

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD
IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING,
DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 17TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1986
AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT: A.S. CLAY, CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
M.I. HARGRAVE, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
T.O. RAINEY, III	CO. ATTORNEY
B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the minutes of the December 17, 1986 meeting were approved as presented with the following change: Delete "Mr. A. Clay and Mr. Bennett removed themselves from the meeting" and insert "Mr. A. Clay and Mr. Bennett did not participate in the discussion or action on Vehicle License Agents."

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and funds appropriated for same: General Fund checks-numbering 86-2665 through 86-2899 amounting to \$217,110.32; Water & Sewer Fund check #W&S-86-14 in the amount of \$86.29; Johnsongrass Control Fund check #JGC-86-9 and 10 amounting to \$758.76; E911 Fund-check #E9-86-4 in the amount of \$7069.41; County Construction Fund check CCF-86-6 in the amount of \$53,370; Law Library Fund - check #LF-86-19 in the amount of \$28.39.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-86-10--DANCE HALLS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 3 and Wednesday, December 10, 1986 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 3, Article V to add Sections 3-70, 3-71, 3-72, 3-73, 3-74, 3-75, 3-76 and 3-77 for dance halls.

Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, County Attorney, reviewed the ordinance. Mr. Robertson asked if this ordinance would preclude the issuance of a special entertainment permit. Mr. Rainey stated they are two separate permits and the Board would still have to issue the special entertainment permit for outside activities. Mr. Hargrave stated this ordinance would establish a good basis.

The Sheriff was present in support of the ordinance. Mr. Mac Echols spoke in opposition. He felt the ordinance discriminated against dance halls. He objected to having to close at 1:00 A.M. and felt all businesses should have to get a permit if dance hall operators were required to.

Mr. H. Clay asked the Sheriff to give some examples of the problems he had encountered. Sheriff Heath stated the dances sometime go on until 4:00 A.M. The trouble is complaints about the music. When his department responds to a call, they can't determine who is in charge. He added that surrounding localities close down at certain times and all the drunks leave and come to Dinwiddie.

Mr. Echols stated he felt 2:00 A.M. was a more reasonable time to close. The Alcoholic Beverage Control Board allows alcohol to be sold until 2:00 A.M. in surrounding localities.

Mr. Robertson asked if the Sheriff felt there would be a problem with 2:00 A.M. Sheriff Heath stated the neighbors might object because it will take until 3:00 A.M. to clear everyone out.

Mr. Bennett stated he felt the County should be equal with the surrounding areas. He asked if the dance hall operator would have to pay \$100 for a permit and \$25.00 for a business license if both ordinances were passed.

Mr. Rainey stated he would unless he was exempted by the Board.

Mr. A. Clay agreed the ordinance should be like the surrounding areas. Mr. H. Clay stated he thought action should be tabled until the following is determined: 1. What do surrounding areas charge for a permit? 2. What is the closing time in surrounding areas? 3. Dance halls should not be hit with a \$100 application fee and also a \$25 business license.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye", amendment A-86-10, Dance Halls, was tabled until the next meeting.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-86-11--VICIOUS DOGS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 3, 1986 and Wednesday, December 10, 1986 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 4, Article II of the Dinwiddie County Code to amend Section 4-17, to amend and add to Section 4-18 and to delete Section 4-20 to reflect changes in dogs running at large generally and vicious dogs running at large.

Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, County Attorney, introduced the ordinance and explained the changes. Mr. Hargrave questioned if "anything of value" meant shrubbery or sheets. Mr. Rainey stated it could. Mr. Richard Earl asked if a dog tearing your pants would be classified as Class 3 or Class 1 misdemeanor. Mr. Rainey stated it would depend upon whether you are personally injured.

Mr. Chuck Nobles stated he had guard dogs and had posted no trespassing and beware of dog signs. Mr. Rainey stated you are criminally liable only if someone "lawfully" comes on your property. However, he still may be civilly liable.

