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

RECEIVED Dec 20 4 56 PM 'NI

POSTAL PART OF HERE HER OFFICE OF CALLSLORD

Docket No. R2001-1

POSTAL RATE AND FEE CHANGES, 2001

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS SCHENK TO INTERROGATORIES OF MAJOR MAILERS ASSOCIATION (MMA/USPS-T43-21-22)

The United States Postal Service hereby provides the responses of witness

Schenk to the following interrogatories of Major Mailers Association: MMA/USPS-

T43-21-22, filed on December 6, 2001.

Each interrogatory is stated verbatim and is followed by the response.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr. Chief Counsel, Ratemaking

Man K. McKejie an K. McKenzie

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20260-1137 (202) 268-3089 Fax -5402 December 20, 2001

MMA/USPS-T43-21 Please refer to Part H of Interrogatory MMA/USPS-T43-13, which you redirected to USPS witness Miller to answer. That question asked you specific information regarding *your* understanding of the derivation of your unit delivery cost for nonautomation mixed AADC letters and that the interrogatory was intended for *you* to answer.

- A. Please confirm that letters addressed and delivered to a post office box do not require nonDPS processing. If no, please explain.
- B. Please confirm that you assumed that the nonDPS cost for nonautomation, machinable mixed AADC letters for the test year, as well as for all other types of presorted letters, was 3.11 cents.
- C. Please confirm that the 3.11 unit cost refers to an average for all nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters, as well as all other types of presorted letters, whether or not they required nonDPS processing, since some unknown portion was addressed and delivered to a post office box.
- D. Please confirm your understanding that the decision to use nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters as a proxy for BMM letters implicitly assumes that the 3.11 unit cost refers to BMM letters as well, and that BMM letters would exhibit the same, unknown portion of letters that was addressed and delivered to a post office box. If you cannot confirm, please explain.
- E. Please confirm that letters addressed and delivered to a post office box do not require DPS processing. If no, please explain.
- F. Please confirm that your derived DPS cost for nonautomation, machinable mixed AADC letters, as well as for all other types of presorted letters, was .5 cents for the test year.
- G. Please confirm that the .5-cent unit cost refers to an average for all nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters, as well as all other types of presorted letters, whether or not they required DPS processing, since some unknown portion was addressed and delivered to a post office box.
- H. Please confirm your understanding that the decision to use nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters as a proxy for BMM letters implicitly assumes that the .5-unit cost refers to BMM letters as well, and that BMM letters would exhibit the same, unknown portion of letters that was addressed and delivered to a post office box. If you cannot confirm, please explain.

RESPONSE:

- A. By "nonDPS processing" I assume you are referring to the carrier processing of nonDPS sorted mail, as USPS-LR-J-117 only refers to carrier costs. Not confirmed. Single-piece First-Class letters may require collection-related processing by carriers. See my response to MMA/USPS-T43-1Q and MMA/USPS-T43-1U.
- B. Confirmed.
- C. Confirmed.
- D. Although the assignment of proxies for BMM letters is outside the scope of my testimony (see witness Miller's testimony, USPS-T-22), I can confirm that the delivery costs for nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters are derived in part using a nonDPS carrier processing cost of 3.11 cents, and that witness Miller has designated the nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters as a proxy for BMM letters in determining delivery costs (see USPS-T-22, page 20 at 21-23). Given these facts, it is my understanding that the delivery costs for BMM letters was derived in part using the nonDPS carrier processing cost of 3.11 cents, and any other assumptions that are implicit in the derivation of the delivery cost of nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters.
- E. By "DPS processing" I assume you are referring to the carrier processing of DPS sorted mail, as USPS-LR-J-117 only refers to carrier costs. Not confirmed.
 See the response to part A above.
- F. Confirmed.
- G. Confirmed.

H. Although the assignment of proxies for BMM letters is outside the scope of my testimony (see witness Miller's testimony, USPS-T-22), I can confirm that the delivery costs for nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters are derived in part using a DPS carrier processing cost of 0.5 cents, and that witness Miller has designated the nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters as a proxy for BMM letters in determining delivery costs (see USPS-T-22, page 20 at 21-23). Given these facts, it is my understanding that the delivery costs for BMM letters was derived in part using the DPS carrier processing cost of 0.5 cents, and any other assumptions that are implicit in the derivation of the delivery cost of nonautomation machinable mixed AADC letters.

