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

Aby 10 RECEIPED 4 47 PH 37

POSTAL RATE AND FEE CHANGES, 1997

Docket No. R97-1

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS MCGRANE TO INTERROGATORIES OF NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA (NAA/USPS-ST44-1-22)

The United States Postal Service hereby provides responses of witness McGrane to the following interrogatories of the Newspaper Association of America: NAA/ USPS_ST44—1–22, filed on November 3, 1997.

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

Anthony F. 🔊verno

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20260–1137 (202) 268–2997; Fax –5402 November 10, 1997

NAA/USPS-ST44-1. Does Exhibit 44A differ in any way from the document previously filed as Library Reference LR-H-109? If so, please identify and explain all differences.

RESPONSE:

No.

NAA/USPS-ST44-2. With respect to Exhibit 44A, previously filed as Library Reference LR-H-109, please confirm that ¾ of the data were collected prior to, and ¼ were collected after, the implementation of the mail reclassification changes resulting from Docket No. MC95-1. If you cannot confirm, please explain why not.

RESPONSE:

Not confirmed. The implementation of classification reform for commercial subclasses occurred on July 1, 1996, which was approximately in the middle of accounting period (AP) 11. Thus, 10½ APs were pre-reclassification and 2½ APs were post-reclassification.

NAA/USPS-ST44-3. Please describe all changes in the preparation and entry requirements for carrier route letters and flats that went into effect on July 1, 1996, with the implementation of the mail reclassification changes resulting from Docket No. MC95-1. Please include any changes in endorsements, sequencing requirements, package preparation requirements, and tray, sack or pallet preparation requirements associated with entry at Enhanced Carrier Route subclass rates. Please indicate the changes for letters and flats separately.

RESPONSE:

The requested information can be found by comparing DMM-50 (July 1, 1996) to DMM-49 (September 1, 1995). The major changes of which I am aware include: the required endorsements were changed from "Carrier Route Presort" and "WS Carrier Route Presort" to "AUTOCR", "ECRLOT", "ECRWSH", and "ECRWSS"; letter shaped mail was required to be presented in trays; pallet makeup was made optional at 250 pounds; and Basic ECR mail was required to be presented in line of travel order.

NAA/USPS-ST44-4. Please provide a version of Exhibit 44A, Table 1 (at page 4) that presents separately the data collected prior to and after the July 1, 1996, implementation of the mail reclassification changes resulting from Docket No. MC95-1.

RESPONSE:

See the attached table for commercial ECR. Nonprofit mail was not affected by the changes resulting from Docket No. MC95-1.

Table 1

Development of Walk Sequence vs. Non-Walk Sequence Costs - Standard (A) Regular ECR Letters

