Postal Rate Commission
Submitted 8/16/2004 4:05 pm
Filing ID: 41391
Accepted 8/16/2004

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

EXPERIMENTAL PRIORITY MAIL FLAT-RATE BOX, 2004

Docket No. MC2004-2

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
WITNESS DANIEL J. BARRETT TO INTERROGATORY OF
DAVID B. POPKIN (DBP/USPS-T2-31)
(August 16, 2004)

The United States Postal Service hereby files the response of witness Daniel J. Barrett to the following interrogatory of David B. Popkin: DBP/USPS-T2-31, filed on August 2, 2004. The Postal Service respectfully notes that this interrogatory purports to follow upon the response to OCA/USPS-T2-25, which indicates that retail acceptance of all Priority Mail pieces, whether flat-rate box or not, is essentially the same. Upon this foundation, Mr. Popkin erects a series of questions about PVIs applied at retail acceptance, and concludes with a question about studies showing the impact of PVIs (which contain barcodes) on mail processing efficiency. PVIs are applied in many contexts at the retail window, not just Priority Mail. Despite the tenuous link between the interrogatory and the flat-rate box proposals, the Postal Service has chosen to reply directly to the interrogatory. Any continued follow-up along these general lines of inquiry will result in a different choice, per POR MC2004-2/4, at 5-6 (August 3, 2004).

The 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

_____
Kenneth N. Hollies

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260–1137
(202) 268–3083; Fax -3084

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
WITNESS BARRETT TO POPKIN INTERROGATORY

DBP/USPS-T2-31. Please refer to your response to OCA/USPS-T2-25 in which you indicate that a mailer who brought a Priority Mail article, either a flat-rate box or a non-flat-rate box, that already had full postage affixed would still have a $0.00 PVI label applied when the article was presented at a retail service window. [a] Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to do so, that one of the purposes of this $0.00 PVI label is to indicate the destination ZIP Code. [b] Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to do so, is that another purpose of this $0.00 PVI label is to indicate that the mail was presented over a retail service window and therefore will not be returned for security reasons if it is over 16 ounces in weight. [c] Please advise any other uses that are made of the information contained on this label. [d] Please advise whether a $0.00 PVI label will also be affixed when full postage has already been applied to the article when the article is entered into the system at other than at a retail service window. If necessary, respond appropriately for each of the other different methods of mailing. [e] Does the addition of the $0.00 PVI label with the destination ZIP Code add to the efficiency of the processing of the article and/or potentially shorten the delivery time? If not, please explain why it is added. If so, please provide the results of any studies that have been conducted.

RESPONSE:

[a] Confirmed.

[b] Confirmed that the presence of a PVI indicates entry via the retail counter.

[c] The bar code printed on a PVI is designed to be used in mail processing. PVI's with $0.00 postage may also be used to indicate the actual mailing date when mail is presented at the retail window with postage affixed.

[d] No.

[e] Please see my response to part (c) above. The bar code is designed to enhance automation, though I am unaware of any specific studies conducted to assess the impact on efficiency or delivery time.

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.

_____
Kenneth N. Hollies

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260–1137
(202) 268–3083; Fax -3084
August 16, 2004