

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

MAIL PROCESSING NETWORK RATIONALIZATION
SERVICE CHANGES, 2011

Docket No. N2012-1

**RESPONSES OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
WITNESS EMILY ROSENBERG
TO COMMISSION INFORMATION REQUEST No. 1
(QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 9)**

The United States Postal Service hereby files the responses of witness Emily Rosenberg to the questions in Commission Information Request No. 1 dated May 24, 2012. The questions are stated verbatim and followed by the responses.

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
June 4, 2012

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO COMMISSION INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

1. Please review the United States Postal News, Release No.12-058, dated May 17, 2012, attached. It describes a recently modified plan (Modified Plan) for implementation of the MPNR. Is this news release accurate? If not, please provide all appropriate corrections.

RESPONSE

United States Postal News Release No.12-058 reflected an overview of the modified network implementation plan at the time the news release was published. The implementation plan is expected to evolve as numerous facility-specific details are refined and finalized. See also the response to Question 4 regarding facility counts for additional information.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

2. The Postal Service originally planned to change the service standards for First-Class Mail within in the contiguous United States from 1 to 3 days to, to 2 to 3 days, thus eliminating the overnight service standard. The Modified Plans retains an overnight service standard for a significant portion of the First Class Mail through February 2014. Please provide the business rules for 1- to 3-day service standards that are proposed to be in effect both before and after the February 2014 date.

RESPONSE

The proposed rule reflected a plan to modify the overnight service standard in 39 C.F.R. Part 121.1 so that it only applied to properly prepared and entered Presort First-Class Mail. See USPS Library Reference N2012-1/8 (76 Fed. Reg. 77942, December 15, 2011). As reflected in USPS Library Reference N2012-1/99 (77 Fed. Reg. 31196, May 25, 2012), the final rule reflects a determination to implement that proposal effective February, 2014. The interim and final First-Class Mail service standard business rules are reflected in USPS Library Reference N2012-1/99 at page 31196, and are depicted graphically at page 31199.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

3. In Docket No. N2012-1, the Postal Service originally estimated a net cost savings of \$2.1 billion annually. As a result of the February 23, 2012, Area Mail Processing (AMP) studies, the Postal Service reduced this estimate to \$1.6 billion annually in testimony presented to the Commission. See USPS-ST-4 at 16; USPS-T-12 at 20.

The Modified Plan indicates that cost reductions from the modified network consolidation plan will result in \$2.1 billion in annual savings, with \$1.2 billion in annual savings from phase one of the network consolidation.

- a. Please provide the basis of the estimated cost savings of \$2.1 billion annually under the Modified Plan. Please describe any differences in this estimate from the \$2.1 billion estimate originally provided in Docket No. N2012-1 and include all supporting workpapers.
- b. Please demonstrate how the \$2.1 billion in annual savings is disaggregated between phase one and phase two under the Modified Plan and include all supporting workpapers.
- c. Please provide an estimate of contribution lost as a result of volume declines due to the reduction in service, disaggregated by phase one and by phase two of the Modified Plan, and include all supporting workpapers.
- d. Please confirm that net savings has increased from \$1.6 billion annually (the current Docket No. N2012-1 estimate) to \$2.1 billion in annual savings under the Modified Plan. If not, please explain.

RESPONSE

- (a) The \$2.1 billion figure in this press release is the same \$2.1 billion figure in the supplemental testimony of USPS witness Bradley (USPS-ST-4).
- (b) The \$2.1B in total full-up savings referenced above in response to part (a) includes any Phase I savings. The \$1.2B estimate in the press release represents an internal target for cost reductions developed during consideration of mailer comments in the service standard rulemaking (before the preparation of the April 30 supplemental costing testimony (USPS-ST-3 and USPS-ST-4)) that the Postal Service consider a gradual approach to implementing the proposed

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

RESPONSE to Question 3 (continued)

Accordingly, the \$1.2B target is based on the original \$2.57B cost savings estimate filed in support of the Request in this case, not the revised \$2.1B estimate.

