



CITY OF IOWA COLONY

CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, April 09, 2026
3:00 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 9th day of April 2026, the City Council of the City of Iowa Colony, Texas, held a meeting at 3:00 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 Councilmember Sydney Hargroder being absent, constituting a quorum at which time the following business was transacted.

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kennedy called the meeting to order at 3:00 P.M.

INVOCATION

Mayor Kennedy prayed aloud.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance and Texas were recited.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Carolyn Bowen shared quotes from Zig Ziglar, her ex-husband, former Mayor Maurice Bright, and Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Consideration and possible action on a resolution to address and denounce conduct and statements of Councilmember Nikki Brooks that violate the City's Code of Conduct and impugn the character of another Councilmember, staff member, or member of the public.

Mayor Kennedy read the resolution aloud.

Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott stated that the resolution was prepared by outside counsel because the situation had not improved. However, she said she was uncomfortable declaring that Councilmember Brooks was unfit for office and requested that language be removed, stating that it is ultimately up to the voters to decide whether an elected official is fit to serve.

Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott also referenced a statement included in the resolution in which Councilmember Brooks said, “and you know I always step out with receipts.” She noted that the remainder of the statement was omitted and quoted the additional language: “this is what you wanted Marquette... enjoy.” She stated that the message had been sent to all councilmembers, the City Manager, and the City Attorney. Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott said she perceived the message as a threat toward her and stated for the record that she did not feel safe. She added that she and the City Attorney had both been attacked and emphasized that this was not how council should conduct itself. She clarified that the censure was not intended as a personal attack on Councilmember Brooks, but rather as a condemnation of the behavior.

Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott also read a follow-up statement made by Councilmember Brooks: “I begged y’all not to play games with me, to move on, and leave me alone and let me ride out my term, but a hard head makes a soft behind. #BTA.” She stated that she did not know what “BTA” meant but again interpreted the statement as threatening in nature.

Councilmember Varlack stated that outside counsel had recommended the City Council undertake the resolution in order to protect the City from potential future liabilities. He commented that serving in public office is not easy and described it as a legal minefield regarding what elected officials can and cannot do, including what information may be shared and the methods through which it may be communicated. He noted that councilmembers had received training on separating personal and official social media accounts.

Councilmember Varlack agreed that it was not the Council’s place to declare a fellow councilmember unfit for office and requested that such language be removed from the resolution. He stated that he believed the actions described in the resolution, along with the action recommended by outside counsel, would allow the Council to move forward and focus on City business. He acknowledged the challenges of working within a group but emphasized the importance of treating one another respectfully while focusing on the work that needs to be accomplished. He quoted, “Let your yes be yes and your no be no, and anything more than that comes from evil.” He thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

Councilmember Varlack further stated that it was important to pass the resolution because the communications referenced could potentially place the Council in a situation involving a walking quorum.

Councilmember Boyce stated that he was disappointed the Council had reached the point of needing to consider a censure. He said the City has a code of conduct that all members should follow and expressed disappointment that it had not been upheld. He stated that the City of Iowa Colony is better than creating or twisting narratives and better than becoming the subject of negative attention from surrounding communities. He also stated that residents should feel confident in their City Council.

Councilmember Boyce said the resolution was about setting a standard for both the Council and the City. He expressed a desire for the City to receive positive recognition rather than negative attention and stated that, without action to restore appropriate boundaries and expectations, the City risked continued negative publicity. He noted that serving on the Council is a significant responsibility that requires elected officials to uphold a higher standard of conduct. He added that while there may be differing perspectives, he was not encouraged by the document or the response that had been presented.

Councilmember Brooks stated that she had never knowingly made any false or defamatory statements and rejected that characterization entirely. She said the resolution presented conclusions and opinions as established facts without evidence being presented or the broader context being examined. She stated that a resolution reflects a majority opinion and is not a fact-finding process or due process proceeding.

Councilmember Brooks stated that she had consistently asked questions, reviewed publicly available information, and raised concerns when issues did not sit right with her as an elected official. She said that disagreement with Council or staff does not constitute defamation or misconduct and that exercising independent judgment should not be reframed as dishonesty simply because it may be uncomfortable or inconvenient.