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
100	On at On at	Be Non Walk Seq	fore July 1, 1996 Walk Seq	Total	Alte Non Walk Seq	r June 30, 1996 Walk Seq	Total	Non Walk Seq	Grand Total Walk Seq	Total	Variable MP Costs	Variable Costs D Non-WS	WS SW
11	Cost Pool	3,876	AASIK Sed	3,039	979	63	1,042	4,854	127	4,981	16,985		432
18	Extrass .	3,070	~~	اوري	0	ã		.,	Ö	0			No Key
12	fsm	63	ŏ	ဒေါ်	ă	Ŏ	o.	63	ŏ	63	169	169	ં ળી
12	ism	1,492	133	1,625	280	Ö	200	1,772	133	1,906	6,467	5,033	454
14	manf	65	0	65	63	0	63	129	0	129	249	249	o!
14	mani	5,768	213	5,981	1,273	72	1,345	7,041	285	7,327	11,718		456
14	manp	. 0	0	0	104	0	104	104	0	104	201		이
13	mecparc	0	0	이	0	0	0	0	a	0			No Key
11	oct	1,287	0	1,287	271	235	506	1,558	235	1,793	4,836	4,203	634
14	Priority	50	0	50	0	0	_0	50	Ģ	50	132	132	익
13	spbs Oth	1,431	0	1,431	173	0	173	1,605	Ō	1,605		2,584	oj
13	spbsPrlo	54	0	54]	117	0	117	171	Ō	171	574	1	이
18	BusReply	0	0	이	0	0	0		0	0			No Kery
j 19	inti	63	0	63	0	0	O	63	g	63	136	138	엙
15	1d15	63	0	63	145	0	145	208	0	205		6,281	0 315
41	LO41	0	108	108	52	0	52	52 0	108 G	160		153	No Key
42	LD42	0	0	0	0	0	9 0 0		155	8,390	-	No Key 9	351
43	LD43	5,334	155 0	5,490 341	900 51	ŏ	900 51	6,235 392	1 33	392			201
44	LD44	341 100	48	148	51 51	ŏ	51	152	48	200		_	ĭ
48 48	LD48_Adm LD48_Exp	1 0	0	0	0	ŏ	0		õ	200		1 *	No Key
48	LO48_Oth	366	0	386	. 51 ·	67	118	417	67	484	1	427	69
48	LO48_SpS	59	ă	59	3	ő	0		å	59			اه
49	LD49	545	Ď	545	187	ŏ	187	732	Ō	732			ōl
79	LD79	579	123	702	58	ā	58	. –	123	759			810
18	Mailoram		0	ol	. 0	Ò	0	0		0	0	C	ol
18	Registry	0	ō	ol	Ö	0	0	0	a	0	1	No Key 1	No Kery
18	Rewrap	(0	Ó	o[0	0	a'		0	0			No Key
17	1bulk pr	0	0	이	0	0	0		a	0			No Key
17	1cancMPP	392	61	453	0	0	0		81	453		1,078	167
18	1EEqmt	0	0	o o	0	0	0	_	0	0			Na Key
18	1Misc	0	O	0	C	0	0		0	0			No Key
17	10pBulk	3,114	129	3,243	332	0	332 349	3,446	129	3,576 2,756			498
17	1OpPref	2,407	0	2,407 1,298	349 345	0 67	412		0 67	2,730 1,711	10,915 18,280		0 715
17	1Platform 1Pouching	1,296	72	705	316	0,	316		72	1,021	4,449	4 133	316
17	1SackS_h	249	0	249	193	ă	193		70	442		2,382	ام
13	1SackS_m	181	ŏ	181	135	Õ			ŏ	181	3,241	3,241	ŏl
17	1scan	66	ŏ	96	ŏ	õ	ŏ		ŏ	66			ō
18	1Support	1 6	ō	اهٔ	63	ā	63		ō	63			Ō
i "	BMC-NMO	ة ا	ă	ă	0	ō	0		Ŏ	0			No Key
1	BMC-PSM	59	Ō	59	Ō	Ó	0	59	0	59	190	190	0(
Ì	BMC-SPB	285	Ō	285	Ö	Ó	0	285	0	265	978		o
l	BMC-SSM	516	ā	516	215	0	215		0	731	3,956		o
ŀ	BMC-Allied Ot	623	49	872	421	54	475		103	1,347	4,578		350
ł	BMC-Platform	721	53	774	161	0	161	882	53	936	1 4		269
	Non-MODS	18,961	906	19,857	3,338	358	3,696	22,299	1,264	23,563	46,687	44,183	2,504
Cond To	-	51,242	2,115	53,356	10,492	916	11,409	61,734	3.031	64,765	192,362		8,339
Grand To	(3)	51,242	2,310	23,306	10,492	810	11,408	01,/34	3,031	95,193	1 182,302	107,000	0,339

Analysis of IOCS tally file (LR-II-23)

USPS-8T-44 (10)*(7)/(9) (10)*(8)/(9) Exhibit 44A Table 1

. ◆*

Table 1

Development of Walk Sequence vs. Non-Walk Sequence Costs - Standard (A) Regular ECR Letters

