

City Council Minutes
May 7, 2024

Orangeburg City Council held its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, May 7, 2024, at 6:00 PM with Mayor Michael C. Butler presiding.

PRESENT:

Michael C. Butler, Mayor
Annette Dees Grevious
Jerry Hannah
Dr. Kalu Kalu
L. Zimmerman Keitt, Mayor Pro Tem
Richard F. Stroman

ABSENT:

Sandra P. Knotts

Mayor Butler opened Public Hearing 1 for consideration of a Zoning District Map Change from B-1, General Business to B-2, Central Business District for properties belonging to Fred Felder at 761 Russell Street TMS #0152-20-01-005.000, TMS #0152-20-01-007.00, a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-002.000 and a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-006.000 and Public Hearing 2 for consideration of an authorization of the transfer of certain parcels of real property with improvements, if any, located near the western corner of the intersection of Seaboard Street and Russell Street, identified as all of TMS #0152-20-01-008.000, a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-002.000 and a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-006.000. He stated, "We are requesting Ms. Sarah Niemann to provide an update and then we will hear from the public."

Ms. Sarah Niemann stated, "I am representing myself and my partners to bring Workforce Housing to Orangeburg. The Planning Commission unanimously approved the recommendation and Council passed the first reading. I am requesting rezoning from B-1 to B-2. Under B-1 zoning multifamily is allowed as a conditional use. We have satisfied those requirements, and a letter has been provided to Council tonight. I am not here to ask as to whether multi-family can be allowed on these parcels. I am here to ask for approval in rezoning to B-2 to allow the site plan to offer more parking for potential adjacent uses, a City space on the first level, and to open the site plan to allow for recreational areas, open space, and an additional landscaping buffer. Under the current zoning, I am eligible for 40 units; however, I am asking to be allowed for 52 units with B-2 Zoning. Orangeburg needs quality workforce and affordable housing. Housing must come first to promote all levels of economic opportunity. The property proposed is Workforce Housing for individuals, families, seniors who earn a living wage but are not financially able to obtain home ownership. I have heard from restaurant owners downtown of struggles to keep doors open. I have over 50 letters of support from individuals and businesses in the area and letters from Senator Hutto and Congressman Clyburn. Housing brings not only quality housing for residents but the money to support local businesses, retail, and restaurants. The population of your City will increase. It was mentioned at the last Council meeting that the City does not have a plan to follow to provide this type of housing. This is not true. There are two plans in place. One is the downtown vision plan, a charette that was put in place in 2014. At that time surveys and public meetings were held to have discussions and brainstorm on how Orangeburg can promote economic viability. I am within that plan as the boundaries extend from Edisto Gardens down Russell Street to Railroad Corner. Secondly and most importantly, the City has a Comprehensive Plan. The plan reflects needs, desires, and goals to achieve those plans. It is the foundation of what makes up every City. There is a housing section in which it talks about the need for almost 900 multi-family units by 2025. There has only been one 40 apartment community in the last ten years. In addition, the Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan breaks down what specifically is appropriate for a zoning district and character area. On page 7.48 of the plan, it states, the list of zoning district alternatives is designed to give developers the need of flexibility to meet changing market conditions within the general framework of the plan. However, change is permitted by alternative distributing or rezoning are inherently limited by a plan map, goals, and objectives for various areas. If there is a deficiency in the plan or conditions have been changed, the plan itself should be amended in this way, the Commission together with the Council will continually evaluate the plan for applicability. Underneath the plan, page 7.6, we are in the general commercial land use, the

Garden District between Broughton Street and Edisto Gardens. The Garden District as stated in the plan is another area defined as general commercial due to its location between which appears to support less intensive commercial and mixed-use activities including professional offices, small shops, and hopefully, some new in-town residential. On page 7.21 of the plan, this area is further defined as urban, community, mixed-use character area. Situated in multiple locations throughout the City. The areas designated as urban communities should be appropriate areas for cities of high density, residential development, and potential mixed uses. These communities allow for a variety of housing options providing opportunities for workers in the community to live in the community. The portions of downtown to the Gardens are identified here as urban community areas. These areas seek to provide objectives that promote housing opportunities, infill mixed-use development, open spaces, preservation, and environmental protection. Page 7.35 of your plan gives a description of that area. This inclusive land use category for multiple adjacent parcels supports major activity centers in and outside the City with a variety of mixed, retail, commercial, office, civic institutional use. High density residential land may also be a part of these mixed-use centers. The land uses are multiple independent parcels within a specific demographic area. These activity centers should provide interactive mixed-use development opportunities and support internal pedestrian-oriented accessibility. They should also minimize the impact of business development on neighboring properties. The policy also states to promote the development of areas classified by the plan map and permit rezoning for higher intensity and densities. This should include housing and mixed-use vertical structures in these activity centers."

