

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20268-0001

Postal Rate Commission
Submitted 8/18/2005 2:25 pm
Filing ID: 46481
Accepted 8/18/2005

Postal Rate and Fee Changes

Docket No. R2005-1

PRESIDING OFFICER'S INFORMATION REQUEST NO. 13

(Issued August 18, 2005)

The United States Postal Service is requested to provide the information described below to assist in developing a record for the consideration of the Postal Service's request for changes in rates and fees. In order to facilitate inclusion of this material in the evidentiary record, the Postal Service is to have a witness attest to the accuracy of the answers and be prepared to explain to the extent necessary the basis for the answers. The answers are to be provided within 14 days.

1. On August 5, 2005 the APWU membership ratified a one-year contract extension to November 20, 2006. Some of the provisions of the extension are a 1.6% pay increase payable March 18, 2006, continuation of the semi-annual COLAs, position upgrades for several crafts, and increases to uniform and work clothes allowances. Please provide descriptions of all changes that would have to be made to the Revenue Requirement workpapers (USPS-LR-K-50) in order to reflect the provisions of the APWU contract extension. Please include any new workpapers or spreadsheets that would be required to show how the extension would be incorporated into the existing workpapers.
2. LR-K-67 contains no rural crosswalk, but does include a parcel crosswalk. The latter crosswalk aligns rural flat and parcel volumes with the DMM definition of flats and parcels. In response to VP/USPS-T16-6b., witness Kelley states "A more acceptable result derivable from LR-K-101 is obtained by eliminating the LR-K-101 rural crosswalk." Please provide a revised LR-K-101 that (1) eliminates the sheet "RCCS EVAL", which contains an obsolete distribution of mail by shape, and (2) incorporates

- an “LR-K-67 type” parcel crosswalk to align rural flat and parcel volumes with the DMM definition (See LR-K-67, file: “FY04.CCS.RPW.Volumes.xls”).
3. Please Refer to LR-K-67 sheet “8.RrlCwlk-RevSatBxds.Rev.Prcls”, which contains the volumes for rural ECR mail, and the response to POIR 3(d), which contains the file “LR-K-101.no.ECR.Crosswalk.xls”, where the rural crosswalk is corrected in LR-K-101 for ECR mail. The distribution of Boxholder volume to subclass and shape is different in LR-K-67 compared with LR-K-101 (See file: “LR-K-101.no.ECR.Crosswalk.xls”).
 - a. With respect to LR-K-67, please revise the volume distribution data, or in the absence of that revision, explain the reasoning for distributing ECR Basic Auto and ECR High Density Boxholder volume solely to flats and for distributing ECR Basic Boxholder volume to flats and parcels, but not letters.
 - b. Please ensure that the distribution of boxholder volume to subclass and shape in LR-K-101 without a rural crosswalk is consistent with the distribution of boxholder volume to subclass and shape in LR-K-67 without a rural crosswalk.
 4. Under the survey tab in the files “mppgby04prc.xls” and “mppgby06prc.xls” (part of LR-K-52), the formula for cell G11 is not consistent with the other cells in the column. The formula listed in G11 is “=D11” while the other formulas in the same column (G7-10 and G12-13) are summations of cells in columns C through F. Should the formula for cell G11 be the same as the formula for cells G7-10 and G11-12? If the formula reference of “=D11” in cell G11 is correct, please explain why the formula is not consistent with the rest of the cells in column G.

George Omas
Presiding Officer