

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

ANNUAL COMPLIANCE REVIEW, 2016

Docket No. ACR2016

RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE TO
QUESTIONS 1-4 OF CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 33

The United States Postal Service hereby provides its responses to the above-listed questions of Chairman's Information Request No. 33, issued on December 20, 2017. Each question is stated verbatim and followed by the response.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
By its attorneys:

Anthony F. Alverno
Chief Counsel,
Global Business and Service Development

Eric P. Koetting
Jeffrey A. Rackow

475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1101
(202) 268-6687; Fax -5418
December 28, 2017

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 33**

1. Please refer to Library Reference USPS-FY16-NP46, June 26, 2017, Excel file "ACR2016.USPS.NP46.06.26.2017\ACD.FCM.FY17Q1Q2.Q1b.NONPUBLIC.xlsx," tab "Q1b." Please provide the districts corresponding to the facilities listed in cells B18 through B92.

RESPONSE:

Upon review, it appears that some data provided in USPS-FY16-NP46, June 26, 2017, Excel file "ACR2016.USPS.NP46.06.26.2017\ACD.FCM.FY17Q1Q2.Q1b.NONPUBLIC.xlsx," tab "Q1b" were not calculated correctly. Corrected data, along with the district names requested in this information request, are provided in "CHIR.33.Q.1.response.NONPUBLIC.xlsx," filed under seal in nonpublic folder USPS-FY16-NP47.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 33**

2. Please refer to the Second Response of the United States Postal Service to Commission Requests for Additional Information in the FY 2016 Annual Compliance Determination, June 26, 2017, Excel file "acd.fcm.fy17q1q2.pub.xlsx," tab "Q2b" (Second Response). Please provide the national percentage of First-Class Mail Single-Piece Letters/Postcards with collection delays. These results should be disaggregated by service standard. These results should be for Fiscal Quarters 1, 2, 3, 4, "mid-year,"¹ "second-half,"² and annually³ for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017.

RESPONSE:

Please refer to data provided in the Excel file "CHIR.33.Qs.2.3.Data.xlsx" attached electronically to this response.

¹ Mid-year refers to the aggregation of the data for Quarters 1 and 2 of FY 2017.

² Second-half refers to the aggregation of the data for Quarters 3 and 4 of FY 2017.

³ Annually refers to the aggregation of the data for all four fiscal quarters of FY 2017.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 33**

3. Please refer to the following tabs in the Second Response, Excel file "acd.fcm.fy17q1q2.pub.xlsx." Please provide the data requested in each of the following subparts at the area level.⁴ These results should be disaggregated by service standard. These results should be for Fiscal Quarters 1, 2, 3, 4, mid-year, second-half, and annually for FY 2017:
- a. Tab "Q2b" (the percentage of First-Class Mail Single-Piece Letters/Postcards with collection delays)
 - b. Tab "Q3b" (the percentage of First-Class Mail Single-Piece Letters/Postcards with origin processing delays)
 - c. Tab "Q4b" (the percentage of First-Class Mail Single-Piece Letters/Postcards with AADC/ADC processing delays, presented in three separate tables specific to air transportation, ground transportation, and both)
 - d. Tab "Q4f" (the Transit Time Measurement System (TTMS) estimates of First-Class Mail Single-Piece Letters/Postcards that have missed the service standard by the last processing scan within the transit phase)
 - e. Tab "Q5b" (the TTMS estimates of First-Class Mail Single-Piece Letters/Postcards that already missed service standard by last processing operation within the destination processing phase)
 - f. Tab "Q6a" (the TTMS estimates of First-Class Mail Single-Piece Letters/Postcards with delivery/last mile failures)

RESPONSE:

Please refer to data provided in the Excel file "CHIR.33.Qs.2.3.Data.xlsx" attached electronically to this response.

⁴ Area level refers to the aggregation of results for each of the seven Postal Service areas: (1) Capital Metro, (2) Eastern, (3) Great Lakes, (4) Northeast, (5) Pacific, (6) Southern, and (7) Western.

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 33**

4. Please refer to following four worksheets provided in Docket No. PI2016-1: Excel file "FY17 Q1 Meas Un Vol.xlsx," tab "Please Follow Template," March 1, 2017; Excel file "FY17Q2MeasUnVolREV6117.xlsx," tab "Qtr 2 FY17," June 1, 2017; Excel file "FY17 Q3 Meas Unmeas Vol.xlsx," tab "Please Follow Template," August 29, 2017; and Excel file "fy17 q4 meas unmeas vol.xlsx," tab "Please Follow Template," November 29, 2017.
- a. Please refer to cells C23 and F23 in each of these four worksheets for USPS Marketing Mail, High Density and Saturation Flats/Parcels, Destination Entry Two-Day. Please explain why cell C23 in each worksheet reports a volume for the total number of pieces in measurement and cell F23 in each worksheet reports zero for the total number of Full-Service IMb pieces included in measurement.
- b. Please refer to cells B54 and C54 in each of these four worksheets for USPS Marketing Mail, Every Door Direct Mail Two-Day. Please explain why cell B54 in each worksheet reports a volume for the total number of pieces in measurement and cell C54 in each worksheet reports zero for the total number of pieces eligible for Full-Service IMb.

RESPONSE:

- a. These data reflect the fact that, while there is mail included in measurement for this product and service standard, that mail is not Full-Service Intelligent Mail. Instead, the service performance measurement for Destination Delivery Unit (DDU) Entry Saturation Flats involves the identification of major weekly Saturation mailings within delivery units. Delivery of these mailings is captured with a scan made by carriers at the completion of delivery of all pieces on the route. Service performance is measured by comparing the delivery date to the end date of the mailer requested in-home window to determine the percent delivered on time. Data from anonymous household "reporters" reporting the receipt of these Saturation mailings are used to validate the accuracy of the carrier scans. This measurement process was developed and implemented in

**RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 33**

FY 2009 so that Saturation mail without Intelligent Mail barcodes (IMb) would be included in service measurement. See also USPS-LR-PI2015-1/8 - USPS Service Performance Measurement Plan, Docket No. PI2015-1, February 23, 2017, at section 6.2.3, pages 38-39.

- b. Assuming that the question intended to reference cells C54 and D54 rather than B54 and C54, the explanation as to why no pieces are eligible for Full-Service IMb is similar to the response for part a. Every Door Direct Mail-Retail does not have a unique address and IMb on each piece, and thus is not part of Full-Service. The measurement process for this product uses the arrival time at a retail office to start the clock, using the point-of-sale scan when unique Intelligent Mail parcel barcodes on bundle facing slips are handed to Postal Service employees. The service performance measurement for EDDM Retail® involves the identification of these bundles within delivery units. Delivery of these bundles is captured with a scan made by carriers at the delivery unit upon distribution of the mail for delivery. Service performance is measured by comparing the total transit days from start-the-clock to delivery with the 2-day service standard to determine the percent delivered on time. The measurement data collected within Postal Service systems are provided to an independent, external contractor to calculate service measurement and compile the necessary performance reports. See also USPS-LR-PI2015-1/8 - USPS Service Performance Measurement Plan, Docket No. PI2015-1, February 23, 2017, at section 6.2.5, pages 39-40.