

## Whitney, Judith

---

**From:** Peter Erb <perb@gmavt.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 12, 2018 3:18 PM  
**To:** PUC - Clerk  
**Subject:** FW: NOPV case (18-0395-PETGate Station (17-4909-PET) investigation case (17-3550-INV)

To the PUC clerk,

I sent an Email to you yesterday addressing NOPV case (18-0395-PETGate Station (17-4909-PET) investigation case (17-3550-INV) and it has been pointed out to me that unless I directly request that the E mail is filed separately in the comments for the three cases my E mail may not become part of the record. In view of this please submit my E mail as a comment in each of the three separate case files.

---

**From:** Peter Erb <perb@gmavt.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 11, 2018 7:14 PM  
**To:** 'puc.clerk@vermont.gov' <puc.clerk@vermont.gov>  
**Subject:** NOPV case (18-0395-PETGate Station (17-4909-PET) investigation case (17-3550-INV)

March 11, 2018

To whom it may concern:

.Both the NOPV case (18-0395-PET), and the currently pending CPG case for the Monkton Gate Station (17-4909-PET) should not be heard or a decision reached until the full scope of the situation is unveiled via the pending investigation case (17-3550-INV) completed a thorough review of the broadened scope of safety violations.

After having read the INTERVENORS CASE TO BROADER SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION, which makes a compelling, clear and urgent case for revisiting installation of the Vermont Gas pipeline, I urge you to insure that this is done. It must be done immediately, not only because of the danger, but also because the more users that connect the greater the impact will be on the public if it must be shut down or reinstalled.. The litany of excuses made for this project, both by Vermont Gas and PUC created an unacceptable danger to Vermont citizens who happen to live, or just be near the pipe line in the face of what appears to be an inevitable failure of this high pressure line.

The conditions of the permit have not been met and it is your responsibility to the citizens of this state to insure that they are.

Thanks for your consideration

Peter Erb,  
Hinesburg, Vermont