

**City Council Minutes**  
**November 18, 2025**

Orangeburg City Council held its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, November 18, 2025, at 6:00 pm in Council Chambers, 933 Middleton Street with Mayor Butler presiding.

**PRESENT:**

**Michael C. Butler, Mayor**  
**Annette Dees Grevious**  
**Jerry Hannah**  
**Jordan E. Hawkins**  
**Dr. Kalu Kalu, Mayor Pro Tem**  
**L. Zimmerman Keitt**  
**Sandra P. Knotts**

A motion was made by Councilmember Grevious seconded by Councilmember Knotts to approve November 4, 2025, minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Stephanie Moorer presented information to Council on an event Thursday, November 20, 2025, 12:00 pm – 3:00 pm at Zimmerman Community Center, 759 Peasley Street for free Flu Shots and information on home delivery of medications.

City Administrator Evering addressed Council concerning third reading of an ordinance authorizing the transfer of approximately 0.21 acres of real property with improvements, if any, located at 215 Courthouse Square, with County TMS #0173-13-29-006.000. He stated, "This is an offer to purchase the green space next to the Williams and Williams Law Firm to make a pocket park/green space that will provide opportunities for the public to use. There will be parking spaces for food trucks, an area for a small stage and some permanent seating. WillBros Property, LLC has offered to purchase the property for \$30,000."

A motion was made by Councilmember Hannah, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Kalu to approve third reading of an ordinance authorizing the transfer of approximately 0.21 acres of real property with improvements, if any, located at 215 Courthouse Square, with County TMS #0173-13-29-006.000. The motion was unanimously approved.

City Administrator Evering addressed Council concerning third reading of an ordinance authorizing the transfer of approximately 0.16 acres of real property with improvements, if any, located at 307 Jennings Court, with County TMS #0173-18-10-003.000. He stated, "This property is located at the corner of Jennings and Rowe Streets. It is a small City park that is seldomly used. The developer wishes to purchase that property for \$2,500 with a reversionary clause that would allow the City to repurchase the property for that amount and any improvements if the property is not rehabbed in the manner that the developer has stated it would be. Again, they are looking to rehab 12 units that are currently located there and to build two more buildings that would house two more units. There will be an increase in rent in January, unrelated to the rehab, of approximately 10 to 15%. The first phase of the rehab would be the construction of the two new buildings. They will include eight parking spaces for those two buildings and an additional five parking spaces for the current residents. Phase two would be a rehab of the twelve units that are currently there."

Councilmember Grevious asked, "Is the developer getting any type of HUD funding where he might be able to qualify for section three housing or section three opportunities for these residents?"

City Administrator Evering stated, "No, the developers are not planning to use any HUD funding"

A motion was made by Councilmember Keitt, seconded by Councilmember Grevious to approve second reading of an ordinance authorizing the transfer of approximately 0.16 acres of real property with improvements, if any, located at 307 Jennings Court, with County TMS #0173-18-10-003.000. The motion was unanimously approved.

City Administrator Evering addressed Council concerning first reading of an ordinance amending, restating, striking and replacing Chapter 12 of the City Code – Animal Control. He stated, “This is replacing of the entire animal control chapter in our code of ordinances. Primarily being that the current code was drafted back in 1969. There are some amendments that did take place in 1972. This is an overdue redoing of the entire animal control ordinance code. I will provide a high-level overview and, if you all have any questions, I have Chief Austin available and our City Attorney to assist me in answering any questions. The first part of the code amendment would govern general animal regulations prohibiting exotic animals, such as large wild cats, bears, pythons, exotic animals of that nature. There is a general care and welfare provision that requires owners to provide food, water, and shelter, veterinary care for animals, any agricultural animals such as cows, horses, mules, goats, animals of the like would require special permission from the Department of Public Safety (DPS). Chickens would be allowed up to four chickens on residential properties, but no roosters and there are also setback requirements. The tethering and abandonment of animals prohibits unsafe tethering short leases or chains that are choke collars on animals. It prohibits abandoning or keeping animals on unoccupied property. There is a section that talks about dogs. Prohibits animals from roaming off the owner’s properties without restraint, allows impoundment for five days and outlines owners’ notification, cost, and potential euthanasia or adoption. There is a section on dangerous and vicious animals that require confinement in securing enclosures and control measures prohibit owning or breeding animals for fighting. It allows summary execution of dangerous animals during attacks when necessary for public safety. Under seizure and empowerment section, it authorizes seizures of animals that are cruelly treated, abandoned, injured, or lacking proper care. This ordinance establishes a minimum two-week period before disposition requires attempts to notify owners within two days of seizure. Under nuisance animals, it defines public nuisance behaviors, establishes, escalating fines for repeated offenses, creates procedures for citizens, complaints, and city enforcement. Requires business licenses for breeding animals for financial gain. There is a section about rabies and animal control officers.”