No one spoke in support or opposition to the amendment.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted, March, 1986 and as heretofore amended, be further amended as follows:

SECTION 4-17 Running at large generally

(b) No person residing in the county on the east side of U.S. Interstate 85 shall cause or permit any dog owned or kept by him to run at large in the county during the period of April first through April fifteenth of each year and no person residing in the County on the West side of U.S. Interstate 85 shall cause or permit any dog owned or kept by him to run at large in the county during the period of April sixteenth through April thirtieth of each year.

SECTION 4-18 Vicious dogs running at large

(a) It shall be unlawful for the owner of a dangerous, destructive or vicious dog to permit or allow such dog to run at large, as defined in section 4-17(a), within the county. Any dog that has been known or should be reasonably known to the owner to attack or attempt to attack or injure any person, animal or fowl, or to damage or destroy anything of value, shall be termed a dangerous or vicious dog. Such dog shall be kept confined upon the premises of the owner, and if removed from the premises, shall be secured by a leash in the hands of a person able to control such dog, or shall be confined inside a vehicle or cage. Proof of a prior attack or attempt to attack shall be prima facie evidence that a dog is vicious.

(b) If after a conviction of the owner of a dog for a violation of this section, the same dog continued to run at large and to be destructive or dangerous, such dog may be killed by the order of the animal warden, if, after twenty-four hours' notice, such dog is not removed by the owner from the county, in lieu of impoundment under section 4-19. (Code 1986, Section 4-11).

(c) The owner of any dog, known to be destructive or vicious, which attacks, or attempts to attack or injure any animal or fowl or to damage or destroy anything of value shall be guilty of a Class 4 misdemeanor and liable for any damages.

(d) The owner of any dog, known to be destructive, dangerous, or vicious, which attacks or attempts to attack or injure any person lawfully on the property of the owner shall be guilty of a Class 3 misdemeanor and liable for any damages.

(e) The owner of any dog, known to be destructive, dangerous or vicious which attacks or attempts to attack or injures any person not on the property of the owner shall be guilty of a Class 1 misdemeanor and liable for any damages.

SECTION 4-20 Compensation for livestock or poultry killed or injured by dog - Waiver of certain prerequisites

DELETE

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-86-12--OFF-DUTY DEPUTIES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 3, 1986 and Wednesday, December 10, 1986 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to permit and regulate the employment of off-duty sheriff and/or deputy sheriffs.

Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, introduced the ordinance. He stated there are businesses and organizations with security needs that request the Sheriff's help. This ordinance would give some control over the men who respond on their off-time. Compensation would be paid to the County.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the ordinance relates to authority of the officer when off-duty. Mr. Rainey stated liability is the main thing. They want to put restraints on where the liability is. Mr. Bennett asked if the requesting organization will pay overtime. The County Administrator stated yes and all fringe benefits. Mr. Bennett asked if the County would have to pay anything. The County Administrator stated the Schools and other county agencies would whenever a Deputy was requested under this ordinance.

Mr. Robertson asked who would determine the charges. Mr. Rainey stated that would be done jointly between the County and the Sheriff.

Mrs. Gilbert Charboneau asked why the schools would have to pay. The Sheriff stated they request more deputies than he has on duty.

Mr. Mac Echols asked if the dance halls could hire off-duty deputies. The Sheriff stated they could if the County will pay for their insurance.

Mr. Hargrave stated he felt the ordinance was vague in relating the deputy's off-duty work to the organizations defined. Mr. Rainey stated he would reference (c) which defines organization in (e) which defines off-duty employment.

The Sheriff was present in support of the ordinance. No one spoke in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted, March, 1986, and as heretofore amended, be further amended, as follows:

ORDINANCE NAME:

This ordinance shall be known and cited as the Dinwiddie Off-Duty Sheriff Ordinance (DODSO).