Mayor Butler stated, "If you want to speak at the Public Hearing, please raise your hand to be recognized to come to the podium. Please state your name and address and keep your comments under three minutes. The Public Hearings are for rezoning and the transfer of property. You may speak if you live in the City or the County."

Ms. Meredith Baker, 184 Scoville Street stated, "I agree with the Workforce Housing points that have been made. I feel this location at the center piece of our town, the Gardens, maybe not be the perfect spot for it. My question would be what box has not been checked or cannot be checked at an alternate location somewhere that is empty or ready to be sold within maybe a mile or so of where we are talking about. I feel we can come up with a compromise to bring housing and keep the space at the front of the Gardens open for something for children to learn such as a stem center where we talk about the science around the black water, how the water wheel works, and English can be incorporated by writing a poem about a rose. I think bringing visitors from the county or the state to visit and experience the gardens would help bring business and customers."

Mrs. Joyce Rheney, 279 Livingston Terrace stated, "I served 20 years on City Council. I am aware of the needs of the City of Orangeburg, and I agree we need housing, but this is not the right place. We identified areas that were blighted several years ago, and those areas have not been sold or developed for housing. The Workforce Housing term is new to me, but senior housing is not new to me. I am appearing before you to oppose the rezoning of 761 Russell Street from B-1 to B-2. Also, there is a small parcel of almost one acre of property that the City of Orangeburg owns currently. When I was on City Council, that property was offered to the City to protect the Gardens a little bit. I think that property should remain in the hands of the City as protection for the Gardens. The Gardens' history dates to 1920, beginning with five acres of land. It has grown to 175 acres but is still not protected. We have a beautiful entrance into the Edisto Gardens. This past Rose Festival weekend was wonderful with young children and vendors. The Veterans' Park has been added. The landscaped Chamber of Commerce is located there. If this is approved, before you know it, you would have a lot of encroachment into this area. I have strong feelings concerning the rezoning of this property and I cannot visualize this building at the entrance to the Gardens."

Mr. Fred Felder, 3055 Bragg Boulevard stated, "I am in favor of this project for what it is and for what it is not. This is not typical government housing. It is not government owned, controlled, or managed. The government does not decide who rents and they do not pay any of the rent. This is Workforce Housing. People that live there must have a job and a background check. This is a great opportunity for downtown Orangeburg. The developer is wanting to spend \$20 - \$30 million dollars at zero cost to the City. The City will get an increase in tax revenue from property and business taxes. DPU will get about 60 new customers. Revitalization of a downtown area like Orangeburg or anywhere does not happen without private investment being

involved. This will bring more private investment. We have heard some negative comments such as people will be loitering in the Gardens, it will not be the people that live here as they must go to work. We have heard that it will not look good next to the Gardens. Do you think they will spend this type of money and build something that looks worse than what is there now? This housing and private investment is needed."

Mr. Harvey Elwood, 676 Buckley Street stated, "I am not going to speak for or against this. My family has been here since 1832 and we have hoped this place would grow into a better community. This development has the ability and power to do that. Most of the local university graduates leave. We do not have the housing to afford these people the opportunity to live, thrive and grow this community. This is an aging community. We need younger people; we need people of vitality in every walk of life. I think it might be something good, but the jury is still out. From Railroad Corner to the Gardens, there are 60 abandoned properties. We need foot traffic up and down Russell Street so people can revitalize those shops. A new Courthouse is being constructed; they need a place to dine. Let us work to change this community for the better and look toward the future of what it can be."

Mr. Greg Bennett stated, "My wife, Ronnie and I own the Broughton Street Café. We are starting to redevelop another building on Russell Street. The first year we did well at the Café, but the last year and half, we have done okay. There is no foot traffic. We were happy when we heard about this project as we need housing here. The decision is Councils, but I hope you can understand me as a businessman looking to survive and to continue to grow here in Orangeburg. We are asking for you to help us to continue to grow Orangeburg."