Mayor Butler stated, “I am glad we are revamping this as we receive a lot of calls about vicious dogs in neighborhoods.”

Councilmember Grevious asked, “Is there a grandfather clause? For example, If a resident has five chickens and now the ordinance states four chickens is the maximum.”

City Attorney Mosser stated, “Presently there is not a grandfather provision in the ordinance. If you currently have a petting zoo on your property in the City, you will have to come to DPS and get permission to continue operating. If you have a dog breeding business that you have been running out of your basement, you now need a business license to continue. If Council want there to be some sort of grandfather provisions, we will need to know specifically which ones Council want to address.”

Councilmember Hawkins asked, “I have a question about exotic animals. If someone wants a snake in their house, would we be infringing upon their rights by prohibiting it?”

Attorney Mosser stated, “There is not presently a grandfathering provision. The ordinance in the prior code is from the 1960s, it does not contemplate exotic animals at all. There are a couple of different considerations. Pythons may not be dangerous to humans, but they are potentially dangerous if they get out and start breeding and have ecological consequences. Scorpions, alligators, things that are potentially dangerous to humans and other animals are on the list because they are inherently dangerous or deemed to be dangerous but again, this is a policy question for Council. It is legal for you to limit.”

Councilmember Hawkins asked, “What about prohibiting, not just limiting but saying you cannot have this as your pet?”

Attorney Mosser stated, “There is a rational basis for you making that as a health decision whether it is the environmental consequences of suddenly have a massive python population in your environment just like they have in Florida. If you are keeping an alligator, a tiger, a scorpion, and any of these things get out, obviously, they present an inherent danger to the community. Again, that is within your police power to regulate whether or not you all want to do that is a policy question, but you can do it.”

Councilmember Grevious asked, "Is it possible for us to identify or exclude certain exotic animals?"

City Attorney Mosser stated, "Section 12-1 is the list of the exotic animals. Particularly, we are in 12-1B. Bears, coyotes, jackals, crocodiles, alligators, monitors which are a big lizard, venomous reptiles, scorpions, exotic snakes, various kinds of pythons, anacondas, and sort of the general catch all of animals that you would be likely to find at a zoo and not at a pet store. If Council wants to amend that list, if you want to have a different classification or we are okay with alligators but not okay with tigers and we are okay with pythons but not okay with scorpions. Again, those are policy considerations for Council."

Councilmember Hawkins stated, "I think we need to change the wording to a non-native venomous or something that is not native to the states."

Mayor Butler stated, "We need to eliminate things that can be dangerous to the public like bears, alligators, and big cats."

Mayor Pro Tem Kalu asked, "Article 2 under dogs. How do know if someone is breeding dogs for professional activities?"

City Administrator Evering stated, "We would not know unless someone brought it to law enforcement's attention or law enforcement happened to be patrolling the area or was tipped off."

DPS Chief Austin stated, "We would have to depend on someone reporting that activity and we would investigate it. If we find that there is a business end of it, then a business license would be required."

Councilmember Hawkins asked, "Is it possible to pull the stats within the last two to three years for exotic animal calls and how many dog calls our officers are responding to?"

DPS Chief Austin stated, "We should be able to pull the dog and cat calls. On the exotic animals, we will try to see what we can find."

Councilmember Knotts stated, "Please explain the section concerning regulates female cats in heat. Cats are all over my neighborhood."

City Administrator Evering stated, "We certainly have colonies of cats that are out of hand in many regards. To your point, Section 12.2 states every female cat in heat shall be kept confined in a building or secure enclosure or in a veterinary hospital or boarding kennel in such manner that such female cat cannot come in contact with another animal except for breeding purposes."

City Attorney Mosser stated, "If I may add, that is in the existing code, it is not a new provision."

Councilmember Grevious asked, "If we suspect a cat is in heat and we call, technically that cat should be removed?"

