

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

RECEIVED
JUN 14 4 12 PM '00
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

POSTAL RATE AND FEE CHANGES, 2000

Docket No. R2000-1

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO
OCA WITNESS EWEN
(USPS/OCA-T5-10-16)

Pursuant to rules 25 and 26 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States Postal Service directs the following interrogatories and requests for production of documents to OCA witness Ewen: USPS/OCA-T5-10-16.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr.
Chief Counsel, Ratemaking


Richard T. Cooper

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 268-2993 Fax -5402
June 14, 2000

USPS/OCA-T5-10. In challenging witness Baron's concept of fixed time at a stop, the Commission's Docket No. R97-1 Recommended Decision argued that this concept "is not required to allow the effect of stop coverage to be measured by a regression of non-elemental load time on system-level stops coverage" (page 177, paragraph 3279).

- (a) Please confirm that the "non-elemental load time" that the Commission is referring to in this quotation is coverage-related load time. If you do not confirm, please state your complete understanding of the Commission's definition of "non-elemental load time" in this quotation.
- (b) Please confirm that the Commission has defined "coverage-related load time" as the excess (or residual) of total accrued load time over elemental load time. If you do not confirm, please state your complete understanding of the Commission's definition of coverage-related load time.
- (c) Please state whether you are aware of any regression analysis that estimates equations that define the residual of total accrued load time over elemental load time as functions of system-level stops coverage and/or any other explanatory variables. If you are aware of any such regression analyses, please provide all documentation of such analyses, and answer the following with respect to each:
 - 1) Who performed the analysis?
 - 2) When was the analysis conducted and what data does it use?
 - 3) What are the dependent and independent variables of the regression equations, what are the regression coefficients, t-statistics, R-squares, and any other diagnostic statistics (e.g. F-Tests), and what elasticities, marginal load times, or marginal costs do these regressions produce?
 - 4) Is the dependent variable in these equations a measure of the residual of total accrued load time over elemental load time?

USPS/OCA-T5-11. In referring to witness Baron's argument that the residual defined as total accrued load time minus elemental load time is institutional cost, the Docket No. R97-1 Decision states the following (at page 176, paragraph 3276):

He [witness Baron] argues that once elemental load time is deducted from accrued load time, the residue should be considered an institutional cost. He does not consider it relevant that the residue can be shown to vary in proportion to system-level stop coverage.

- a. Do you agree that the residual load time – that is, the excess of total accrued load time over elemental load time – “can be shown to vary in proportion to system-level stop coverage?” Please explain fully.
- b. If your answer to part (a) is in the affirmative, are you aware of any existing empirical or other analyses that suggest that that residual load time “varies in proportion to system-level stop coverage.” If your answer is yes, please describe fully each such analysis, and provide all documentation of each. Include in your descriptions answers to the following:
 - 1) Who did the analysis?
 - 2) When was the analysis conducted and what data does it use?
 - 3) How does the analysis define “system-level stop coverage?”
 - 4) If the analysis included regression equations, what are the dependent and independent variables of these equations, what are the regression coefficients, t-statistics, R-squares, and any other diagnostic statistics (e.g. F-Tests), and what elasticities, marginal load times, or marginal costs do these regressions produce?
 - 5) Is the dependent variable in these equations a measure of the residual of total accrued load time?
- c. If your answer to part (a) is in the affirmative, but you have no knowledge of any existing regression or other analyses that show that residual load time (total accrued load time minus elemental load time) varies in proportion to system-level stop coverage, please specify what type of study you believe could be conducted to show that residual load time varies in proportion to system-level stop coverage.

USPS/OCA-T5-12. Please refer to page 177, paragraph 3279 of the Commission's Docket No. R97-1 Recommended Decision, where the Commission describes witness Crowder's "mathematical derivation of the established model of system-level load time variability" as a "clear and comprehensive explication of the established load time analysis."

a. At the beginning of the presentation of her model of "system-wide load time," witness Crowder's Docket No. R97-1 Testimony defines system-wide coverage-related load time as "non-elemental load time which includes the fixed time incurred as a result of the need to make a load, e.g., fixed time to open and close the satchel and mail box." Ms. Crowder also states in this reference that "like access time," coverage-related load time "is variable to the same extent as stops coverage is considered variable." (Docket No. R97-1, JP-NOI-1, page 10 lines 24-26 through page 11 lines 1-2).

(1) Do you agree with Ms. Crowder that coverage-related load time includes fixed time? If you agree, please explain fully in what sense you believe this included fixed time is "fixed." Do you believe, for example, that this fixed time is fixed with respect to volume and volume mix? If not, in what sense is it fixed?

(2) Do you agree that Ms. Crowder's system-wide load time model, which contains the definition of system-wide coverage-related load time as time that includes fixed time, is a "clear and comprehensive explication of the established load time analysis?" Please explain fully.

(3) Do you believe that coverage-related load time is variable to the same extent that accrued access time is variable? Please explain fully.

b. Have you evaluated Ms. Crowder's "mathematical derivation of the established model of system-level load time variability?" If your answer is yes, please consider the following mathematical principal: For a nonlinear equation of Y as a function of X, the average value of Y over a given range of X does not equal the value of Y defined at the corresponding average value of X. Do you confirm that Ms. Crowder's mathematical derivation of system-level load time variability violates this mathematical principal? Please explain your answer fully.

USPS/OCA-T5-13. The Commission's Docket No. R97-1 Recommended Decision, at page 179, paragraphs 3283-3284, makes the following statements:

Witness Baron argues that witness Crowder's mathematical derivation of the established system-level load time model is invalid in every respect, because it assumes that the average value of the load time function equals the function of the average value of the cost driver.