DEFINITIONS:

A. Sheriff shall mean the Sheriff of Dinwiddie County, Virginia.

B. Deputy Sheriff shall mean employees of the Dinwiddie Sheriff's Department funded by the State Compensation Board.

C. Organizations shall mean one of the following:

(1) A voluntary fire department or rescue squad or auxiliary unit thereof which has been recognized by an ordinance or resolution of the political subdivision where the voluntary fire department or rescue squad is located as being a part of the safety program of such political subdivision.

(2) An organization operated exclusively for religious, charitable, community or educational purposes; an association of war veterans or auxiliary units thereof organized in the United States, or a fraternal association operating under the lodge system.

D. On-Duty Employment shall mean those periods of time when the Sheriff or Deputy Sheriff is carrying out an assigned duty or function of this office.

E. Off-Duty Employment shall mean those periods of time other than on-duty employment which require the application of law enforcement skills, powers or techniques to the organizations as defined in paragraph (C).

EMPLOYMENT PERMITTED:

The Sheriff or any Deputy Sheriff may engage in off-duty employment which may occasionally require the use of their police powers in the performance of such employment subject to the other provisions of this Ordinance.

PERMISSION OF SHERIFF REQUIRED:

Any Sheriff or Deputy Sheriff shall first obtain permission or consent from the Sheriff or the duly authorized Deputy to engage in the off-duty employment.

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

The Sheriff shall promulgate such reasonable rules and regulations to apply to such off-duty employment.

COMPENSATION PAID TO COUNTY:

Compensation to any Sheriff or Deputy performing off-duty activities shall be paid directly to the County of Dinwiddie by the sponsoring organization.

ORDINANCE AUTHORITY:

This Ordinance is adopted pursuant to Section 15.1-133.1 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.

APPROVED ORGANIZATION:

The Sheriff shall approve the sponsoring organization in accordance with the definitions herein and the rules and regulations adopted hereto.

EFFECTIVE DATE:

This Ordinance shall be effective upon its adoption.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--BUSINESS LICENSES--A-86-13

Mr. Robertson asked if he and Mr. A. Clay would be in conflict if they participated in the discussion and action on business licenses. The County Attorney stated it was his opinion that they would not be in conflict.

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 3, 1986 and Wednesday, December 10, 1986 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 13 of the Dinwiddie County Code to add Sections 13-60, 13-61, 13-62, 13-63, 13-64, 13-65 and 13-66 for business licenses.

Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, County Attorney, introduced the ordinance. He pointed out that it is a revenue producing section of the code but the intent as he has written it is to be more administrative and to identify businesses in the County. It will be helpful to the County Planner and protect citizens from unscrupulous businesses. He pointed out that some contractors already pay a gross receipts tax.

Mr. W.E. Bolte, Commissioner of Revenue, stated his office would be involved in the issuance of the license. He also stated that this ordinance is making a revenue producing section regulatory. A lot of cities rely upon it heavily for income.

He stated that builders and contractors already pay a gross receipts tax and he felt it would be unfair if all other businesses only pay \$25. Mr. H. Clay pointed out that they are not paying anything now and this ordinance would be no more unfair than what is being done now. Mr. Bolte stated the contractors license brings in approximately \$10,000. He predicted the business license would produce approximately \$8,000 and will cost half of that to administer.

Mr. Robertson stated he was concerned that the ordinance would become revenue-producing. He was not in favor of it.

Mr. Bolte stated his office was getting stuck with the work and it will produce very little income. Mr. H. Clay asked Mr. Bolte if he had an alternative to accomplish what the Board wanted. Mr. Bolte stated he did not know of any other way.

Mr. Hargrave said he thought when it was first considered, the concern was for itinerant vendors. He said he could see where it might be nice to have a list of businesses but it will be another burden on them. He was concerned about some people who weren't in business but work on the side. Now they would be criminally at fault. He could not see the need at this point.

Mr. Bolte stated he might be able to find another way of getting a list of businesses.