The \$1.2B figure was developed simply by approximating the workroom square footage of approximately 160 facilities (identified as potential candidates for consolidation in the first part of a phased implementation of the proposed overnight First-Class Mail service standard change), as a percentage of the overall workroom square footage of all facilities that are candidate for consolidation (around 229). The result is approximately 64 percent. That percentage was then applied to the following categories of the original \$2.57B total estimated savings:

- Workload Transfer
- Supervision and Plant Management Reductions
- In Plant Support Reductions
- Indirect Cost Reductions
- PVS to HCR Conversions
- Plant-to-PO Network Restructuring
- Building Maintenance and Custodial Labor
- Utilities
- Supplies and Contractor Costs
- Rents or Rental Opportunity Costs

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

RESPONSE to Question 3 (continued)

Based on consultations among subject headquarters subject matter experts, a 10 percent capture rate was applied to Plant-to-Plant HCR Network Restructuring, a 35 percent capture rate was applied to the Productivity Gains, and a 75 percent capture rate was applied to the Maintenance Labor and Parts and Supplies.

There were no savings estimates included for:

- Premium Pay Reductions
- Reduction in Outgoing Secondary Sorting
- Replacement of CSBCS and USFM10000
- Additional DPS Sorting.

These calculations are shown in the Excel workbook accompanying this response, in the "SavingsEstimate_IntraSCF.xls." tab "Costing." No similar analysis has been performed to disaggregate the current \$2.1B full-up cost savings estimate. The remainder of the \$2.1B in savings is expected to be generated by the implementation of Phase II.

- (c) I am informed by witness Whiteman (USPS-T-12) that no similar disaggregated Phase-by-Phase contribution loss analysis has been performed.
- (d) Not confirmed. See the responses to parts (a) through (c). The press release merely reflects the revised Postal Service (USPS-ST-4) estimate of operational cost savings and does not address the contribution loss estimate provided by witness Whiteman in USPS-T-12.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

4. The Postal Service states that 229 facilities will be scheduled for consolidation under the Modified Plan (140 consolidations in phase one and 89 facilities in phase two). Forty-eight facilities are scheduled for consolidation starting soon after May 2012, with another 92 facilities scheduled for consolidation starting January/February 2013, and the final 89 facilities scheduled for consolidation starting February 2014.
- a. Please confirm that the 229 facilities identified in the Modified Plan are the same 229 facilities (223 approved consolidations and 6 ongoing AMP studies) identified by the February 23, 2012 AMP study results. See Library Reference USPS-LR-N2012-1/73. If not confirmed, please identify the different facilities and provide the associated AMP studies if not already included in Library Reference USPS-LR-N2012-1/73.
 - b. Please identify the facilities in the first group of 48 facilities scheduled for potential consolidation starting soon after May 2012.
 - c. Please identify the facilities in the second group of 92 facilities scheduled for consolidation starting January/February 2013.
 - d. Please identify the facilities in the third group of 89 facilities scheduled for consolidation starting February 2014.

RESPONSE

- (a) Not confirmed. The press release list of 229 reflects the addition of four facilities (Coshocton OH, Massillon OH, Portsmouth OH, and Wooster OH) and ultimately the removal of four (Eastern Shore MD, Springfield IL, White River Junction VT, and Eastern Maine ME) from consideration. The four additional sites are not network facilities and are therefore not reflected in USPS Library Reference N2012-1/57 which shows the entire population of network facilities. These sites are Post Offices which contain Carrier Sequence Bar Code Sorters that are projected to be removed during the same time period. These sites were inadvertently included in the press release list, but do not actually reflect an elimination of a network facility. There are no AMP studies to support these

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

RESPONSE to Question 4 (continued)

equipment relocations since they do not perform outgoing or destinating Sectional Center Facility (SCF) processing that would be subject to the USPS Handbook PO-408 AMP guidelines.

- (b) A list identifying the group of 48 facilities presently identified as being subject to some form of operational consolidation in the summer of 2012 is reflected on the first page of the attachment to this response. The 48 sites, with the exception of Socorro NM, were drawn from the list of 140 disseminated as part of the May 17, 2012 press kit. The list of 140 is reflected in pages 2-5 of the attachment to this response. Socorro NM was inadvertently not included on that list.
- (c) The second group consists of the remainder of the consolidations identified on the list of 140 referenced in response to part (b).
- (d) .Subject to the modification described in response to part (a), the remaining 89 facilities would be what remains of the list of 229 in USPS Library Reference N2012-1/73. It should be emphasized that some facilities may be impacted in more than one phase. Under Phase I, only a portion of the operations at some sites could be consolidated. The remainder of the operations could be subject to consolidation as part of Phase II.

