

BEFORE THE
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20268-0001

RECEIVED
JAN 24 2 06 PM '00
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

POSTAL RATE AND FEE CHANGES, 2000

Docket No. R2000-1

DOUGLAS F. CARLSON
INTERROGATORIES TO UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
WITNESS SCOTT J. DAVIS
(DFC/USPS-T30-1-4)

January 17, 2000

Pursuant to sections 25 and 26 of the *Rules of Practice*, I hereby submit interrogatories to United States Postal Service witness Scott J. Davis.

If the witness is unable to provide a complete, responsive answer to a question, I request that the witness redirect the question to a witness who can provide a complete, responsive answer. In the alternative, I request that the question be redirected to the Postal Service for an institutional response.

The instructions contained in my interrogatories to witness Mayo (DFC/USPS-T39-1-9) are incorporated herein by reference.

Respectfully submitted,



DOUGLAS F. CARLSON

Dated: January 17, 2000

DFC/USPS-T30-1. Please refer to your testimony at page 12 and explain all differences between the cost study for return receipt and return receipt for merchandise conducted for Docket No. R2000-1 and the cost study conducted for Docket No. R97-1.

DFC/USPS-T30-2. Please provide an analysis of why the costs for return receipt have increased substantially since Docket No. R97-1.

DFC/USPS-T30-3. At page 12 of your testimony, you indicate that the costs for return receipt for merchandise are based on the costs of certified mail. Please explain how costs were estimated for return receipt for merchandise in the past.

DFC/USPS-T30-4. Why does the new methodology for return receipt for merchandise necessarily provide a better estimate of costs than the old methodology?

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon the required participants of record in accordance with section 12 of the *Rules of Practice*.



DOUGLAS F. CARLSON

January 17, 2000
Emeryville, California