

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

Nicholas Calo)	
8386 Cypresswood Drive)	
Cincinnati, Ohio 45249)	
)	
Complainant)	Case No. 17-2267-EL-CSS
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.)	
)	
Respondent)	

ANSWER OF DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.

For its Answer to the Complaint of Nicholas Calo (Complainant), Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., (Duke Energy Ohio or Respondent) states as follows:

1. The Complaint is not in a form allowing for specific admission or denial as to individual allegations. Accordingly, Duke Energy Ohio generally denies the allegations set out in the Complaint.

2. In response to the second paragraph of the Complaint, Duke Energy Ohio admits that its high-voltage transmission lines run through and near various homes and apartment buildings in the Greater Cincinnati area. Further answering, Duke Energy Ohio states that, where applicable, the Company has easements on property through which its high-voltage transmission lines run and rights-of-way below its transmission lines so as to enable the continued safe and reliable operation of its high-voltage transmission system. Finally, Duke Energy Ohio states that its actions are consistent with its express grants of easement and with its

Programs for Inspection, Maintenance, Repair and Replacement of Distribution and Transmission Lines, Section (f), as approved on June 13, 2016. All remaining allegations of this paragraph are denied.

3. Duke Energy Ohio denies the allegations contained in the third paragraph of the Complaint. Duke Energy Ohio further submits that Complainant lacks standing to assert relief on behalf of other citizens. Answering further, Duke Energy Ohio denies that it is using toxic herbicides on Complainant's property. Duke Energy Ohio further submits that Complainant lacks standing to assert relief on behalf of other citizens of Deerfield Township. Finally, Duke Energy Ohio states that its actions are consistent with its express grants of easement and with its Programs for Inspection, Maintenance, Repair and Replacement of Distribution and Transmission Lines, Section (f), as approved on June 13, 2016. All remaining allegations of this paragraph are denied.

4. Duke Energy Ohio denies the allegations contained in the fourth paragraph of the Complaint. Answering further, Duke Energy Ohio states that its actions are consistent with its express grants of easement and with its Programs for Inspection, Maintenance, Repair and Replacement of Distribution and Transmission Lines, Section (f), as approved on June 13, 2016. All remaining allegations of this paragraph are denied.

5. In response to the allegations contained in the fifth paragraph of the Complaint, Duke Energy Ohio submits that statements regarding requested relief are not allegations to which a response is required. However, to the extent a response is required, Duke Energy Ohio denies that it is using toxic herbicides on Complainants' property. Duke Energy Ohio further submits that Complainant lacks standing to assert relief on behalf of other citizens. Finally, Duke Energy Ohio states that its actions are consistent with its express grants of easement and with its

Programs for Inspection, Maintenance, Repair and Replacement of Distribution and Transmission Lines, Section (f), as approved on June 13, 2016. All remaining allegations of this paragraph are denied.

6. With regard to the documents attached to the Complaint, Duke Energy Ohio states the easement provided by Complainant is not relevant to his property or the lawful actions Duke Energy Ohio intends to undertake on Complainant's property so as to enable the continued safe and reliable operation of its high-voltage transmission system. Answering further, Duke Energy Ohio states that the easement provides it with the unambiguous right to remove trees and other obstructions in the easement and right-of-way. However, with regard to certain statements therein, Duke Energy Ohio states that the terms of its lawfully obtained easements speak for themselves and further denies that its request, as docketed under Case No. 16-915-EL-ESS, has not been approved. Said request was approved pursuant to O.A.C. 4901:1-10-27(F)(2). Duke Energy Ohio further states that it has engaged in extensive community outreach, interacting with individual property owners on whose property the Company possesses easement rights and will be working. All remaining allegations, as inferred or implied by the documents attached to the Complaint, are denied.

7. With regard to the allegation that a stop order be issued, Duke Energy Ohio states that the Commission is without jurisdiction to resolve issues of equity. Answering further, Duke Energy Ohio states that any vegetation management activities in which it may engage are permissible under express grants of easement and consistent with its Programs for Inspection, Maintenance, Repair and Replacement of Distribution and Transmission Lines, Section (f), as approved on June 13, 2016.

8. Duke Energy Ohio denies each and every allegation of fact and conclusion of law not expressly admitted herein.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. Duke Energy Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense the easement attached to the Complaint does not concern the property owned by Complainant. Such easement, therefore, cannot support the Complaint. Answering further, such easement expressly confirms the rights of Duke Energy Ohio to engage in vegetation management activities with regard to the property on which such easement exists.

2. The Complainant does not assert any allegations of fact that would give rise to a cognizable claim against Duke Energy Ohio.

3. Duke Energy Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that pursuant to R.C. 4905.26 and O.A.C. 4901-9-01-(B)(3), Complainant has failed to set forth reasonable grounds for complaint.

4. Duke Energy Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that Complainant has not stated any request for relief that can be granted by this Commission.

5. Duke Energy Ohio states as an affirmative defense that Complainant lacks standing to assert any claims against the Respondent in respect of property for which he is not the lawful property owner of record.

6. Duke Energy Ohio asserts that to the extent Complainant is seeking monetary damages, such relief is beyond the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction.

7. Duke Energy Ohio asserts that, to the extent the Complainant is seeking equitable relief, such relief is beyond the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction.

8. Duke Energy Ohio asserts that it has superior property rights, as confirmed by lawful grants of easement.

9. Duke Energy Ohio reserves the right to raise additional affirmative defenses or to withdraw any of the foregoing affirmative defenses as may become necessary during the investigation and discovery of this matter.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, having fully answered, Duke Energy Ohio respectfully requests that the Commission dismiss the Complaint of Nicholas Calo for failure to set forth reasonable grounds for the Complaint and to deny Complainant's request for relief, if any.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Elizabeth H. Watts _____
Amy B. Spiller (0047277) (Counsel of Record)
Deputy General Counsel
Elizabeth H. Watts (0031092)
Associate General Counsel
Duke Energy Business Services LLC
139 East Fourth Street, 1303-Main
P.O. Box 960
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960
(513) 419-1810 (telephone)
(513) 419-1846 (fax)
amy.spiller@duke-energy.com
elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com

Robert A. McMahon (0064319)
Eberly McMahon Copetas LLC
2321 Kemper Lane, Suite 100
Cincinnati, Ohio 45206
(513) 533-3441 (telephone)
(513) 533-3554 (fax)
bmcMahon@emclawyers.com

Attorneys for Respondent Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Answer of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., was served via regular US Mail postage prepaid, or by electronic mail service, this 16th day of November 2017, upon the following:

Nicholas Calo
8386 Cypresswood Drive
Cincinnati, Ohio 45249

/s/ Elizabeth H. Watts
Elizabeth H. Watts