

## **CITY OF CHARDON LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

### *Meeting Minutes*

July 1, 2021

#### **Members Present:**

Andrew Blackley  
Deborah Chuha, Chairman

#### **Also Present:**

Ben Chojnacki, Law Director  
Dave Jevnikar, G-TV  
Rebecca Repasky, Secretary  
Mate Rogonjic, Finance Director

Randy Sharpe, City Manager  
Steve Yaney, Community Development  
Administrator

Mrs. Chuha called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. Roll was called.

Mrs. Chuha said everyone received copies of the March 4, 2021 meeting. The motion was made by Mr. Blackley to approve the minutes. It was seconded by Mrs. Chuha. The vote carried 2-0.

**OLD BUSINESS** – none.

**NEW BUSINESS** –

#### **DISCUSSION ON G-TV FUNDING**

Mr. Rogonjic provided the Committee with a chart that shows the City of Chardon's franchise fee allocated to G-TV (which includes Burton Village, Middlefield Village, Chardon Township, Hambden Township and Munson Township). The chart shows that the City allocates the most funding to G-TV, totaling \$200,691 from 2018 – 2020; which was 31% of G-TV's total funding from the listed communities. Another chart shows the vast majority of programming on G-TV is related to activities of the Chardon Local School District; which is approximately 75% - and the school district uses Boxcast TV to stream events to the public. Mr. Jevnikar explained G-TV videos an event for the schools; produces the video and then the school streams the video. Mr. Blackley asked if recorded videos for the schools could be charged to the schools. Mr. Jevnikar said he has never thought of charging the schools for the work.

Mr. Rogonjic explained Chapter 1332 of the Ohio Revised Code governs the franchise fee. It appears that the 5% franchise fee is in place to compensate municipalities for the cable/video providers use of the public right-of-way. Based on reviewed from the Finance Director and Law Director, there are no restrictions as to how the City can use the franchise fee revenues.

Mrs. Chuha asked how long G-TV has been in business. Mr. Jevnikar said since 1984.

Mr. Blackley asked what would happen if the City cut G-TV's funding by 1/3<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Jevnikar said it will likely go out of business.

Mr. Jevnikar said the schools find great value in G-TV; and asked if there is no G-TV, would the City still assess the fees to the community. Mr. Sharpe explained that 5% fee would be used by the City to improve communication capabilities and for the General Fund.

Mrs. Chuha asked what is the minimum dollar amount needed to run G-TV. Mr. Jevnikar said he doesn't know, but if funding continues to decrease, it will go out of business.

Mrs. Chuha asked if G-TV gets private funding for school sporting events. Mr. Jevnikar said no; but the 'Gridiron' group will cover some costs of some football games.

Mr. Jevnikar commented this work and programming is worth doing, and the City is not in a position where it needs this 5% money. He asked if G-TV has done anything to warrant this discussion on reducing funding. Mr. Sharpe explained in his eleven (11) years as City Manager, there has never been a discussion if this is a good use of the money. Mr. Blackley commented he isn't sure what a reasonable cost for this service is.

Mr. Blackley explained as an item on the agenda for this meeting, he believes there should be a yearly contract that gets reviewed; but he is not ready at this meeting to decide the future of G-TV and recommends bringing this topic to all of Council and for Mr. Jevnikar to appear in front of all of Council to state his case; and to keep this discussion in public.

Mr. Sharpe explained Mrs. Chuha will bring this up as a committee report at the next Council meeting.

#### **DISCUSSION ON LITTER NUISANCE ABATEMENT**

Mr. Yaney explained Staff is starting to see a rise in litter on properties such as the bike path and behind the plazas. He said the code does have a nuisance procedure to deal with litter, but it does not include the provision for Staff to abate the nuisance in the same way as the grass section of the code. Currently, Staff cites litter violations under property maintenance. The problem is, it is a slower process because of the 30-day warning, 30-day violation then court process. Mr. Yaney explained this proposed amendment would allow for an abatement if the violation is not corrected within seven (7) days of the notice of violation after the initial warning notice. This would allow Staff to enter onto the property whenever litter is present for the remainder of the year, have a contractor remove the litter and the bill would be sent to the property owner. If the property owner does not pay, the cost will be assessed to the property tax.

Mr. Blackley clarified this is not towards the users of the bike path. Mr. Yaney said correct.

Mr. Blackley made a motion to recommend to Council the adoption of the Litter Nuisance Abatement. It was seconded by Mrs. Chuha. The vote carried 2-0.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION – none**

Mr. Blackley made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:45 p.m. It was seconded by Mrs. Chuha.

Respectfully Submitted:

---

DEBORAH CHUHA, CHAIRMAN

---

Rebecca Repasky, Secretary