List of 48 Summer 2012 Facilities

Hickory P&DF
Waldorf MD CSMPC
Altoona P&DF
Greensburg CSMPC
Mansfield P&DF
Monmouth P&DC
New Castle P&DF
Pleasantville
Southeastern P&DC
Steubenville CSMPC
Washington CSMPC
Bloomington IL P&DF

Bloomington IN P&DF
Carbondale CSMPC
Cardiss Collins P&DC
Centralia CSMPC
Columbus IN CSMPC
Detroit P1 Annex
Effingham CSMPC
Gaylord P&DF
Lansing P&DC
Kenosha WI CSMPC
Portage WI CSMPC
Quincy P&DF

Rockford P&DF
Terre Haute P&DF
Lowell MA DDC
Northwest Boston P&DF
Springfield, MA
Utica NY
Midway
Modesto DDC
North Bay P&DC
North Peninsula DDC
Pasadena
Anniston AL

Fort Lauderdale FL
Fort Worth TX (Orig)
Mid-Florida FL (Orig)
Tuscaloosa AL
Waycross GA
Alliance CSMPC
Carroll CSMPC
Creston IA CSMPC
Devils Lake CSMPC
Hutchinson CSMPC
Socorro CSMPC
Wheatland CSMPC

Potential to Consolidate*

State	Study Facility		Gaining Facility(ies)		
	City	Facility	Gaining Site	City	State
AL	Anniston	Anniston CSMPC	Birmingham P&DC	Birmingham	AL
AL	Tuscaloosa	Tuscaloosa CSMPC	Birmingham P&DC	Birmingham	AL
AR	Jonesboro	Jonesboro CSMPC	Memphis P&DC	Memphis	TN
AR	FORT SMITH	Fort Smith CSMPC	NW Arkansas P&DF	Fayetteville	AR
AR	Harrison	Harrison P&DF	Fayetteville P&DF	Fayetteville	AR
AR	Hot Springs National Park	Hot Springs Ntl Pk CSMPC	Little Rock AR P&DC	Little Rock	AR
AZ	Tucson	Tucson P&DC	Phoenix P&DC	Phoenix	AZ
CA	Petaluma	North Bay CA DDC	Oakland P&DC	Oakland	CA
CA	PETALUMA	North Bay P&DC	Oakland P&DC	Oakland	CA
CA	Burlingame	North Peninsula CA DDC	San Francisco P&DC	San Francisco	CA
CA	Modesto	Modesto CA CSMPC	West Sacramento P&DC	West Sacramento	CA
CA	Stockton	Stockton P&DC	West Sacramento P&DC	West Sacramento	CA
CA	Bakersfield	Bakersfield P&DC	Santa Clarita P&DC	Santa Clarita	CA
CA	Pasadena	Pasadena P&DC	Los Angeles P&DC	Los Angeles	CA
CA	Long Beach	Long Beach P&DC	Los Angeles P&DC	Los Angeles	CA
CA	San Diego	Midway P&DF	ML Sellers CA P&DC	San Diego	CA
FL	Panama City	Panama City P&DF	Pensacola P&DC	Pensacola	FL
FL	Gainesville	Gainesville P&DF	Jacksonville P&DC	Jacksonville	FL
FL	Mid Florida	Mid-Florida P&DC	Orlando P&DC	Orlando	FL
FL	Pembroke Pines	South Florida P&DC	Miami P&DC	Miami	FL
FL	Fort Lauderdale	Fort Lauderdale P&DC	Miami P&DC	Miami	FL
GA	Waycross	Waycross CSMPC	Jacksonville P&DC	Jacksonville	FL
GA	Albany	Albany GA CSMPC	Tallahassee P&DF	Tallahassee	FL
GA	Columbus	Columbus GA CSMPC	Montgomery P&DC	Montgomery	AL
GA	Athens	Athens GA P&DF	North Metro P&DC	Duluth	GA
GA	Acworth	Acworth GA CSMPC	Atlanta P&DC	Atlanta	GA
GA	Cartersville	Cartersville GA CSMPC	Atlanta P&DC	Atlanta	GA
GA	Marietta	Marietta GA DDC	North Metro P&DC	Duluth	GA
GA	Savannah	Savannah P&DF	Charleston P&DF Macon P&DC Jacksonville P&DC	North Charleston; Macon; Jacksonville	SC; GA; FL
GA	Savannah	Savannah PO CSMPC	Charleston P&DF	North Charleston	SC
GA	Atlanta	Atlanta P&DC	North Metro P&DC	Duluth	GA
GA	Douglasville	Douglasville GA CSMPC	Atlanta P&DC	Atlanta	GA
IA	Carroll	Carroll CSMPC	Des Moines P&DC	Des Moines	IA
IA	Creston	Creston IA CSMPC	Des Moines P&DC	Des Moines	IA
IL	Chicago	Cardiss Collins P&DC	Carol Stream P&DC South Suburban P&DC	Carol Stream; Bedford Park	IL; IL
IL	Carbondale	Carbondale CSMPC	Springfield IL P&DC	Springfield	IL
IL	Bloomington	Bloomington IL P&DF	Peoria P&DF Champaign P&DF	Peoria; Champaign	IL; IL
IL	Rockford	Rockford P&DF	Carol Stream P&DC;Palatine P&DC	Carol Stream; Palatine	IL; IL
IL	Quincy	Quincy P&DF	Springfield IL P&DC	Springfield	IL
IL	Centralia	Centralia CSMPC	Springfield IL P&DC	Springfield	IL
IL	Effingham	Effingham CSMPC	Champaign P&DF	Champaign	IL