It is true that models that use average values for the independent variable under investigation are only approximations of models that attempt to account for the specific distribution pattern of the independent variable across a sample. They are close approximations, however, where the function is well behaved. The elemental variability function is such a function.

- a. Do you believe the assumption "that the average value of the load time function equals the function of the average value of the cost driver" is an incorrect or invalid assumption? Please explain fully.
- b. Do you believe "witness Crowder's mathematical derivation of the established system-level load time model" is valid despite the fact that it "assumes that the average value of the load time function equals the function of the average value of the cost driver?" Please explain fully.
- c. If your answer to part (b) is in the affirmative, do you believe the assumption that "the average value of the load time function equals the function of the average value of the cost driver" is therefore **not relevant** to witness Crowder's mathematical derivation of the established system-level load time model?
- d. If you believe the assumption that "the average value of the load time function equals the function of the average value of the cost driver" is relevant to Ms. Crowder's mathematical derivation of the established system-level load time model, then please explain fully how can that derivation be valid if the assumption is incorrect.

- e. Please refer to the first paragraph of the above quotation from the Docket No. R97-1 Recommended Decision, where, according to the Commission, “[w]itness Baron argues that witness Crowder’s mathematical derivation of the established system-level load time model is invalid in every respect....”
- (1) Please specify, what, in your view, are the different “respects” of witness Crowder’s model that may or may not be valid.
 - (2) Which of these respects or aspects of witness Crowder’s model are valid and which are invalid? In particular, which are valid despite the Crowder model’s assumption that the average value of the load time function equals the function of the average value of the cost driver. Which are invalid because of this assumption? Please explain your answers fully.
- f. Please refer to the second paragraph of the quotation from the Docket No. R97-1 Decision cited at the beginning of this interrogatory. (Paragraph 3284 at page 179). Do you believe that the “elemental variability function” is a “close” approximation of a model that attempts “to account for the specific distribution pattern of the independent variable across a sample?” Please explain fully why you believe the elemental variability function is or is not a “close approximation” of such a model.
- g. Consider the SDR, MDR, and BAM load time regressions estimated by the Commission in its Docket No. R90-1 Recommended Decision and used to derive the alternative BY 1998 elemental and volume-variable coverage-related load time costs presented in Table 2 of your Docket No. R2000-1 Testimony (OCA-T-5 at page 7). Do you believe that these load time regressions are “close approximations” of “models that attempt to account for the specific distribution pattern of the independent variable across a sample?” Please explain fully the reasons for your answer.
- h. Do you believe the SDR, MDR, and BAM regressions cited in part (g) of this interrogatory are “close approximations” to linear regressions? Please explain fully the reasons for your answer.

USPS/OCA-T5-14. At page 48, lines 3-6 of Docket No. R2000-1, MPA-T-5, witness Crowder states that "when volume on a route increases and there is less than 100% delivery coverage on the stop, then some of the volume goes to newly covered stops/deliveries (causing whatever fixed stop/delivery time is appropriate)...."

- a. Do you agree with witness Crowder that when some of the mail volume resulting from a volume increase goes to a previously uncovered stop, it causes corresponding additional fixed stop time? Please explain fully.
- b. If you do not agree, is it your position that no additional fixed stop time occurs as a result of a carrier going to a newly covered stop in response to volume growth? Please explain fully.

USPS/OCA-T5-15. At Appendix B, page 10, footnote 9 of Docket No. R2000-1, MPA-T-5, witness Crowder, evaluates "the volume-load time relationship observed at the stop level." She states that "at the stop level, the cost-volume curve does have a positive intercept, indicating fixed stop time," and that "[e]xtending the plot of this curve to zero volume would indicate a positive intercept value, revealing the fixed stop load time."

- a. Do you agree with Ms. Crowder that some of total load time "at the stop level" is "fixed stop load time?"
- b. If you agree, would you regard this "fixed stop load time" as coverage-related load time? In addition, would you regard this "fixed stop load time" as the coverage-related load time that the Commission referred to when it stated in its R97-1 Decision (as quoted by you at page 8 lines 16-19 of your Testimony) that:

[t]he coverage-related load time analysis was intended to find the additional volume variability resulting from the fact that additional deliveries are caused by additional volume.

Please explain your answers fully.

- c. If you agree with Ms. Crowder that some of load time "at the stop level" is "fixed stop load time," in what sense to you believe this "fixed stop load time" is fixed? For example, is it fixed with respect to volume and volume mix? Please explain fully.

USPS/OCA-T5-16. At page 48, footnote 46 of MPA-T-5, witness Crowder makes the following statement:

When there is less than 100% coverage, a volume increase causes an increase in coverage which reduces average volume per stop on the route. If there are stop/delivery-level load time scale economies (i.e., elemental load time variability is less than 100%), then average per piece load time actually increases (coverage-related load time is positive). On the other hand, if there are no such scale economies (i.e., elemental load time variability is 100% and there is no fixed stop/delivery time), then average load time per piece does not change and changes in coverage have no effect on per piece load time (i.e., coverage-related load time is zero).

- a. Do you agree that if there are no scale economies in the loading of mail at the individual stop or delivery point, then there is "no fixed stop/delivery time?" Please explain your answer fully.
- b. Do you agree that if there are no scale economies in the loading of mail at the individual stop or delivery point, then "coverage-related load time is zero?" Please explain fully.
- c. Do you believe that if there is no fixed stop or delivery time, coverage-related load time can still be positive? Please explain fully.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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


Richard T. Cooper

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 268-2993 Fax -5402
June 14, 2000