

BEFORE THE
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

PREMIUM FORWARDING SERVICE

Docket No. MC2007-3

**NOTICE OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
OF FILING ERRATUM TO USPS-T-3 TESTIMONY (ERRATA)**
(August 30, 2007)

The Postal Service filed its Request and supporting testimony in this docket on July 31, 2007. The testimony of witness Dawson, USPS-T-3, at page 11, identifies proposed changes to Domestic Mail Classification Schedule (DMCS) language for Premium Forwarding Service (PFS) keyed to section numbers; the first two of those reference DMCS §937.21 instead of §937.11. Actual text of proposed DMCS changes, Attachment A to the Request, shows the correct changes. A revised page 11 as well as a complete copy of revised USPS-T-3 are accordingly being filed.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr.
Chief Counsel, Ratemaking

Kenneth N. Hollies
David H. Rubin

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 268-3083; Fax -3084

1 **VII. DMCS Changes**

2 I propose the following changes to the Domestic Mail Classification Schedule

3 (DMCS). These changes are shown in Attachment A to the Request.

- 4 • In §937.11, delete “classes of” from first sentence after the word “all” so that it reads,
5 “... the option to receive substantially all mail addressed to a primary address ...”

6 This housekeeping change eliminates words that are unnecessary and arguably
7 incorrect. In fact, PFS involves all classes of mail, not “substantially all.” Moreover,
8 PFS entails the reshipment of “substantially all” pieces of mail.

- 9 • In §937.11, delete “, primarily Priority Mail postage due,” so that it reads, “...pieces
10 may be re-routed, as specified by the Postal Service.” This housekeeping change is
11 explained by the letter Dan Foucheaux sent to the Commission on September 16,
12 2005 (a copy of which is attached to witness Hope’s testimony, USPS-T-1). As the
13 Postal Service prepared to implement the PFS experiment, it realized that reshipping
14 Package Services and Standard Mail parcels outside the weekly PFS shipment as
15 Priority Mail pieces constituted an upgrade from ground to air transportation that
16 would violate aviation security regulations. While mail pieces are reshipped “as
17 specified by the Postal Service,” the previous emphasis upon use of Priority Mail for
18 ‘outside’ pieces is no longer warranted.

- 19 • In §937.31, delete “...to the post office responsible for delivery to that customer’s
20 primary address ...” This deletion removes a limitation on where a customer can
21 sign up for PFS service, while leaving control of where sign-up can occur to the
22 Postal Service. So, for example, if the Postal Service develops internet tools that
23 enable a customer to initiate or pay for PFS, such tools could be implemented
24 without additional classification changes.

- 25 • Delete the text of existing §937.51 and section number “937.52” thus retaining the
26 text of existing §937.52 as the text of §937.51. This deletion reflects the facts that
27 both the application and weekly PFS fees now appear in Fee Schedule 937 and that
28 no reference to the Priority Mail rate schedule is necessary.