		(13)	(14)	L,	(15)		(16)		(1)	2
LDC	Cost Pool	Non-W Before 7/1/96	S Costs After 6/3	wee	Before 7/	WS (20 sts _After 6/3	0/96	No i	Cev
11	bcs	13,215	75.00 01	3,338	2010/10 17	216		216		-
18		No Key	No Key		Na Key		No Key			2
12	lam .	169		0	,	0		G	n/a	
12	lem	5,079		954		454		0	n/a	
14	mars!	127		123	į	D		0	n/a	
14	mani	9,226		2.006		341		116	n/a	
14	mano	7,0		201		0		0	n/a	
13	wectate	No Key	No Key	'	No Key		No Key			32
11	ocr	3,471		732	l i	0	-	634	n/a	
14	Priority	132		0	ł	0		Q	n/a	
13	sobs Oth	2,305		279	l	0		٥	r/a	
13	eobel ^o rio	181		393	,	0		0	n/a	
18	BusReply	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key			•
19	inti	136		0	1	0	•	0	n/a	
15	kd15	1,914	1	4,367	ĺ	0		O	c/a	
41	LD41	,,,,		153]	315		O.	n/a	
42	LD42 I	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key	i	ŀ	3
43	LD43	12,036	1	2,031	<u> </u>	351		0	n/a	
44	LD44	607	,	91	1	0		0	rva	
48	LD48_Adm	(}	0		0		0	c/a	
48	LD48_Exp	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key		l.	7
48	LD48 Oth	375	i .	53	•	0		69	n/a	
48	LD48_Sp\$	40	1	0		0			n/a	
49	LO49 .	1,250		429	ł	0			n/a	
79	LD79	3,826	ļ	382	1	810		0	n/a	
18	Maligram] ()	0	č	0		0]	(
18	Registry	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key			1
16	Rewrap	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Kay		1	
17	1bullt pr	No Key	No Key	_	No Key		No Key	_	Ĺ	33
17	1canoMPP	1,070		0	1	167		U	(1/a	
18	1EEqmi	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key		l	834 1,027
18	1Miso	No Key	No Kay	4 000	No Key	400	No Key			1,02
17	10pBulk	11,99		1,280		498			rva rva	
17	1OpPref	9,53		1,384		0			n/a	
17	1Platform	13,879 2,750		3,690 1,377		316			10/2	
17	1Pouching	1.34		1,042		310		-	n/a	
17 13	1SackS_h 1SackS_m	3,24		1,042		Ö			n/a	
13 17	1800kS_M tackn	3,24		Ö	1	ă			100	
18	19upport		Ď	1,210		Č			n/a	
10	BMC-NMO	No Key	No Key	1,210	No Key		No Kev	•	r	1
	BMC-PSM	19		Q		0		0	n/a	•
	BMC-SPB	977	-	Ö		č		-	1/2	
	BMC-SSM	2.79	_	1,163		Č			n/a	
	BMC-Alled OI	2,79		1,432		167			n/a	
	BMC-Platform	3,62		811		269			n/a	
	Non-MODS	37,56		6,614	I.	1.795		-	n/a	
	120-100-0								1-3-	
Grand To	rati	146,51	5 1	35,565	l l	5,696	ı	2,641	İ	1,96

{11}*(1)/(1)/(4 (11)*(4)/(1)+(4 (12)*(2)/(2)+(5 (12)*(5)/(2)+(5 =(10) if No Key

Table 1

Development of Welk Sequence vs. Non-Welk Sequence Costs - Standard (A) Regular ECR Hon-Letters