She further stated that if there were specific claims alleging that she made false statements, those claims should be evaluated through proper documentation and evidence in the appropriate forum rather than through a resolution. Councilmember Brooks stated that she did not believe it was a productive use of City resources or staff time to go line by line through the document during the meeting.

Councilmember Brooks agreed that determining whether she was fit to serve was a matter for the voters, not the Council. However, she expressed concerns regarding the processes, behaviors, and patterns she had observed over the previous eleven months, including the censure, a \$25,000 investigation, and the current resolution. She questioned whether the use of City time and resources during business hours, with multiple full-time staff members present, reflected appropriate priorities.

Councilmember Brooks also addressed the text message referenced earlier, stating that while the word “enjoy” had been mentioned, the related documentation she later posted had not been discussed. She stated that the message was not intended as a threat but rather to indicate that she was being compelled, as part of her role, to move forward with documentation that needed to be presented to multiple agencies.

She further stated that she was unaware that either she or other councilmembers were operating under any timeline and noted that, with only three weeks remaining until the election, it was fair to ask whether the Council was focused on conducting City business. Councilmember Brooks stated that she had shared portions of the documentation and stood by what she had presented. She added that she felt obligated to provide transparency to taxpayers so the public could have the full picture. She stated that she stood by the truth, her integrity, and the record, and that she would continue serving the public as long as the people allowed her to do so. She concluded by stating that elected officials were chosen to conduct the business of the people, not to denounce one another.

Councilmember Murray stated that she attended the meeting despite her father being hospitalized because elected officials are accountable to the residents of the City. She emphasized that how councilmembers conduct themselves is both vital and important. While disagreements are acceptable, she stated that individuals should not seek to hurt or destroy one another and that all actions taken should be for the betterment of the City.

Mayor Kennedy then asked Ms. Hamm, outside legal counsel who conducted the investigation, to come forward. He asked whether the subject of the complaint filed by Mrs. Anderson had been interviewed or given an opportunity to participate in the investigation.

Ms. Hamm stated that all individuals involved were provided an equal opportunity to participate. She explained that she was unable to personally interview Councilmember Brooks because Councilmember Brooks initially advised that she was represented by counsel, and ethical rules prohibited direct communication. Ms. Hamm stated that, on the day the report was due to City Council, Councilmember Brooks informed her that she was no longer represented by counsel and submitted a written statement, which was reviewed and considered as part of the investigation.

Ms. Hamm further stated that City Council extended the investigation by one week to allow sufficient time to review the statement and incorporate its contents into the findings. She added that portions of the written statement clarified certain findings to Councilmember Brooks’

benefit. While no interview ultimately occurred with Councilmember Brooks, Ms. Hamm stated that the opportunity to participate had been provided and information had been submitted and considered.

Mayor Kennedy then spoke regarding constitutional rights and freedom of expression. He stated that while individuals have the right to free speech, those rights are not unlimited. He said that speech crosses a line when it transitions into unlawful conduct and noted that the Constitution does not protect threats of violence, destruction of property, harassment, obscenity, or defamation. Mayor Kennedy stated that the First Amendment is intended to protect liberty, not to serve as a tool for character assassination, and emphasized that public service requires integrity from elected officials.

Motion made by Councilmember Varlack to amend the Resolution by removing the following verbiage from the Resolution "and states it's opinion that Councilmember Brooks is not fit to hold public office.", Seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott.

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

Motion made by Councilmember Varlack to consider adopting the Resolution to address and denounce the conduct and statements by Councilmember Nikki Brooks that violates the city code of conduct and imputes the character of another councilmember, staff member, or member of the public, Seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott.

Voting Yea: Councilmember Murray, Mayor Pro Tem Greene-Scott, Mayor Kennedy, Councilmember Varlack, Councilmember Boyce

Voting Abstaining: Councilmember Brooks

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 P.M.

APPROVED THIS 18th DAY OF MAY 2026

Kayleen Rosser, City Secretary

Wil Kennedy, Mayor