MMA/USPS-T43-22 Please refer to your response to Part B of Interrogatory

MMA/USPS-T43-12. There you discuss the derivation of the DPS unit cost to

process presorted letters based on the derived nonDPS unit cost to process

presorted letters from FY 1993 cost and volume data.

- A. Please confirm that your derived estimate for the test year DPS unit cost to process presorted machinable letters is .5 cents. If you cannot confirm, please provide the correct figure and a source for your answer.
- B. Please confirm that USPS witness Miller estimates that the test year DPS unit cost to process presorted machinable letters is 1.14 cents, as shown in the following table. If you cannot confirm, please provide the correct figures and the sources for your answer.

Computation of Unit DPS Costs For Presorted Letter Categories From USPS Witness Millers Models (Cents)

| Model | | TPH | Total Cents Per Piece | DPS % | Unit DPS Cost |
|-----------------|--------------|--------|--------------------------|--------|------------------|
| BMM | Auto 3-Pass | 3,205 | | 75.73% | 0.0793 |
| | Auto 2-Pass | 13,536 | | 75.73% | 1.0624 |
| | Avg DPS Cost | | | | 1.1416 |
| Mach MAADC-AADC | Auto 3-Pass | 3,182 | 0.187 | 75.17% | 0.0793 |
| | Auto 2-Pass | 13,436 | 0.594 | 75.17% | 1.0624 |
| | Avg DPS Cost | | | | 1.1416 |
| Mach 3D-5D | Auto 3-Pass | 3,276 | 0.187 | 77.40% | 0.0793 |
| | Auto 2-Pass | 13,835 | 0.594 | 77.40% | 1.0624 |
| | Avg DPS Cost | : | | | 1.1416 |
| Auto Mix AADC | Auto 3-Pass | 3,122 | 0.187 | 73.76% | 0.0793 |
| | Auto 2-Pass | 13,184 | 0.594 | 73.76% | 1.0624 |
| | Avg DPS Cost | | | | 1.1416 |
| Auto AADC | Auto 3-Pass | 3,232 | 0.187 | 76.35% | 0.0793 |
| | Auto 2-Pass | 13,646 | 0.594 | 76.35% | 1.0624 |
| | Avg DPS Cost | | | | 1.1416 |
| Auto 3D | Auto 3-Pass | 3,258 | 0.187 | 76.98% | 0.0793 |
| | Auto 2-Pass | 13,759 | | 76.98% | 1.0624 |
| | Avg DPS Cost | | | | 1.1416 |

Source: USPS-LR-J-60 (Revised 11/14/01)

Note that Unit DPS Cost = (TPH x Total Cents Per Piece) / DPS % /10,000

C. Please explain why your derived test year presorted DPS unit cost is less than half that derived by USPS witness Miller.

RESPONSE:

- A. Confirmed.
- B. Not confirmed. The data presented in the above table in the columns headed "TPH", "Total Cents Per Piece", and "DPS%" are confirmed as coming from USPS-LR-J-60, workbook FCMREV2.xls. However, I have not been able to confirm that witness Miller calculates any unit DPS costs in USPS-LR-J-60 or in his testimony (USPS-T-22).
- C. The test year presorted DPS unit costs presented in USPS-LR-J-117 are DPS unit carrier costs, i.e., the unit costs associated with carrier processing of DPS sorted mail. The derived unit DPS costs for presorted letters presented in part B above, if correct, would be mail processing unit cost for DPS sortation. Since the unit DPS costs presented in USPS-LR-J-117 and those presented in part B above are measuring different functions, they are not directly comparable.

DECLARATION

I, Leslie M. Schenk, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing answers are true and correct, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Leslie M. Schenk

Dated: 12/20/01

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.

Nan K. McKenzie Nan K. McKenzie

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20260–1137 December 20, 2001