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
		Bef	ore July 1, 1996		Afte	r June 30, 1996			Grand Total	Total	Variable MP Costs	Variable Costs I Non-WS	WS WS
LDC	Cost Pool	Non Walk Seq	Walk Seq		Non Walk Seq	Walk Seq	Total	Non Walk Seq 72	Walk Seq 0	72	281	281	- ,,,,
11	bos	72		72	0	0	0		ŏ	' <u>ô</u> '			lo Key
18	Express	0	0	0	974	Ö	974	5,162	327	5,490		12,641	802
12	វែកា	4,188	327	4,516	. 9/ *	ŏ	0	105	a.	105	394	394	ol
12	ism _	105	0	105 4,101	410	72	488	4.445	145	4,589	9,302	9,009	293
14	manf	4,029	72 70	577	136	' ô	136	642	70	712	1,207	1,088	118
14	mani	507 493	70 45	539	1,30	å			45	539	632	579	53
14	manp	133		133	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ		Õ	133	355	355	0
13	mecparc	7,33	a	130	ŏ	ă	ō	,	Ō	Q	14	No Key 1	io Key
11	OCT COLOR	133	ŏ	133	i	ă	ŏ		à	133	261	261	O
14	Priority	3,725	202	3,927	927	ŏ	927	4,652	202	4,854	8,096	7,759	337
13	spbs Oth		202	133	72	ă	72		0	205	656	656	0
13	spbsPrio	133 0	0	133	ί ο	ŏ	'0		ō	0		No Key I	Vo Key
18	BusRaply	, ,	ă	a	ŏ	ō	ō	-	0	D	54	No Key 1	No Key
19	inti id 15	ا ة	ŏ	ō	ō	ō	Ó		0	0	. o	0	0
15	1015 LD41	\	ă	ă	ŏ	ō	0	l o	0	0		0	0
41	LD42	1 6	sŏ.	80	ŏ	ō	ā	. 0	80	80	54	0	54
42 43	LD42	7,565	1,701	9,266	1,672	109	1.781	9,238	1,810	11,047	27,255	22,790	4,465
44	LD44	308	146	454	160	0	160	489	146	614	1,158	884	274
48	LD48_Adm	181	148	329	0	0	Ò	161	148	329	0	0	. 0
48	LD48_Exp	0	Ö	0	0	Q	q	-	0	_0			No Key
48	LD48_Oth	953	48	1,001	0	51	51		99	1,052		868	91
48	LD48 SpS	370	58	428	0	0	0		58	428		242	38
49	LD49	524	0	524	135	0	135		0	659			630
79	LD79	421	97	518		0	135		97	653	1		630
18	Mailgram	0	0	Ð		Ō	0		0	0		0	No Key
18	Registry	0	a	0		0	0	-		0			No Key
18	Rewrap) 0	Q	0		a 0	0		0	269		585	0
17	1bulk pr	269	0	269		0	0		ŏ	107		337	ŏ
17	1cancMPP	107	<u>a</u>	107	0	0	0		T .	107			No Key
18	1EEqmt	0	0	0 137	0	0		7	Č	137		1,322	Q ⁱ
18	1Misc	137	0	3,232		ŏ	329		189	3,581			706
17	1OpBulk	3,043 2,462	169 215	2,677	498	ŏ	496			3,175			759
17 17	10pPref 1Platform	2,402	117	2,238		ŏ	268			2,505	21,933		1,028
17	1Pauching	566	70	636	191	õ	191		70	827		3,276	304
17	1SackS_h	1,096	111	1,207		Ó	126	3 1,222	111	1,333			468
13	1SackS_n	158		158		ŏ	0		0	158			Ō
17	1scan	1 2	ŏ	2		Ö	(2	0	2		94	0
18	1Support	1 6	ă	ā	-	0	83			8<			0
	BMC-NMO	53	157	211	54	0	54			264			393
i	BMC-PSM	287	Ö	267	116	0	110	6 402		402			0
1	BMC-SPB	527	59	586		ø	101			687		1,917	180
i	BMC-SSM	415	0	415		0	(415			0
1	BMC-Allied O	111	0	993	427	0	427			1,420		4,464	0
ĺ	BMC-Platform		107	906		0	295			1,201			542
l	Non-MODS	21,485	3,444	24,929	3,272	1,438	4,710	24,756	4,682	29,639	66,409	55,469	10,940
		1			}						J		~ ~
Grand To	rtal	58,360	7,484	65,624	10,387	1,671	12,058	8 69,747	9,135	77,882	ši	192,014	22,475

Analysis of IOCS tally file (LR-H-23)

