



FILE

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

2007 MAR 19 AM 10:17

139 East Fourth Street, R. 25 At II
P.O. Box 960
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960
Tel: 513-287-4326
Fax: 513-287-3810
Rocco.D'Ascenzo@duke-energy.com
Rocco O. D'Ascenzo
Counsel

VIA OVERNIGHT MAIL

PUCO

March 16, 2007

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Docketing Division
13th Floor
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215-3716

RE: In the Matter of the Complaint:
James Byerly, Jr.; Benjamin F. Wissel; Shirley J. Newman; Daniel J. Ledford; and
Patricia B. Ingram v. Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
Case Nos. 07-196-EL-CSS; 07-197-EL-CSS; 07-198-EL-CSS; 07-263-EL-CSS;
and 07-265-EL-CSS

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed please find an original and 12 copies of Duke Energy Ohio's Answer in each of the following cases:

1. PUCO Case No. 07-196-EL-CSS James Byerly, Jr. v. Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.;
2. PUCO Case No. 07-197-EL-CSS Benjamin F. Wissel v. Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.;
3. PUCO Case No. 07-198-EL-CSS Shirley J. Newman v. Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.;
4. PUCO Case No. 07-263-EL-CSS Daniel J. Ledford v. Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.; and
5. PUCO Case No. 07-265-EL-CSS Patricia B. Ingram v. Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.

Please return two (2) file-stamped copies of each filing to me in the overnight mail envelope provided.


If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (513) 287-4326.

Sincerely,


Rocco O. D'Ascenzo.
Counsel

ROD/sew
Enclosures

cc: All parties of record (w/encl.)

This is to certify that the images appearing are an
accurate and complete reproduction of a case file
document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician  Date Processed 3-19-07

www.duke-energy.com

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Complaint of)

Shirley J. Newman)

30 E. Central Parkway #1002)

Cincinnati, OH 45202)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.,)

Respondent.)

Case No. 07-198-EL-CSS

ANSWER OF RESPONDENT DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.

For its answer to the complaint of Plaintiff Shirley J. Newman (Complainant), Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., (DE-Ohio) states as follows:

FIRST DEFENSE

1. DE-Ohio admits that Shirley J. Newman is a consumer of DE-Ohio.
2. DE-Ohio is without sufficient information to either admit or deny Complainant's statement that "[m]y husband, Frederick, and I own and reside in a residential condominium." DE-Ohio admits that Complainant's billing address is 30 E. Central Parkway, Apt. 1002, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. DE-Ohio also admits that it is a renovated office building.
3. DE-Ohio denies that it engages in a "practice that is both 'unjust and unreasonable' for certain residential customers and as a result is 'discriminatory in practice'."

4. DE-Ohio admits that Complainant is taking service pursuant to DE-Ohio's Secondary Distribution Service-Small (Rate DM) tariffed rate.
5. DE-Ohio admits that the building was a former office building and that it is wired for 3 phase electrical service (3 ph). DE-Ohio is without sufficient information or knowledge to admit or deny that the "developer for practical reasons chose to extend this 3 phase power to each residential unit and at that point tap each leg of that power to service each unit." DE-Ohio admits that the building is wired for 3ph service and that each tenant's meter receives 3ph service. This wiring was done by the developer and against the recommendation of DE-Ohio.
6. DE-Ohio is without sufficient information to admit or deny Complainant's allegation that there is "no 3 phase usage in any residential unit." Regardless of what the units may or may not require, they are wired for and do in fact receive 3 ph service.
7. DE-Ohio denies that "discussions with Duke have yielded little." DE-Ohio did what it could to prevent the developer's installation of 3 ph service to the residential units. DE-Ohio explained to the residents that it must legally charge its tariffed rates. DE-Ohio admits that its Residential Service (Rate RS) is inapplicable for 3 ph electric service. DE-Ohio charges rates for all consumers according to the appropriate tariff for the installed electrical service.
8. DE-Ohio denies Complainant's allegation that consumers are paying unreasonably high rates. DE-Ohio is charging all consumers according to the appropriate tariff and consumers are paying the appropriate tariffed charges, no more, no less.
9. DE-Ohio denies Complainant's allegation that Complainants should be charged pursuant to Rate RS and that the Consumers are entitled to any refund. At all times relevant, DE-

Ohio has charged the Complainant according to the appropriate tariffed rate. Rate RS was not designed to accommodate 3phase electrical service and expressly excludes 3 ph service from its applicability.

10. DE-Ohio denies that it has acted in a discriminatory manner and has charged Complainant the appropriate rate for the service Complainant receives. DE-Ohio advised the building developer during renovation that single phase service should be installed. The developer chose to ignore DE-Ohio's recommendation and instead installed 3 ph service.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES


In addition to the foregoing specific answers to the allegations raised by Complainant, DE-Ohio raises the following defenses:

11. DE-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.
12. DE-Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that at all times relevant to Complainant's claims, DE-Ohio has provided reasonable and adequate service under applicable tariffed rates to Complainant in accordance with all applicable provisions of Title 49 of the Ohio Revised Code and regulations promulgated thereunder, and in accordance with DE-Ohio's filed tariffs, and all applicable state and federal laws and industry standards.
13. DE-Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that it does not have a Commission approved tariff for residential 3ph electric service. DE-Ohio charges rates for all consumers according to the appropriate tariff for the installed electrical service.
14. DE-Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that it breached no legal duty owed to Complainant.

15. DE-Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that to the extent that Respondent violated any applicable statute, regulation, industry standard, reliability guidelines or tariff provision, which is expressly denied, such violation was not the proximate cause of any injury alleged by Complainant.
16. DE-Ohio asserts that the Complainant is requesting this Commission award monetary damages or adjusts bills back to the time of the purchase of the condominium, that service has been rendered and billed according to the metered service and that such a remedy is outside the jurisdiction of this Commission.
17. DE-Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that the Company did not perform the actual wiring of the building. DE-Ohio did what it could to prevent the installation of 3ph service to the residential units. In October 2003 DE-Ohio was contacted concerning service availability for the subject address. DE-Ohio representatives met with the building owners and their consulting agent on June 14, 2004. DE-Ohio was provided load calculations, and a one line wiring diagram from the electrician which showed 3ph 4W meters being installed for the residential condominium units. DE-Ohio advised against this course. DE-Ohio met with the electrician who referred them to the consultant on the project to advise against installation of 3ph wiring. DE-Ohio's last conversation with consultants was in March 2005. It was expressed to DE-Ohio by the building consultant that they understood the cost difference and were still pursuing the installation of 3 ph metering due to the size of the units.
18. DE-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.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered, Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., respectfully moves this Commission to dismiss the Complaint of Shirley J. Newman, for failure to set forth reasonable grounds for complaint and to deny Complainant's Requests for Relief.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Ascenzo', is written over a horizontal line.

Rocco D'Ascenzo (Trial Attorney)

Counsel

Paul A. Colbert

Associate General Counsel

Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.

139 East Fourth Street, Rm 25 AT II

Cincinnati, OH 45201-0960


Telephone: (513) 287-4326

Fax: (513) 287-3810

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Answer was sent via regular U.S. Mail, postage prepaid to the following party of record this 16th day of March 2007.

Shirley J. Newman
30 E. Central Parkway #1002
Cincinnati, OH 45202



Rocco O. D'Ascenzo
Counsel