Mr. Clevis Harrison, 154 Holly Creek Drive stated, "Many of you know me for my extensive travels to over 75 countries around the world. I am fortunate to see what is possible and I would like to bring those possibilities here. I have seen many gardens, world renowned gardens. For what they propose for housing at that site, I honestly do not agree. You want to bring in tourism, you want to bring in commercial work. Putting Workforce Housing in that location does not make sense to me when you think about global attraction. If you want to thrive, you have the Gardens. I see Orangeburg as a walking town, as a City that can thrive in multiple ways. I walk through the Gardens, and know if a plan were in place, it could attract so much more. You are talking about putting a development on a corner of an entrance for the Gardens at a site that can be monumental. You have all these vacant buildings that can be restored. Look at downtown Summerville and Charleston. Everything in this world evolves around creativity. I strongly disagree with Workforce Housing at the entrance of the Gardens."

David McCully, 990 Moss Street stated, "I am 33 years old, a member of the younger generation. I do not have family in Orangeburg, I moved here when I was 25 because I love the town. I love going to the Gardens with my wife and son. I work in Columbia; I am in Orangeburg because I choose to be. I am an economist in Economic Development for the state. I have been looking at this problem for the last couple of weeks since it became public knowledge. The issue is not Workforce Housing as everyone has made the point that Orangeburg needs it, the issue is location. According to Orangeburg Parks and Recreation, 600,000 people visit the Gardens every year. That corner lot is the gateway for those tourists to turn the corner and visit downtown businesses. When they get to the end and housing is there, they will go back to their cars and go home. I suggest an opportunity cost with this. In the Orangeburg Comprehensive Plan, you talk about hotels and overnight amenities. That lot could be a great spot for a boutique hotel which is a common model for developing downtowns. A boutique hotel by the gardens where people can have weddings and their guests can stay. You can host industrial developers who want to look at things like the power site, you need somewhere for them to stay so they can see downtown and the Gardens. They can learn how great it is to live in Orangeburg. From 2020 to 2022, Orangeburg's population fell 1.7% while the average age rose from 32 to 36. Young people, my generation, are leaving. But I am staying because I have hope for downtown and the development of downtown. We need Workforce Housing, but that corner lot is pivotal to attract tourism to downtown which is a key market force for developing your downtown."

Mrs. Louise Hughes, Zion Church Road stated, "I live in the county, but I visit the Gardens often as I have loved them for a long time. I have no objection to Workforce Housing as we need it, but not at that location. There is a vacant lot a block up that will make it much easier for people to walk downtown to shop. It appears there will be a retention pond next to the fountain at the

entrance of the Gardens. This does not seem ecstatic for visitors to enjoy the Gardens. I do not think this is the proper location for Workforce Housing.”

Mr. Scott Weaver, 3072 Greg Boulevard stated, “Prestwick Development specializes in urban development. They are a resource for the City and are ready to invest \$30 million in private funds. This is a great opportunity. We are losing citizens to Lexington, Chapin, Blythewood, and Summerville. We have three colleges here. Upon graduation, how many high-level entrepreneurs and leaders are we losing to other towns from these colleges? If you put these apartments there, it will catch visitors’ attention. Downtown needs foot traffic. We need to focus on the future. Since 1980, the City has lost 12% of our population. We need this.”

Mr. Chad Rast, 731 Partridge Road stated, “I am a local contractor and developer. One thing that is unique about this piece of property is the location as it checks the boxes for Workforce Housing. It might not be where some people think is the best location but the opportunity to put this aesthetic complex on the corner and provide housing to me is a lot better than dilapidated buildings. I believe with the cost of this property and the cost to demo this property makes it impossible for anyone else to do something without absorbing a huge amount of cost. I agree we have some businesses downtown that would benefit from this. Russell Street has a new library complex, new development at Railroad Corner, the new Courthouse, then there is the square, the new City Hall and then you could have this nice Workforce Housing complex. These are people that I need in my business as I am looking for workers and cannot find them. I believe this development will offer that opportunity for all of us to have a pool of 60 workers. I hope you take this into consideration that these business owners and I are also your constituents, and we would like your support.”