USPS-ST-44 (10)*(7)/(9) (10)*(8)/(9) Exhibit 44A Table 1

Table 1

Development of Walk Sequence vs. Non-Walk Sequence Costs - Standard (A) Regular ECR Non-Letters

		(13)	(14	0	[15			3)		(17)
LDC	Cost Pool	Non-W Before 7/1/96	S Costs After 6/	30/96	Before 7	WS (71/96	After 6	30/96	ı	No Key
11	bcs	281		0		0			r/e	
18	Express .	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key			12
12	farn	10,256	•	2,365		802		0	n/a	
12	le/n	394		0		0		0	n/a	
14	manf	8,166	i	843		147		147	n/a	
14	mani	858		230	l	118		0	n/a	
14	manp	579		0		53		0	n/a	
13	mecoarc	355	i	0	ļ	0		0	n/a	
11	OCT	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key			14
14	Priority	261		0		0		Ö	n/a	
13	spbs Oth	6,213		1,546		337		0	n/a	
13	spbsPrio	425		231		0		O ^l	n/a	
18	BusReply	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key			10
19	inti	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key		l	5
15	1415	0		0		0		0		(
41	LD41	l		ō		0		Q		(
42	LD42	1 6		ŏ		54		ū	1/2	
43	LD43	18,664		4,125	}	4.196		269		
44	LD44	581		302		274			0/0	
46	LD46_Adm	ا م		0	j	0			7/1	
48	LO48 Exp	No Key	No Key	•	No Key	•	No Key	-		
48	LD48_Oth	866		Đ		44		47	Ŋ'n	
48	LD48_Sp\$	242		ŏ		38		0	1/3	
49	LD49	1,236		318	1	a		ŏ		
79	LD79	2,734		874		630		Ó	₩.	
18	Mailgram]		0		0		ō		
18	Registry	No Key	No Key	_	No Key	-	No Key	_		:
18	Rewrap	No Key	No Key		No Key		No Key		1	1
17	1bulk pr	585		0		0		Ü	n/a	
17	1cancMPP	337		0	1	0		0	N/a	
18	1EEqmt	No Key	No Key	_	No Key		No Key		l	1,09
18	1Misc	1,322		0		O		0	n/2	
17	1OpBulk	11,350		1,229	ł	708		0	N/a	
17	10pPref	8.694		1,759		759			n/e	
17	1Platform	18,567		2,343	[1,028		0	n/e	
17	1Pouching	2,451		825	Ī	304		0	n/a	
17	1SackS_h	4,620		533	1	468	l	0	n/a	
13	1SackS_m	1,820		0	ı	0)	0	n/a	
17	1scan	94		O	1	0	1	0	n/a	
18	1Support	_	,	1,255		Ö	1	Ó	n/a	
	BMC-NMO	133		134		393	1	0	n/a	
	BMC-PSM	82		334		0)	0	N/a	
	BMC-SPB	1,600		309		180)	0	n/e	
	BMC-SSM	2.42		0		0)	0	n/a	
	BMC-Affect Ot			1,344		Č			n/a	
	BMC-Pietform	4,044		1,496	L	542			n/a	
	Non-MOOS	48,134		7,331		7,717	,	3,223		
		1			 				1	
rand To	-4-4	162,26		29,748	.I	18,790		3,685	1	1,20

(11)~(1)/((1)+(4 (11)~(4)/((1)+(4 (12)~(2)/((2)+(5 (12)~(5)/((2)+(5 =(10) # No Key

NAA/USPS-ST44-5. Please provide a version of Exhibit 44A, Table 2 that presents separately the data collected prior to and after the July 1, 1996 implementation of the mail reclassification changes resulting from Docket No. MC95-1.

RESPONSE:

See the attached table for commercial ECR. Nonprofit mail was not affected by the changes resulting from Docket No. MC95-1.