* Pre-Decisional and subject to modification based upon legislative service standard requirements and further analysis.

Potential to Consolidate*

State	Study Facility		Gaining Facility(ies)		
	City	Facility	Gaining Site	City	State
IN	Gary	Gary P&DC	So Suburban P&DC	Bedford Park	IL
IN	Bloomington	Bloomington IN P&DF	Indianapolis P&DC	Indianapolis	IN
IN	Kokomo	Kokomo IN P&DF	Indianapolis P&DC	Indianapolis	IN
IN	Terre Haute	Terre Haute P&DF	Indianapolis P&DC	Indianapolis	IN
IN	Columbus	Columbus IN CSMPC	Indianapolis P&DC	Indianapolis	IN
KS	Colby	Colby CSMPC	North Platte P&DF	North Platte	NE
KS	Hays	Hays CSMPC	Wichita P&DC	Wichita	KS
KS	Hutchinson	Hutchinson CSMPC	Wichita P&DC	Wichita	KS
KS	Liberal	Liberal CSMPC	Amarillo P&DF	Amarillo	TX
KS	Topeka	Topeka P&DF	Kansas City P&DC	Kansas City	MO
KY	Bowling Green	Bowling Green KY P&DF	Nashville TN P&DC	Nashville	TN
KY	Elizabethtown	Elizabethtown CSMPC	Louisville P&DC	Louisville	KY
KY	Hazard	Hazard CSMPC	Knoxville P&DC	Knoxville	TN
KY	London	London P&DF	Knoxville P&DC	Knoxville	TN
KY	Somerset	Somerset CSMPC	Knoxville P&DC	Knoxville	TN
LA	Lafayette	Lafayette LA P&DF	Baton Rouge P&DC	Baton Rouge	LA
MA	SPRINGFIELD	Springfield MA P&DC	Hartford P&DC & Central MA P&DC	Hartford; Shrewsbury	CT; MA
MA	Wareham	Wareham CSMPC	Providence P&DC	Providence	RI
MA	Lowell	Lowell MA DDC	Boston MA P&DC	Boston	MA
MA	Waltham	Northwest Boston P&DF	Boston P&DC (ltrs only) Middlesex Esx P&DC (flts only)	Boston; North Reading	MA; MA
MD	Waldorf	Waldorf MD CSMPC	Southern Maryland P&DC	Capitol Heights	MD
MD	Gaithersburg	Suburban MD Annex	Southern Maryland Capital Beltway Facility	Capitol Heights	MD
MI	Gaylord	Gaylord P&DF	Traverse City P&DF	Traverse City	MI
MI	Saginaw	Saginaw P&DC	Michigan Metroplex MI P&DC	Pontiac	MI
MI	Saginaw	Wheeler Street MI Annex	Michigan Metroplex MI P&DC	Pontiac	MI
MI	Jackson	Jackson MI CSMPC	Detroit P&DC	Detroit	MI
MI	Lansing	Lansing P&DC	Michigan Metroplex; Grand Rapids P&DC	Pontiac; Grand Rapids	MI
MI	Romulus	Detroit P1 Annex	Detroit P&DC	Detroit	MI
MN	Mankato	Mankato P&DF	Minneapolis P&DC	Minneapolis	MN
MN	Rochester	Rochester MN P&DF	Saint Paul P&DC	Saint Paul	MN
MN	Waite Park	Saint Cloud P&DF	Minneapolis P&DC	Minneapolis	MN
MS	Grenada	Grenada CSMPC	Jackson P&DC	Jackson	MS
MS	Tupelo	Tupelo CSMPC	Memphis P&DC	Memphis	TN
MT	Kalispell	Kalispell CSMPC	Missoula CSMPC	Missoula	MT
NC	Kinston	Kinston NC Annex	Raleigh P&DC	Raleigh	NC
NC	Kinston	Kinston P&DF	Raleigh P&DC	Raleigh	NC
NC	HICKORY	Hickory P&DF	Greensboro P&DC	GREENSBORO	NC
ND	Devils Lake	Devils Lake CSMPC	Grand Forks CSMPC	Grand Forks	ND
NE	LINCOLN	Lincoln P&DF	Omaha P&DC	OMAHA	NE
NE	Alliance	Alliance CSMPC	North Platte P&DF	North Platte	NE

* Pre-Decisional and subject to modification based upon legislative service standard requirements and further analysis.