City Administrator Evering stated, "Yes, it needs to be in a confined enclosure. It cannot be out wondering."

Councilmember Hannah stated, "We have rules and regulations which means you will have to retrieve some animals. We must have something in place to house those animals. The County is amenable to assisting us with some housing if we talk to them."

DPS Chief Austin stated, "I have had a conversation with the County Director Clarkson of Animal Services. We discussed whether the County would be amenable to an addition to the County's animal facility. We are going to have a subsequent meeting to further those discussions, but we have at least begun the discussions."

Councilmember Hannah stated, "I raised that question because if the County is amenable to add on more slots designated for the City's use, that would help us out versus erecting a site, having it

maintained and monitored. With this new ordinance, we will have cats and dogs picked up but we will need some place to take them.”

City Administrator Evering stated, “We are exploring sponsorships from pet companies or any other industry that might be interested in sponsoring a kennel or an addition to a kennel.”

Councilmember Hawkins asked, “Do we still have the kennels behind Station Three on Kennerly Road? Is it adequate to add more?”

DPS Chief Austin stated, “The area quite frankly is not conducive to maintain kennels there. The better outcome for us if we are able to join with the County and add on to their facility.”

Councilmember Hannah asked, “Is there anything in this ordinance concerning pet owners picking up pet feces/droppings?”

City Attorney Mosser stated, “Yes, that is in the General Nuisance Section 12-49. It states nuisance animals include but not limited to animals that defile, defecate on private property or on public walks, such waste is immediately removed and properly disposed of by the owner.”

Councilmember Hannah stated, “I am referring to stray dogs and cats defecating on property.”

City Attorney Mosser stated, “That is addressed in Section C-4 Animals running at large. The Animal Control Officer is entitled to seize the dog regardless of whether we know who the owner is. Whether they have a place to put them is a policy question, but the Animal Control Officer has the ability to pick up the dog.”

City Administrator Evering stated, “It is an extensive ordinance. If you all have any questions as we move forward in the process, feel free to send them to me so we can get them answered.”

A motion was made by Councilmember Hannah, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Kalu to approve first reading of an ordinance amending, restating, striking and replacing Chapter 12 of the City Code – Animal Control. The motion was unanimously approved.

City Administrator Evering addressed Council concerning first reading of an ordinance amending Chapter 2 (Administration) of the City code by amending Section 2-1.2 (Election procedure for Mayor and Councilmembers) to provide of the nomination of candidates for Mayoral and Council Candidates by petition. He stated, “As an overview, this would require candidates for Mayor and City Council qualify by submitting a nominating petition. Petitions must be filed with the Municipal Election Commission no fewer than 45 days prior to the election. Petitions must contain signatures of 5% of the qualified electors of the district for which the City Council person is a candidate or five percent of the entire City if the candidate is running for mayor. Petitions are reviewed by the supervisor of registration who is certified candidates no fewer than 30 days before the election. Filing fees are established at \$150 for City council candidates and \$500 for mayoral candidates. City Council candidates must be registered voters residing in the district they seek at the time of filing. Mayoral candidates must be registered voters residing within the City of Orangeburg at the time of filing and proof of residency is required as determined by the Municipal Election Commission. This would keep the non-partisan status of the City of Orangeburg’s elections and if enacted the changes would not apply until the next election cycle after December 31, 2026.”

Councilmember Hannah asked, “I know we got one new Councilmember this term, one Councilmember in the previous term and one Councilmember before that. Where did this come from?”

Mayor Butler stated, “This was in a discussion in Executive Session.”

Councilmember Hawkins asked, “Where did this come from? What is this going to improve moving forward? Why was it brought upon to change.”

City Administrator Evering stated, “As I understand it, it would basically make sure that the candidates who are running for City Council or Mayor are serious and have the support of the district or the entire City in case of the Mayor. They have some synergy or some familiarity with

that district and the folks are familiar with them. So, a person cannot just up and run and have no affiliation or familiarity with the district.”

Councilmember Hawkins asked, “How did it get brought up to come into Executive Session?”

City Administrator Evering stated, “There was a discussion about the legality of doing this particular method.”

Mayor Butler stated, “Before you came on, Jordan, we talked about this, and we have been talking about this for months before you came on the Council. This is something that we discussed.”

Councilmember Keitt stated, “It will tell whether you are serious about running for an election. I am hoping that we will think about the seriousness of it and go with it. It is meant for people who are really interested in serving your community. Just to put your name in something does not mean anything but to put your name in it and really work it, it means something.”

