience to understand that the document was not distributed appropriately and that privileged protections had been placed on it. She concluded by stating that, in her opinion, the matter should not have reached this point. She further stated that apologies are meaningless without the willingness and ability to change behavior, noting that while three apologies were offered, no change in behavior followed.

Councilmember Murray stated that she was present at the meeting where the incident occurred. She admitted that she used profanity and acknowledged her actions. She stated that responsibility now needs to be taken. She acknowledged that there is a proper way for matters to be handled and emphasized that, ultimately, they are all part of one team; Team City of Iowa Colony. She stated that she has admitted her conduct and needs to be prepared to accept the censure as the consequence of her actions. She concluded by stating that she does not want anyone to use profanity toward her.

Councilmember Boyce stated that he is disappointed and embarrassed by the situation, noting that this is not the standard he expects from city officials. He expressed that this is not something citizens should have to witness or endure. He emphasized that the issue under discussion is the conduct involved. He stated that he was not present at the meeting when the matter occurred and that his understanding is based on secondhand accounts and a review of the materials afterward. He expressed difficulty in voting on an issue without having all of the information. However, he stated that he has enough information to know what he does not want to see in the city. He concluded by stating that the council must uphold and conduct itself in a respectful manner. He is disturbed by the fact that there are four officers present in this meeting. He feels that the city puts out a lot of information that is highly accessible to the residents of the city.

Mayor Kennedy stated that when he hears he yells at someone he is concerned. He apologized to those on staff if he did yell at them.

Councilmember Brooks requested the opportunity to make a closing statement in response to the censure. The mayor stated that, at this time, the council needed to move forward.

Councilmember Brooks responded that it was acceptable and that she would instead make her statement on social media. She stated that if the council was finished hearing from her, that was fine. She then posed two questions: whether the council intended to update the rules of procedure to prohibit the use of profanity, and what consequences would apply if she or another councilmember used profanity in the future. She stated that she would communicate further through social media and emphasized that the city clearly needs greater transparency. She further stated that there appears to be a culture issue within city staff.

Councilmember Hargroder asked whether there was a motion on the floor.

City Attorney Natasha Brooks requested that the presentation given by Councilmember Brooks that evening be shared with her, as she would like a copy. She stated that several statements made during the meeting were inaccurate, noting that she has practiced law for over 20 years and takes her career very seriously. She expressed her love for the City of Iowa Colony and explained that when the previous city manager retired, she was asked to assume the role. To ensure continuity of operations, she took on a dual role. She stated that she contacted outside counsel and that when she was called into executive session, she was prepared to discuss multiple personnel matters. She stated that she does not want her professional reputation affected by statements made during the meeting. She emphasized that all of her actions were in accordance with the law and that she will protect her law license. She stated that she is a qualified and competent attorney and would like the opportunity to address the statements made that evening.

Councilmember Brooks stated that while Natasha is a qualified and competent attorney, the issue lies in her role as City Manager. She stated that the council placed her in a position requiring responsibilities for which she was not trained, creating a conflict of interest. Councilmember Brooks continued talking as the mayor called order to the room.

Councilmember Brooks interrupted the proceedings and stated that the Councilmembers were lying. She further stated that she intended to pursue legal action against the City and would be contacting the Office of the Attorney General. She also urged the public to vote the current members of the Council out of office.

Councilmember Varlack addressed the audience, explaining that when a motion is made, it places the question before the Council for a vote, and a second allows for discussion. He stated that the conduct displayed during the meeting was the very issue before the Council and asked whether the behavior exhibited that evening would be included in the motion under consideration.

Councilmember Brooks responded by stating that if her passion was being characterized as dangerous, she questioned whether she appeared to be a threat, asking rhetorically whether she looked as though she was about to physically confront someone.

The Mayor then directed Councilmember Brooks to leave the dais. Councilmember Brooks collected her belongings and exited the room.

The Mayor stated that he had directed the Councilmember to leave the dais. He further explained that removal of a Councilmember requires a two-thirds vote of the Council. A vote was taken, and all six remaining Councilmembers voted in favor of the removal.

Motion made by Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott action on a resolution to formally censure Councilmember Nikki Brooks regarding her conduct on November 5, 2025, for violations of the Rules of Procedure and Code of Conduct., Seconded by Councilmember Varlack.

Voting Yea: Councilmember Murray, Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott, Mayor Kennedy, Councilmember Hargroder, Councilmember Varlack, Councilmember Boyce
Councilmember Brooks was absent

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 P.M.

APPROVED THIS 26th DAY OF JANUARY 2026

Kayleen Rosser, City Secretary

Wil Kennedy, Mayor