Potential to Consolidate*

State	Study Facility		Gaining Facility(ies)		
	City	Facility	Gaining Site	City	State
NJ	Egg Harbor Township	Jersey Shore (Pleasantville) DDC	South Jersey P&DC	Bellmawr	NJ
NJ	Eatontown	Monmouth P&DC	Trenton P&DC	Trenton	NJ
NM	Alamogordo	Alamogordo CSMPC	El Paso P&DC	El Paso	TX
NM	Roswell	Roswell CSMPC	Lubbock P&DF	Lubbock	TX
NY	Melville	Mid-Island NY Annex	Mid-Island NY P&DC	Melville	NY
NY	Staten Island	Staten Island P&DF	Brooklyn P&DC	Brooklyn	NY
NY	Monsey	Monsey NY DDC	Westchester NY P&DC	White Plains	NY
NY	Plattsburgh	Plattsburgh CSMPC	Albany P&DC	Albany	NY
NY	UTICA	Utica P&DF	Syracuse P&DC	SYRACUSE	NY
OH	Portsmouth	Portsmouth OH CSMPC	Columbus P&DC	Columbus	OH
OH	Dayton	Dayton P&DC	Columbus P&DC	Columbus	OH
OH	MANSFIELD	Mansfield P&DF	Cleveland P&DC	CLEVELAND	OH
OH	Athens	Athens OH CSMPC	Columbus P&DC	Columbus	OH
OH	Ironton	Ironton OH CSMPC	Columbus P&DC	Columbus	OH
OH	Steubenville	Steubenville CSMPC	Pittsburgh P&DC	Pittsburgh	PA
OH	Canton	Canton OH P&DF	Akron OH P&DC	Akron	OH
OH	Wooster	Wooster OH CSMPC	Akron OH P&DC	Akron	OH
OH	Youngstown	Youngstown P&DF	Cleveland P&DC	Cleveland	OH
OH	Cambridge	Cambridge OH CSMPC	Columbus P&DC	Columbus	OH
OH	Chillicothe	Chillicothe OH CSMPC	Columbus P&DC	Columbus	OH
OH	Coshocton	Coshocton OH CSMPC	Columbus P&DC	Columbus	OH
OH	Massillon	Massillon OH CSMPC	Akron OH P&DC	Akron	OH
OK	Mcalester	Mcalester CSMPC	Oklahoma City P&DC	Oklahoma City	OK
PA	New Castle	New Castle P&DF	Pittsburgh P&DC	Pittsburgh	PA
PA	Reading	Reading P&DF	Harrisburg P&DC	Harrisburg	PA
PA	Southeastern	Southeastern P&DC	Philadelphia P&DC	Philadelphia	PA
PA	DUNCANSVILLE	Altoona P&DF	Johnstown P&DF	JOHNSTOWN	PA
PA	Williamsport	Williamsport PA P&DF	Harrisburg P&DC	Harrisburg	PA
PA	Scranton	Scranton PA P&DF	Lehigh Valley PA P&DC	Lehigh Valley	PA
PA	Washington	Washington CSMPC	Pittsburgh P&DC	Pittsburgh	PA
PA	Horsham	Horsham PA DDC	Philadelphia P&DC	Philadelphia	PA
PA	Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh PA Building II Annex	Pittsburgh P&DC	Pittsburgh	PA
PA	Lancaster	Lancaster P&DF	Harrisburg P&DC	Harrisburg	PA
PA	Youngwood	Greensburg CSMPC	Pittsburgh P&DC	Pittsburgh	PA
SC	Florence	Florence P&DF	Columbia P&DC	Columbia	SC
SD	ABERDEEN	Aberdeen CSMPC	Dakota Central P&DF	HURON	SD
SD	PIERRE	Pierre CSMPC	Dakota Central P&DF	HURON	SD
TN	Clinton	Clinton TN STC	N/A		0
TN	Jackson	Jackson TN P&DF	Memphis TN P&DC	Memphis	TN
TN	Memphis	Jet Cove Annex	Memphis TN P&DC	Memphis	TN
TX	Lufkin	Lufkin P&DF	Beaumont P&DF	Beaumont	TX
TX	Fort Worth	Fort Worth P&DC	North Texas P&DC	Coppell	TX
TX	Bryan	Bryan P&DF	Austin P&DC	Austin	TX
TX	Waco	Waco TX Annex	Austin P&DC	Austin	TX
VA	Lynchburg	Lynchburg P&DF	Roanoke P&DC	Roanoke	VA
WA	Everett	Everett P&DF	Seattle P&DC	Seattle	WA