Mr. Rodney Tumbleson, 168 Club Acres stated, “I have traveled the state and the region. When you look at blighted areas in Charleston, Greenville, Columbia, Wilmington, and Aiken, can you point at one of them that reinvigorated their inner corridor by bringing in low income? I have been in the housing industry in Orangeburg for 30 years. I am one of the biggest proponents of affordable housing, we need it. We need it in this district. This particular property will be the keystone for any development. On the other side of Russell Street, we have South Carolina State University (SCSU) where the average faculty income is \$100,000 or more. If we can create something to bring those folks into this area, that would be great. I agree housing is needed and Workforce Housing is needed, I just do not know that is the spot for it. A common term is diversity in housing. I do not think this project is bringing this to the downtown area.”

Mr. Michael Holloway, 172 Hollolough Road stated, “I agree with others here tonight as housing is needed. I just do not like this location. We are the Garden City. People come to visit the Gardens from other places, they do not come to see this. This is somewhat of an eyesore in my opinion to the beautiful Gardens that we have. Orangeburg needs green spaces, not hard spaces.”

Mr. Steve Agazada, 186 Elliott Street stated, “I appreciate the developer wanting to invest in downtown Orangeburg as I think it is desperately needed. I agree with a lot of the community here that location will be pragmatic for the City. There would be a lot of increased congestion in that area from car traffic. There would be additional investment in sanitation, parks, and police to maintain the cleanliness and safety of that area. I would imagine that there is a wealth of opportunity in the existing 60 vacant buildings in downtown Orangeburg where those upper floors could be taken advantage of for apartments. I request you reconsider that location as I think this housing would be better in a different area.”

Ms. Kim Sanchez stated, “My husband Eduardo Sánchez and I own and operate Rosalia’s Mexican Restaurant. We have been doing business in Orangeburg County for 17 years in March. We have been in our current location at 1058 Russell Street since 2013. We own the restaurant and the real estate. I am here in support of the proposal to build housing at the end of Russell Street. I am a resident and a business owner. I do not see it as a distraction, I see it as an enhancement and an opportunity to expand the Gardens. We would like to see our Main Street revitalized, and housing is where it starts.”

Mr. Darren Rhodes, Southeast Land and Real Estate stated, “I am not a constituent as I live in Richland County; however, I work at an office at 275 Cut Off Road, Orangeburg. I have been selling commercial real estate for 20 years. I met Sarah Niemann seven years ago when she was looking to put Workforce Housing in Blythewood. At that time, Blythewood had purchased 22

acres of property to build a beautiful 2500 seat amphitheater and they have since purchased 36 acres to add to the park. Currently there are two Preswick properties in Blythewood less than a mile from the Volkswagen manufacturing plant site. I suggest you go to Blythewood and look at these two properties. You have beautiful Gardens here that are an asset. I encourage you to look at the opportunity this will bring of not only housing but additional retail and potential commercial development. It typically starts with something like this.”

Reverend Sam Glover stated, “I have had jobs where I have been in every county in the state. I have been in conversations for a long time about Railroad Corner and we finally have a plan as to how it will look. We market the Edisto Gardens as one of the Crown Jewels of Orangeburg. When you travel down 301, the first thing you see is the Gardens. I know we need Workforce Housing because I serve on the Development Commission. But I think we have a lot of places that we can build Workforce Housing in Orangeburg. I think that we can have lofts and apartments upstairs and businesses or restaurants on the bottom. I cannot be in favor of Workforce Housing being put at the opening of the Gardens.”

Mr. Leonard Blanchard, 1349 Tolly Ganly stated, “Freddie Felder asked me to attend tonight with an open mind and I have learned a lot. I would rather see Class A housing, but the Workforce Housing is a level that is appropriate I think for this City. I have looked online at Preswick complexes. They do a good job with their buildings, and they are very aesthetically appealing to the eye. I think sitting above the Gardens would grow on you after a while, but the verdict is still out with me as I have questions.”

Mayor Butler closed the Public Hearings and opened the Regular Meeting.

A motion was made by Councilmember Stroman, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Keitt to approve the April 16, 2024, minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

A motion was made by Councilmember Stroman, seconded by Councilmember Kalu to approve the April 25, 2024, minutes with the correction of Councilmember Hannah did not vote on the two motions. The motion was unanimously approved.