Mayor Butler stated, “This is what we had in place before and it gives you a chance to meet your voters. If you go out and get a percentage of people to vote for you, you meet them, you knock on their door. So, people just will not jump up and say I am going to run. This gives you a chance to meet your voters, your voters know you and they have a better situation to decide on whether they are going to vote for you in your district. Because a lot of people will run for office and the voters do not know them and so we give you a chance to meet your voters and put seriousness about you. I remember the first time I ran in 2013; I knocked on all of the doors and got a chance to meet my voters and where they live.”

Mayor Pro Tem Kalu asked, “For clarity, are there other municipalities that have adopted this ordinance?”

City Administrator Evering stated, “I am not sure. I can do that research and find out how many different municipalities.”

Mayor Butler stated, “I know, more cities have this. We had this process and then we changed from the petitions. I have talked to other mayors that have this.”

Councilmember Grevious asked, “Is there a reason the change was made to remove the petitions?”

Mayor Butler stated, “When we stopped with the petitions, I am going to be honest with you, we said we are tired of walking.”

Councilmember Knotts stated, “If you go to the community in which you are going to be serving, ten times out of ten, a lot of folks already know you. That tells me, I just need to get more engaged in the community and I do not see doing a petition because you will be doing the campaigning, foot traffic, in that area so people will know who you are regardless. We did petitions before for the longest before we changed it. My biggest concern is the climate that we live in now. You must be careful going into communities knocking on doors.”

Councilmember Hawkins stated, “I had a gun pulled on me this year campaigning. I think 5% is not going to get you in office and if voters are not serious, they will not vote anyway.”

Councilmember Knotts stated, “If we are going to go back to this, we need to do an in-depth kind of thinking in terms of where we are right now because when we first initially did the petitions, we did not have the kind of nonsense that we have now. On the news, there was a lady and her husband that cleaned housing apartments. She knocked on the door and was shot and killed through the door. I am saying because of the times we are in, we need to rethink if this is the best approach. Someone in another municipality might be doing it, but they may not be having the issues that we are having here in Orangeburg.”

Mayor Butler stated, “There are other things you can do besides knocking on doors such as you can have fish fries. You can get neighborhood captains take the sheet around for you. But I think we need to revisit this as far as getting serious candidates to lead the City. We need to think about leaving the City in good hands of good people.”

Councilmember Hawkins asked, "So the person running for office does not have to be the one that actually gets the signature?"

Mayor Butler stated, "No, you can get neighborhood captains to get signatures."

Councilmember Hawkins asked, "How do we verify those are valid signatures?"

Mayor Butler stated, "They must include voter registration number, and you look them up by that number. If you are serious, you will find a way to do it. We cannot have people that want to be over our City that are not serious. Our work here is not selfish gain; it is completely for the City of Orangeburg and the citizens."

Councilmember Hannah stated, "The important thing to me is you want 100% of your citizens to vote. Currently only a couple of hundred citizens vote in a district no matter how much you campaign, people are not coming out to vote."

Councilmember Grevious asked, "Are these wet signatures on the petition?"

City Administrator Evering stated, "Yes."

Mayor Pro Tem Kalu stated, "This is just first reading, and we have second and third readings that will give us time to think about it."

A motion was made by Mayor Pro Tem Kalu, seconded by Councilmember Hannah to approve first reading of an ordinance amending Chapter 2 (Administration) of the City code by amending Section 2-1.2 (Election procedure for Mayor and Councilmembers) to provide for nomination of candidates for Mayoral and Council Candidates by petition. The motion was approved 5-2. Councilmember Hawkins and Councilmember Knotts opposed.

A motion was made by Councilmember Keitt, seconded by Councilmember Knotts to go into Executive Session concerning discussion of negotiations incident to proposed contractual arrangements and the receipt of legal advice – SC Code Sec. 30-4-70(a)(2) a) Health Insurance. And b) USDA Grant for Civil Rights Museum and discussion of employment, appointment, compensation, promotion, demotion, discipline or release of an employee, a student or a person regulated by a public body, or the appointment of a person to a public body SC Code Sec. 30-4-70(a)(1) – Finance Department. The motion was unanimously approved."

Council did not return to open session. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

*Linda McDaniel*

Linda McDaniel  
City Clerk