* Pre-Decisional and subject to modification based upon legislative service standard requirements and further analysis.

Potential to Consolidate*

Study Facility			Gaining Facility(ies)		
State	City	Facility	Gaining Site	City	State
WA	Tumwater	Olympia P&DF	Seattle P&DC	Seattle	WA
WA	Pasco	Pasco P&DF	Spokane P&DC	Spokane	WA
WA	Wenatchee	Wenatchee CSMPC	Spokane P&DC	Spokane	WA
WA	Redmond	Seattle WA East DDC	Seattle P&DC	Seattle	WA
WI	Kenosha	Kenosha WI CSMPC	Milwaukee P&DC	Milwaukee	WI
WI	Portage	Portage WI CSMPC	Madison P&DC	Madison	WI
WI	Oshkosh	Oshkosh P&DF	Green Bay P&DC	Green Bay	WI
WI	Eau Claire	Eau Claire P&DF	Saint Paul P&DC	Saint Paul	MN
WV	Parkersburg	Parkersburg CSMPC	Charleston WV P&DC	Charleston	WV
WV	Petersburg	Petersburg CSMPC	Johnstown P&DF	Johnstown	PA
WV	Wheeling	Wheeling WV P&DF	Pittsburgh P&DC	Pittsburgh	PA
WV	Bluefield	Bluefield CSMPC	Charleston WV P&DC	Charleston	WV
WY	Wheatland	Wheatland CSMPC	Cheyenne P&DC	Cheyenne	WY

* Pre-Decisional and subject to modification based upon legislative service standard requirements and further analysis.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO COMMISSION INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

5. The Modified Plan indicates that the percent of First-Class Mail that is delivered overnight will be reduced by 20 percent as a result of phase one of the network consolidation. Please provide workpapers that develop the 20 percent reduction of First-Class Mail eligible for overnight delivery, disaggregated by single-piece and presort First-Class Mail.

RESPONSE

For purposes of the press release, a very simple analysis of Origin-Destination Information System (ODIS) data was conducted to estimate the percentage of First-Class Mail subject to the current overnight standard that would retain an overnight standard if the standard were modified to intra-SCF, assuming a network along the lines of the Phase I network.

The current percentage of First Class Mail overnight was then compared to the proposed and rounded for the purposes of the press release. There has been no detailed analysis completed to break out between single-piece and presort.

Service Standard Volume Distribution¹

	Current	Phase I: Intra-SCF
1	41.6%	34.6%

1:SOURCE: ODIS FY 2010 Volumes

$34.6 \div 41.6 =$ approx 83 percent, which was rounded to 80 percent.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

6. The Modified Plan explains that network consolidations will lead to a reduction in workforce of up to 28,000 employees.
 - a. Please provide workpapers that demonstrate how the 28,000 employee reduction was calculated, disaggregated between phase one and phase two of the Modified Plan.
 - b. Please confirm that this estimate is consistent with the employee reductions assumed at the outset of Docket No. N2012-1.
 - c. Please reconcile the 28,000 employee reduction with the revised cost savings estimates provided at the May 9, 2012 hearing.

RESPONSE

- (a) Please see the attached Excel workbook "SavingsEstimate_IntraSCF.xls." The workbook contains Phase II high-level expected workforce reductions. This analysis was completed using preliminary estimates complement data from September 2011. The proposed complement was calculated using high level assumptions about the workload at the gaining site and productivities provided by subject matter experts. The 28,000 estimate can be attained by summing cells E:467 – H:467 on the worksheet entitled, "Required Complement by Node". On the "Costing" worksheet, cell D:38 illustrates how the Phase I estimate was derived. The Phase I complement impact was approximated by dividing the estimated percentage savings from Phase I of the Total Phase I/Phase II savings. This percentage was then applied to the 28,000 to generate the Phase I estimate of 13,000.
- (b-c) The FTE savings for clerks, mail handlers, maintenance and vehicle driver craft employees based on witness Bradley's direct testimony, USPS-T-10, is 23,153 as per the spreadsheet NPMHU-USPS-T10-12.Revised.3.15.xls, which was

