

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

RETAIL ACCESS OPTIMIZATION INITIATIVE, 2011

Docket No. N2011-1

**RESPONSE OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO DAVID POPKIN INTERROGATORY DBP/USPS-82**

The United States Postal Service hereby provides an institutional response to the above-identified interrogatory of David Popkin dated September 26, 2011. The interrogatory is stated verbatim and followed by the response.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Anthony F. Alverno, Jr.
Chief Counsel, Global Business

Michael T. Tidwell

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 268-2998; Fax -5402
October 25, 2011

**RESPONSE OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO INTERROGATORY OF DAVID POPKIN**

DBP/USPS-82 Please refer to Library Reference USPS LR N2011-1/11 filed on September 21, 2011. For each of the facilities no longer under consideration for discontinuance review, please advise the condition or conditions that led to that decision. The response should be facility specific and not generalities why the group of facilities was placed on the list.

RESPONSE

As was the case in the Station and Branch Optimization and Consolidation Initiative reviewed in Docket No. N2009-1, the Postal Service does not require local Retail Access Optimization Initiative discontinuance coordinators to systematically record such information as they perform preliminary analysis that leads them to narrow down the candidate pool and eliminate facilities from further consideration. Accordingly, under the circumstances, the Postal Service can offer the following:

Assuming each district was operating at the same pace in examining candidates, the first candidates to drop would likely be those for which it could be summarily determined that the facility was extremely isolated and alternate postal retail locations were virtually inaccessible to the community the candidate facility served. Not surprisingly, such circumstances are most likely to exist in the state of Alaska. Accordingly, Alaska facilities or those isolated by themselves on small islands in other states might drop off the list most rapidly without the need for more thorough analysis or a full-blown discontinuance study. In other circumstances, the existence of a cluster of relatively close candidate

**RESPONSE OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO INTERROGATORY OF DAVID POPKIN**

RESPONSE to DBP/USPS82 (continued)

facilities might lead to a local determination to eliminate from further consideration the one facility in the cluster most isolated from the others, especially if it appeared to have the least promising prospects for developing alternate access opportunities.

Additional factors that may lead to a facility being dropped from consideration relatively early during a top-down initiative without the need for a full-blown study could include existing leasehold obligations, the lack of space in a nearby gaining facility to accommodate the transfer of Post Office Box and other retail operations, or factors that surface during consideration of public input.