Councilmember Grevious asked, “Have other properties been considered for this development?”

Ms. Niemann stated, “Yes, we came before Council, and had several Zoom calls and I proposed several locations to Council to look at a couple different opportunities based off scoring that SC Housing provides and it was determined that this was the most viable option.”

Councilmember Kalu asked, “Listening to the audience, the point of contention is location. We all agree on the concept of Workforce Housing. There have been different voices for and against. Looking at the statistics in Orangeburg, we have about 7,500 – 8,000 people that travel in and out of Orangeburg to work and then go back to their homes. The City of Orangeburg does not have a master plan. We cannot put properties all over the place without a master plan. We are talking about the entire downtown area from Railroad Corner to the Gardens. There is open space on Sprinkle Avenue where housing can go and on the other side of the Gardens are run-down buildings where a fantastic structure can be built. What we are dealing with is location. Looking at that building, what will it take for it to not be a hindrance or a stumbling block to the Gardens? We must think about that before we make any decision tonight. Is this going to enhance or brighten up the Gardens? Do we want to enhance the image of Orangeburg or is it to hamper the progress of Orangeburg?”

Councilmember Grevious asked, “Just to clarify, we are voting on rezoning not whether this development goes on this property, correct?”

Mayor Pro Tem Keitt and Mayor Butler stated, “Yes.”

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Keitt to pass the second reading of an ordinance of a Zoning District Map change from B-1, General Business to B-2, Central Business District for properties belonging to Fred Felder located at 761 Russell Street TMS #0152-20-01-005.000, TMS# 0152-20-01-007.000, a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-002.000 and a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-006.000.

Councilmember Stroman asked, "The motion is to approve? If the zoning is changed, it will allow for the apartments."

During the discussion, Councilmember Grevious made a second that was not recognized by Mayor Butler.

Mayor Butler asked for clarification from the City Attorney.

City Attorney Kozlarek stated, "This is the second reading of an ordinance to change the zoning on the properties at 761 Russell Street. There are two tax map numbers and a portion of two other tax map numbers. There is nothing in the application or the ordinance that is being considered right now that is with the specifics of the project. It is simply whether the properties will be rezoned from B-1 General Business to B-2 Central Business. This is merely a zoning change and whatever could be within the B-2 District would be eligible if the property was rezoned."

Councilmember Stroman asked, "If the zoning is changed, the apartments will be eligible to go there, correct? The rezoning request is so they can build apartments, right?"

City Attorney Kozlarek stated, "I have not looked at the zoning to see what is eligible in the B-2 District. As I understand it, the current zoning is B-1 General Business, and the request is to rezone it B-2 Central Business. It is whatever would be permissible in the B-2 Central Business District. Maybe I misunderstood the question. Obviously, the City does not own the property, so it is merely a matter of whether the zoning change would be appropriate in the City Council's mind regardless of the project."

Councilmember Stroman stated, "Apartments can go in B-2. If we rezone it, we are approving the apartments."

Councilmember Kalu asked, "For point of clarification, I understand what Councilmember Stroman is saying and I agree. We need to know the components of B-2. If the apartments are part of the components of B-2, if you approve it, she has the right to put the apartments in B-2. Mr. Singh, what are the components of B-2?"

Public Works Director Singh stated, "B-2 regulations would allow for multi-family housing just like Railroad Corner was changed to B-2 for housing. The purpose of the B-2 District is the concept for the downtown to be able to have residential and business combined. A good example would be a business with an apartment over the top of it. Multi-family residential is allowed in B-2."

Mayor Butler stated, "Going forward in our plan, in the buildings downtown, we wanted to be able to have residential upstairs."

Public Works Director Singh stated, "Correct, when we rezoned Railroad Corner, we rezoned some additional space on the downtown corridor to B-2 which allows housing. B-1 is for commercial business and does not allow housing above it?"

Councilmember Grevious asked, "So housing cannot go in B-1?"

Public Works Director Singh stated, "Housing cannot go in B-1."

Mayor Pro Tem Keitt made a motion to rescind the motion on the Zoning District Map Change from B-1 to B-2. The motion died as there was not a second.

Councilmember Hannah stated, "We had a motion that was seconded."