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

RESPONSE to Question 6 (continued)

attached to the Revised Response of USPS Witness Smith to NPMHU/USPS-T10-12 Redirected from Witness Bradley (March 16, 2012). Based on that spreadsheet, the attached spreadsheet, "Total FTE Calculations for CIR1.Q6.Direct Testimony.xls" reflects the total savings associated with witness Bradley's direct testimony, USPS-T-10, by adding FTE reductions for carriers (567.0) and managers/supervisors (2,168.3) for a total of 25,888. The FTE savings based on witness Bradley's supplemental testimony (USPS-ST-4) is 22,737. This is provided in the additional attached spreadsheet, "Total FTE Calculations for CIR1.Q6.Supplemental Testimony.xls", which is the same as the spreadsheet for the Direct Testimony FTE calculation, except that it is updated with Supplemental Testimony inputs on savings.

Because senior postal management regards the savings estimates filed in this case to be conservative, it has established an operating goal moving forward of exceeding that number of FTE reductions as it achieves full-up implementation. Postal management's operating goal for the full-up environment translates into about a reduction of about 28,000 FTEs. Thus, the FTE savings estimates cited above is not identical to, but is within the "up to 28,000" range reflected in the press release.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

7. Please provide the following information for (1) the portion of phase one that will occur during the summer, (2) the portion of phase one that will be initiated in January or February 2013, and (3) phase two of the network consolidation plan outlined in the Modified Plan.
 - a. The future originating service standards for market dominant products by 3-digit ZIP Code pairs. See, e.g., Library Reference USPS-LR-N2012-1/8.
 - b. The 3-digit customer assignments for each mail processing facility. See, e.g., Library Reference USPS-LR-N2012-1/16.

RESPONSE

(a-b) The Postal Service is currently developing the origin-destination 3-digit ZIP Code assignments implied by the summer 2012 interim service standards and will submit them in the form of a Library Reference as expeditiously as possible in June 2012 in a format similar to USPS Library Reference N2012-1/8.

The Postal Service also anticipates publishing L201 and L005 label lists in a Library Reference in June 2012 that will reflect facility-specific 3-digit ZIP Code assignments (associated with the aforementioned interim service standards) in a format similar to USPS Library Reference N2012-1/16.

It currently is not known how far in advance of the January/February 2013 operational changes that the 2013 updates will be completed and published.

That is also the case for Phase II implementation.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

8. In his testimony, witness Williams states: "The Postal Service has determined that, in order for the planned mail processing consolidations to generate significant cost savings, changes... must be made that necessitate changes to existing service standards." USPS-T-1 at 10. Witness Williams outlined the process through which the Postal Service determined what changes to the mail processing and transportation network were necessary to maximize capacity utilization. This process was also used to ensure the proposed network would be able to meet the revised service standards. These steps included the LogicNet model described by witness Rosenberg (USPS-T-3), and the AMP process described by witness Neri (USPS-T-4), as well as an overall network floor space capacity model described in Library Reference USPS-LR-N2012-1/47.

The Modified Plan indicates proposed changes will occur in two phases. In phase one, 140 facilities will be consolidated and the overnight service standard will remain for mail that is not affected by the consolidation. In phase two, an additional 89 facilities will be consolidated and the overnight service standard will be significantly curtailed.

- a. Concerning the proposed phase one network under the Modified Plan:
- i. Please describe the process used to determine that the phase one network, which retains most of the overnight service standard for First-Class Mail, is a feasible and functional network.
 - ii. Did the Postal Service use network modeling tools, such as LogicNet, for the determination that the phase one network is feasible and functional? Please describe that process.
 - iii. Were the February 23, 2012 AMP results used in this determination?
 - iv. Library Reference USPS-LR-N2012-1/47 tab "Process Steps of Interest" cells N53 to P54 detail that the current mail processing network currently has a floor space utilization of 84 percent, and opening the operating window by 2 hours would open enough floor space for the Postal Service to consolidate 115 facilities from the network. Was this analysis used in the determination that the phase one network is feasible?
 - v. What is the expected mail processing capacity utilization rate?
 - vi. Please provide all workpapers used to determine the parameters of the phase one network (e.g., facilities, customer assignments, transportation links, etc.). If the workpapers used to develop this determination are already in the Docket No. N2012-1 record, please explain how these documents apply to phase one.
- b. Concerning the proposed phase two network under the Modified Plan, please discuss how the differences between the phase one network and the phase two network necessitate the elimination of the overnight service standard.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

