Postal Rate Commission
Submitted 1/12/2005 4:14 pm
Filing ID: 42702
Accepted 1/12/2005

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

EXPERIMENTAL PREMIUM FORWARDING SERVICE	:	Docket No. MC2005-1

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
WITNESS ARNETTA L. COBB
TO INTERROGATORY OF DAVID B. POPKIN
(DBP/USPS-T1-51)
(January 12, 2005)

The United States Postal Service hereby files the response of witness Arnetta L. Cobb to the following interrogatory of David B. Popkin: DBP/USPS-T1-51, filed on December 22, 2004. The Postal Service filed a partial objection to DBP/USPS-T1-51 on January 5, 2005.

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
Keith E. Weidner

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

RESPONSE OF POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS COBB
TO DAVID B. POPKIN INTERROGATORY

DBP/USPS-T1-51.

(a) Please explain, in general, the steps taken in processing mail that arrives at an address in which the customer has filed a Change of Address Order.

(b) Please indicate the normal time frames for each of the actions to be taken. For example, if a letter arrives at the delivery unit on a Monday, when will that letter be entered into the system with the new address?

(c) Are forwarded letters normally handled with the same delivery standards [1-, 2-, or 3-days] as other letter mail is?

(d) If not, please explain.

(e) Please advise the action taken with each of the classes of mail [for example, First-Class Mail/ Priority Mail/ Express Mail/ Standard Mail/ Package Services/ Periodicals/ etc.] with a temporary vs. permanent Change of Address Order.

RESPONSE:

This interrogatory was the object of a partial objection in which the Postal Service agreed to respond "regarding the forwarding procedures for pieces requiring scans, but only those pieces." Also, as noted in my response to OCA/USPS-T1-22, these procedures are the same for both forwarded mail and mail that would be reshipped under PFS.

(a)-(d) When a mail piece that requires a scan at delivery arrives at the delivery unit which serves the forwarding address, the piece receives a "forwarded" scan and is re-entered into the mail stream. That piece would then receive a "delivered" scan (or one or more other scans, including "attempted" delivery) when it reaches the temporary or new permanent address. To the best of my knowledge, the "forwarded" scan is entered in the delivery unit either before the mail is taken out on the delivery route or after the delivery employee returns from the route having realized that one or more pieces are subject to a forwarding order. Under PFS, mail that requires a scan would also be scanned and immediately rerouted to the temporary address. These procedures are followed

when a carrier casing mail finds a piece subject to a forwarding order, or would be followed when a piece subject to a PFS order is found. Such procedures could occur during each delivery day and would not involve a Computerized Forwarding System (CFS) unit. There are no delivery standards specific to forwarded mail. However, as noted in my testimony, USPS-T-1 at 1, PFS is proposed as an alternative to the sporadic delivery that characterizes forwarded pieces.

(e) All pieces that require a scan at delivery, regardless of their class and type of forwarding order, receive a “forwarded” scan and are returned to the mail stream that day.