City Attorney Kozlarek stated, "There was a motion and a second to approve the zoning change. Council can vote on the pending motion. The pending motion could also be amended. The pending motion could be tabled. There was a motion made by Mayor Pro Tem Keitt, seconded by Councilmember Grevious. As far as I understand that is the status of where Council sits."

Councilmember Stroman asked, "Can we make a motion to table it?"

Councilmember Grevious asked, "After a seconded motion, it can be tabled?"

City Attorney Kozlarek stated, "Yes, a motion to table is in order. It is non-debatable and must be voted on immediately."

A motion was made by Councilmember Stroman, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Keitt to table the second reading of an ordinance of a Zoning District Map change from B-1, General Business to B-2, Central Business District for properties belonging to Fred Felder located at 761 Russell Street TMS #0152-20-01-005.000, TMS# 0152-20-01-007.000, a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-002.000 and a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-006.000. Four Councilmembers voted to approve the motion.

Councilmember Grevious asked, "We are tabling this until when?"

City Attorney Kozlarek stated, "That is Council's pleasure as to whether there is a postponement of the current motion that is on the floor to a certain date or an actual tabling of the motion that is on the floor. Councilmember Stroman, who made the motion, would need to clarify whether his intent was to table or postpone. The motion to postpone requires some additional clarity as to what time or date. A motion to table is just that, it is laid on the table and if Council does not remove it from the table during the current meeting, technically the motion dies."

Councilmember Stroman stated, "I want to table it."

The motion was repeated by Councilmember Stroman, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Keitt to table the second reading of an ordinance of a Zoning District Map change from B-1, General Business to B-2, Central Business District for properties belonging to Fred Felder located at 761 Russell Street TMS #0152-20-01-005.000, TMS# 0152-20-01-007.000, a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-002.000 and a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-006.000. The motion was approved 4-2. Councilmember Hannah and Councilmember Grevious opposed.

A motion was made by Councilmember Stroman, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Keitt to deny second reading of an ordinance authorizing the transfer of certain parcels of real property with improvements, if any, located near the western corner of the intersection of Seaboard Street and Russell Street, identified as all of TMS #052-20-01-008.000, a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-002.000, and a portion of TMS #0152-20-01-006.000. The motion was approved 4-2. Councilmember Hannah and Councilmember Grevious opposed.

DPU Manager Harley addressed Council concerning the City of Orangeburg DPU recognized as a Reliable Public Power Provider (RP3). He stated, "It is my pleasure to announce the Department of Public Utilities has earned the gold level distinction of Reliable Public Power Provider by the American Public Power Association. With me tonight is Wade Holmes, Director of the Electric Division and Javaris Miles, data analyst engineer who spearheaded this project. It is based on industry recognized leading practices in four important disciplines of reliability, safety, workforce development and system improvement. The RP3 designation is a sign of our utility's dedication to operating an efficient, safe, and reliable distribution system. Being recognized by the RP3 Program demonstrates DPU's commitment to its employees, community, and customers. It is also a distinction that Council should be proud of because you had to permit us to do our jobs and commit the resources that we needed to meet these standards. It is with your dedication and hard work that we bring you this honor."

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Keitt, seconded by Councilmember Grevious to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda McDaniel
Linda McDaniel
City Clerk



V O I D

V O I D

V O I D



RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Dhayalini C. Garvin, faithfully served the Department of Public Utilities of the City of Orangeburg for twenty-nine years, nine months and three days with a retirement date of May 3, 2024; and

WHEREAS, she, through her long and faithful service contributed greatly to the successful operation of the City of Orangeburg; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, in recognition of the fine contribution rendered to the City of Orangeburg, wants to inscribe on the records its appreciation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and Members of Council, in Council assembled, do officially recognize the faithful service rendered to the City of Orangeburg in the capacities in which she served and we take pride in commending her for a job well done.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution, in appreciation for her devotion of duty to the City of Orangeburg, be placed in the Minute Book of the City in recognition of her services.

PASSED BY the City Council of the City of Orangeburg, State of South Carolina, this 7th day of May 2024.



Michael C. Butler
Mayor

Sandra P. Scott
Liz Zimmermann Keitt
[Signature]
[Signature]
[Signature]
Richard F. Stroma
Members of Council

ATTEST:

Linda McDaniel
City Clerk