RESPONSE to Question 8

- (a)(i) Today's network is designed to provide intra-SCF overnight First-Class Mail service. The Phase I network will be comprised of facilities already capable of providing intra-SCF overnight First-Class Mail service. The Phase I network reflects a judgment reached by Headquarters after consultations with Area and District operations and transportation experts to determine a subset of feasible consolidations that could permit the preservation of intra-SCF overnight First-Class Mail service. Additional review may lead to adjustments to ensure that Phase I operations support applicable service standards.
- (ii) No.
- (iii) The AMP results were used to the extent that they identify the network facilities that are possible to consolidate under the relaxed service standards under the final rule. The interim rule contains a subset of these facilities.
- (iv) No. The Library Reference in question refers to the model that was created in 2009 as a starting point for analysis in determining that the operating window length has an impact on the required square footage.
- (v) The Postal Service has yet to perform analysis that would yield such information.
- (vi) See the response to subpart (a)(i).
- (b) Phase II involves expansion of the DPS operating window up to 20 hours to pursue the full-up savings that will bring the postal costs more in line with

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

RESPONSE to Question 8 (continued)

declining volumes and revenues, as described in USPS-T-4. The February 2014 service standard changes facilitate pursuit of these objectives.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

9. An attribute of the Modified Plan is that the Postal Service will have the opportunity to modify, further delay, or cancel phase two prior to its implementation in February 2014.
- a. What data will the Postal Service collect to allow it to evaluate the actual effect of phase one implementation on:
 - i. Service performance in the service areas where consolidation takes place.
 - ii. Customer mailing practices in the service areas where consolidation takes place.
 - iii. Customer satisfaction in service areas where consolidation takes place.
 - iv. Costs for labor, transportation, and plant and equipment in service areas where consolidation takes place as compared with estimates developed in the February 23, 2012 AMP studies.
 - b. Discuss the factors that will be considered in deciding whether to retain phase one service standards or to proceed with implementation of phase two thereby eliminating the overnight service standard for First-Class Mail.

RESPONSE

(a)(i) The Postal Service constantly monitors service performance and customer satisfaction for market-dominant products through a combination of measurement systems that generate reports periodically filed with the Commission. It should be emphasized that service performance measurement monitoring is a fundamental aspect of day-to-day postal management and takes place throughout the network irrespective of whether a service area has been directly involved in mail processing operational consolidation activity.

I am informed that the Postal Service will be generating service measurement reports that focus on monitoring service for consolidation impacted service areas. Irrespective of whether it is able to isolate and measure the "actual effect" of

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1**

RESPONSE to Question 9 (continued)

Phase I on service performance, the Postal Service will continue to evaluate service during Phase I against applicable service standards, operational targets, and the goal of continuous improvement. Management at every level will be expected to seek solutions to service performance and customer satisfaction issues that arise during Phase I, irrespective of whether it is possible or reasonable to attribute those issues to Phase I implementation.

- (ii) I am informed that most direct interaction with retail postal customers takes place through retail units unaffected by implementation of either phase of the initiative under review in this docket. Accordingly, irrespective of any other monitoring of retail activity, the Postal Service has not developed any plans for specifically isolating and measuring the impact of the implementation of Phase I on retail customer mailing practices. I also am informed that District and Area Postal Service managers presently monitor bulk mailing practices at Business Mail Entry Units in their service areas on a routine basis to determine if operational adjustments are necessary. It is expected that they will do so in the future, irrespective of the degree of local consolidation activity, and make adjustments consistent with applicable operating parameters.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS ROSENBERG
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 1
RESPONSE to Question 9 (continued)**

- (iii) See the response to part (a)(i).
- (iv) As witness Neri (USPS-T-4) has explained, the Area Mail Processing (AMP) guidelines in USPS Handbook PO-408 establish a process of post-implementation review (PIR) for operational consolidations that are subject to the AMP process. I am informed that examples of numerous PIR studies are reflected in USPS Library Reference N2012-1/NP12 and that witness Neri's implementation team will continue to generate future PIR analysis for the February 23, 2012 consolidation decisions where required by the PO-408.
- (b) I am informed that any decision by senior postal management regarding "whether to retain phase one service standards or to proceed with implementation of phase two" will be influenced by whether a legislative enactment prohibits the Postal Service from implementing Phase II. The Postal Service also will review the advisory opinion issued in this case.