

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Terri Bean	)	
6381 Branch Hill-Miamiville	)	
Loveland, Ohio 45140	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	Case No. 17-2454-EL-CSS
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

ANSWER OF DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.

For its Answer to the Complaint of Terri Bean (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 allegations contained in the second paragraph of the Complaint, Duke Energy Ohio denies that it is negatively impacting property values in Miami Township and the city of Loveland. Duke Energy Ohio admits that it is exercising its lawful right, pursuant to grants of easement, to engage in vegetation management activities that include, but are not limited to, removing vegetation within its easement and right-of-way. Such removal is necessary to enable the continued safe and reliable operation of high-voltage power lines used in the provision of service to Duke Energy Ohio's customers,

including those located in Miami Township and the city of Loveland. All remaining allegations of this paragraph are denied.

3. Duke Energy Ohio denies the allegations contained in the third 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.
4. In response to the allegations contained in the fourth paragraph of the Complaint, Duke Energy Ohio submits that statements regarding requested relief are not allegations to which a response is required. Duke Energy Ohio further submits that Complainant lacks standing to assert relief on behalf of other citizens of Miami Township and the city of Loveland. However, to the extent a response is required, Duke Energy Ohio denies that it is using toxic herbicides on Complainant's property. Answering further, Duke Energy Ohio states that its actions are necessary to enable the continued safe and reliable operation of high-voltage power lines used in the provision of service to Duke Energy Ohio's customers, including those located in Miami Township and the city of Loveland and 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. Duke Energy Ohio further states that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (Commission) is without jurisdiction to issue equitable relief, including the relief requested herein. All remaining allegations of this paragraph are denied.

5. 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. All remaining allegations of this paragraph are denied.
6. Statements regarding the lack of objection to trimming trees are not allegations to which a response is required. However, to the extent a response is required, Duke Energy Ohio is without sufficient knowledge as to the truth of the opinions of Complainant and thus denies the same. Answering further, Duke Energy Ohio states that its practices 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.
7. Statements regarding the date on which activities may commence are not allegations to which a response is required. However, to the extent a response is required, Duke Energy Ohio states that the Commission is without jurisdiction to resolve issues of equity, as inferred by such statement. Answering further, Duke Energy Ohio states that its practices 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 and, as such, it cannot be deprived of its right to engage in permissible and lawful activities.

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

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. The Complainant does not assert any allegations of fact that would give rise to a cognizable claim against Duke Energy Ohio.
2. 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.
3. Duke Energy Ohio asserts as an affirmative defense that Complainant has not stated any request for relief that can be granted by this Commission.
4. Duke Energy Ohio states as an affirmative defense that Complainant lacks standing to assert any claims against the Company in respect of property for which she is not the lawful property owner of record.
5. Duke Energy Ohio asserts that to the extent Complainant is seeking monetary damages, such relief is beyond the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction.
6. 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.
7. Duke Energy Ohio asserts that it has superior property rights, as confirmed by lawful grants of easement.
8. 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 Terri Bean 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)
bcmahon@emclawyers.com (e-mail)

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 5th day of December 2017, upon the following:

Terri Bean
6381 Brach Hill-Miamiville
Loveland, OH 45140

/s/ Elizabeth H. Watts
Elizabeth H. Watts

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

12/5/2017 3:17:23 PM

in

Case No(s). 17-2454-EL-CSS

Summary: Answer of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. electronically filed by Carys Cochern on behalf of Watts, Elizabeth H. Ms.