STATE OF CONNECTICUT
PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

November 3, 2026
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No. 26-10-02

Alex Giner
E-TV Coordinator
Town of Enfield
820 Enfield Street
Enfield, CT 06082

Re: Docket No. 26-10-02 – ANNUAL ALLOCATION OF THE PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL AND GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMMING AND EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT ACCOUNT

Dear Mr. Giner:

On October 29, 2026, Enfield Television (E-TV) submitted correspondence to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority), requesting clarification regarding the definition of a programmer and studio operator in the public, educational, and governmental programming and education technology account (PEGPETIA) program. See General Statutes § 16-331cc(b). Specifically, E-TV noted that (1) E-TV's local cable operator had informed E-TV that it was a programmer, not a studio operator, (2) Tri-Town Government Access Cable Committee GCTV Granby (GCTV) is similarly situation to E-TV, as both provide programming on their local government access channel, and (3) GCTV applied for and received a grant in Docket No. 24-10-02 as a studio operator. The Authority hereby clarifies that the term studio operator refers to community access providers (CAPs) that are required to make studios available to the public in their areas.

One half of PEGPETIA grant funding is "available to local community antenna television and video advisory councils; the state-wide video advisory council; public, educational and governmental programmers and public, educational and governmental studio operators to subsidize capital and equipment costs related to producing and procuring such programming." General Statutes § 16-331cc. Although General Statutes § 16-331cc does not define what a public, educational, and governmental (PEG) studio is, General Statutes § 16-331a, which addresses CAPs, refers to "local community access studios operated by volunteers or nonprofit operating groups." Additionally, Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-331a-11(c) requires that organizations providing community access support make available equipped studios.

The Authority has also previously treated the term PEG studio as meaning those studios provided by CAPs to programmers:

> The Authority also noted that [e]quipment purchased by individuals is not broadly available to the public or programming community and, therefore,

> has a much more limited impact. In addition, individual grants impose administrative burdens with respect to auditing and compliance. Importantly, PEG studios are required to maintain video production equipment and to make the equipment available to programmers.
>
> The Authority believes that the goals of the Act are best achieved by increasing the availability, quantity, and quality of equipment at local studios so that the greatest number of individuals have the ability to produce programming utilizing state of the art equipment and facilities.

Decision, Apr. 9, 2025, Docket No. 24-10-02, Annual Allocation of Public Educational and Governmental Programming and Education Technology Investment Account Pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. § 16-331cc (24-10-02 Decision), p. 9 (citing Decision, Oct. 23, 2019, Docket No. 07-10-11RE01, DPUC Proceeding to Establish Administrative Guidelines for the Public Educational and Governmental Programming and Education Technology Investment Account – Grant Eligibility Criteria and Guidelines (Revised Guidelines Decision), pp. 2–3; General Statutes § 16-331a(b); Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-331a-11).

The Authority also indicated that:

> The Authority's concerns, as expressed in the Revised Guidelines Decision, are similarly applicable to providing PEG funding to individual PEG programmer organizations whose central mission is not producing television content. Many non-studio organizations received large amounts of funding in the past few grant cycles and provided compliance showing little to no programming provided to local access channels. Meanwhile, grants provided to PEG studios resulted in significantly more programming for local access channels. The Authority recognizes that some non-studio grant recipients provided more content to local access channels, however, those appear to be exceptions to the typical results.

24-10-02 Decision, p. 9.

Accordingly, it is clear that the term "public, educational and governmental studio operator" in the PEGPETIA application was intended to refer to the CAPs operating studios that are available for public use. The term "public, educational and governmental programmer," is a broader term, intended to refer to entities which produce programming for PEG channels. It appears that GCTV mistakenly applied as a studio operator in Docket No. 24-10-02 and was erroneously awarded a larger grant as a result. Nevertheless, GCTV and E-TV are properly classified as programmers and should not apply as studio operators in this proceeding.[1]

[1] It appears that the New Fairfield Community Access Board of Education has mistakenly filed an application in this proceeding as a "studio operator." Motion No. 9, Application and Itemized Budget, p. 3.

By the following commissioner,



Janice A. Beecher
Commissioner

cc: Service List