No one appeared in support of the ordinance. Mr. Richard Earl spoke in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", amendment A-86-13, Business Licenses, was not adopted.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--A-86-14--ITINERANT VENDORS

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 3, 1986 and Wednesday, December 10, 1986 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Chapter 13 of the Dinwiddie County Code to add Section 13-3 for Itinerant Vendors, Merchants and Mechanics.

Mr. T.O. Rainey, III, County Attorney, presented the ordinance stating it would give the Sheriff a means of identifying the individual. He recommended the Board could make an exception for anyone who was already licensed in the State.

Mr. Robertson stated he felt it should be \$100 a day. Mr. Rainey stated they could be challenged for restraining trade. Mr. H. Clay asked if they could be required to post a bond. Mr. Rainey said they could be required to have a performance bond. He pointed out that the Board should think about the legitimate businessman when setting requirements. Mr. A. Clay stated he thought the performance bond was a good idea.

Mr. Hargrave asked if there was a definition of itinerant vendors. Mr. Rainey stated it was in the Virginia Code and he could reference it.

Mr. Hargrave stated this ordinance would be a good start. The performance bond could be added later.

Sheriff B.M. Heath spoke in favor of the ordinance. Mr. Richard Earl asked if Amway and Avon distributors would fall under the ordinance. He stated he felt it should be fine tuned before it was adopted.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the person who comes on their own could be separated from the one that is called.

Mr. Robertson asked if it could be left to the discretion of the Sheriff. The County Attorney stated it could. He felt this would be a starting point.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted, March, 1986, and as heretofore amended, be further amended as follows:

SECTION 13-3 Itinerant Vendors, Merchants and Mechanics

(a) An annual County license tax of one hundred (\$100.00) dollars is hereby levied upon and shall be collected from every person, corporation or partnership who, for compensation, shall carry from place to place any goods, wares or merchandise, and offer to sell or barter same or actually sells or barter same, or shall offer to repair, fix, improve or perform repairs or installation on property as a vendor, traveling salesman, merchant or mechanic.

(b) Individuals, corporations or partnerships covered by this code section, in addition to the duties required of them under

any state or federal statutes or regulation, shall maintain a true and accurate record of all transactions conducted within the County. Said record shall contain a complete and accurate description of any goods or services sold, the time and date of said sale, the price of the items sold or services rendered. This record shall be open to inspection by any federal, state or local law enforcement officer during business hours and shall be maintained for three (3) years after the transaction occurred.

(c) No such tax shall be prorated.

(d) Individuals, corporations, or partnerships covered by this code section shall register annually with the Commissioner of Revenue; providing the Commissioner with their full legal name, trade name, if any, date of birth, address, telephone number, social security number, prior criminal record, if any, and a recent photograph. Said registration form shall be required of every individual who performs acts covered under this code section. Information provided under this code section shall be given under oath, under the penalty of perjury.

(e) Any individual, partnership, corporation who shall fail to comply with the above code requirements shall be guilty of a Class 1 Misdemeanor. Each separate action shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

(f) An exemption from the license fee shall be granted for non-profit organizations and any private non-profit yard sale, provided said yard sale does not operate more than twice annually. Any organization or individual granted said exemption shall still be required to apply for license.

IN RE: ITINERANT VENDORS LICENSE--REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Itinerant Vendor's ordinance be placed on the agenda for review in October of 1987.

IN RE: FORD VFD--AWARD OF BID FOR NEW FIRE TRUCK

Mr. Gene Jones, Ford VFD, appeared before the Board to request authorization to purchase a 1987 Ford Pumper. The first bids received were for a 1987 Ford pumper with a steel body as follows:

Mack Truck - no bid
American Fire Equipment - \$117,849 - Delivery 30 days.
Slagle's Fire Equipment - \$110,434 - Delivery 180 days.
Pierce Manufacturing - \$109,180 - Delivery 300 days

At the time of receipt of bids, the fire department learned that the Ford fire chassis was being discontinued. They, therefore, asked for prices from the three bidders on a custom cab and chassis and the bids were as follows:

American Fire Equipment - \$133,221 - Delivery 45 days; alternate bid - \$123,902 - Delivery 45 days
Slagle's Fire Equipment - \$126,700 - Delivery 180 days
Pierce Manufacturing - \$114,698 - Delivery 360 days.

After reviewing the bids, the fire department felt the all aluminum body would be the best choice. Because the specifications had been written for a steel body, all bidders were asked to quote on an all aluminum body and an aluminum tank. The results were as follows:

American Fire Equipment - \$117,849 (aluminum tank) Delivery 30 days
Slagle's Fire Equipment - \$113,734 (steel tank) Delivery 180 days
Pierce Manufacturing - \$112,680 (steel tank) Delivery 300 days.

A decision had been postponed pending investigation of the County's financial priorities. The fire department has requested that the Board approve the truck offered by American Fire Equipment. They stated they liked the all aluminum body and the aluminum tank. The truck can also be delivered in 30 days which is important because the 1959 pumper cannot be used and would be quite expensive to repair. The Board, therefore, agreed that the quick delivery date of the high bid would be worth the difference in price because they would be saving the cost of repairing the 1959 pumper.

Upon motion of Mr. Bennett, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voting "aye", American Fire Equipment, Inc. was awarded the bid for a 1987 Ford fire truck for the Ford VFD, cost \$117,849.

IN RE: LANDFILL--AUTHORIZATION TO BID NEW TRASH TRUCK

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to prepare specifications and solicit bids for a new trash truck for the Landfill Department.

IN RE: BINGO AND RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Dinwiddie Senior High School has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for calendar year 1987; and

WHEREAS, Dinwiddie Senior High School meets the requirements of the Code of Virginia and paid the \$10.00 application fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Senior High School is awarded a Bingo and Raffle permit for the calendar year 1987.

IN RE: BINGO AND RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE YOUTH LEAGUE

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Youth League has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for calendar year 1987; and

WHEREAS, the Dinwiddie Youth League meets the requirements of the Code of Virginia and paid the \$10.00 application fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Youth League is awarded a Bingo and Raffle permit for the calendar year 1987.

IN RE: BINGO AND RAFFLE PERMIT--DINWIDDIE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Dinwiddie County Junior High School has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for calendar year 1987; and

WHEREAS, Dinwiddie County Junior High School meets the requirements of the Code of Virginia and paid the \$10.00 application fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Dinwiddie Junior High School is awarded a Bingo and Raffle permit for the calendar year 1987.

IN RE: BINGO AND RAFFLE PERMIT--NAMOZINE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Namozine VFD has made application to the Board of Supervisors for a Bingo & Raffle permit for calendar year 1987; and

WHEREAS, the Namozine VFD meets the requirements of the Code of Virginia and paid the \$10.00 application fee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Namozine VFD is awarded a Bingo & Raffle permit for the calendar year 1987.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--PLANNING COMMISSION--GILBERT WOOD

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", Mr. Gilbert Wood was reappointed to the Planning Commission, term expiring December 31, 1990.

IN RE: LEASH LAW--AUTHORIZATION TO PREPARE ORDINANCE

Mr. H. Clay stated that he felt there is sufficient interest for the Board to consider a leash law.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the County Attorney was instructed to prepare a leash law ordinance in registered subdivisions for the Board's consideration for public hearing.

Mr. Bennett asked what the Board's feelings were to request the General Assembly to put it on referendum for the citizens to vote on. Mr. Robertson stated that it may have to include property adjacent to subdivisions.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE--ELECTRONIC CALCULATOR

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia concurs with the Commissioner of Revenue's request to the Compensation Board for the purchase of an electronic calculator, cost \$88.00.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay voting "aye", pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (1) and (6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:28 P.M. to discuss personnel and legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 11:01 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Hargrave, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 11:02 P.M.


A.S. CLAY, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: 
W.C. KNOTT