Table 2
Summary of Walk Sequence vs. Non-Walk Sequence Costs
Standard (A) Enhanced Carrier-Route Mail

Commercial

With No Key Distributed

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
	Not	Ws	W	IS	No	Not	WS	W	'S	
	Endo	orsed	Endo	orsed	<u>Key</u>	Ende	orsed	<u>Endo</u>	rsed	<u>Source</u>
	Before 7/1/96	After 6/30/96	Before 7/1/96	After 6/30/96		Before 7/1/96	After 6/30/96	Before 7/1/96	After 6/30/96	
Letters	146,515	35,565	5,698	2,641	1,963	148,026	35,931	5,756	2,668	Table 1, pg 1
Non-Letters	162,267	29,748	18,790	3,685	1,204	163,178	29,915	18,895	3,706	Table 1, pg 2
Total						311,203	65,846	24,652	6,375	
Sources:	Table 1	Table 1	Table 1	Table 1	Table 1	(1) + (5)* (1)/(sum(14))	(2) + (5)* (2)/(sum(14))	(3) + (5)* (3)/(sum(14))	(4) + (5)* (4)/(sum(14))	

NAA/USPS-ST44-6. Please provide the corresponding volume data for the period covered by the data in Exhibit 44A, presenting separately the volumes prior to and after the July 1, 1996, implementation of the mail reclassification changes resulting from Docket No. MC95-1. Please provide the volumes separately for carrier route non-letters and non-letters, distributed among saturation, high-density (125-piece walk sequenced), and basic.

RESPONSE:

See the attached table for commercial ECR. Nonprofit mail was not affected by the changes resulting from Docket No. MC95-1.

Response to NAA/USPS-ST44-6. FY96 ECR Mail Volumes Separated Into Pre and Post Reclassification

Commercial ECR (000)

	Let	ters	Non-L	.etters
Category	Pre-Reclass	Post-Reclass	Pre-Reclass	Post-Reclass
Basic	8,702,253	1,016,870	6,572,299	1,747,561
High Density	35	127,898	541,141	202,801
Saturation	2,064,702	892,028	5,876,778	1,393,887

NAA/USPS-ST44-7. Please refer to the response to NAA/USPS-19(d). That response states that "[t]he analysis contained in Library Reference H-109 assumes that distribution of walk-sequence and non walk-sequence mail for the ECR mail contained in unidentified items and in containers for a particular mail processing cost pool is the same as the distribution observed in the direct tallies in that cost pool."

- a. Please explain why you believe this to be a valid assumption.
- b. Please refer to page 1 of Table 1 in LR-H-109 (ECR Letters). Please confirm that the direct tally IOCS costs for platform operations (Group #34) represent less than 10 percent of the total variable mail processing costs. If you cannot confirm this figure, please explain.
- c. Please explain why it is valid to distribute the other 90 percent of the costs of platform operations on the basis of these direct tallies.

RESPONSE:

- a. ECR mail is generally contained in identical items, and thus IOCS observations of ECR mail will tend to result in direct tallies. The distribution of mail in an item sampled within a costpool is likely to be the same as the distribution of mail in the same type of item residing in containers being handled in that costpool. This is generally the same assumption as being made for distribution methodology presented in Witness Degen's testimony (USPS-T-12).
- b. Not confirmed. I calculate the percentage as 10.2 percent.
- c. Platform generally has low incidence of handling mail as single pieces and items, from which a direct tally would result. However, ECR mail, especially at saturation densities, is predominately handled on the platform as pallet, which is an item subject to the identical mail sampling rule. The methods used here are conservative, because to the extent that saturation and high density mail is presented on pallets more often than Basic ECR mail, saturation and high density costs will be overstated.

NAA/USPS-ST44-8. Please confirm that the data in Exhibit 44A indicates that delivery costs comprise a majority of the total costs for ECR mail. If you cannot confirm, please explain why not.

RESPONSE:

Exhibit USPS-44A only shows the clerk and mail handler mail processing costs of ECR mail. No inference about delivery costs can be made from these data alone.

NAA/USPS-ST44-9. Are the majority of costs derived from mail processing IOCS tallies and presented in Exhibit 44A from bulk handlings? If possible, please provide the proportion of such mail processing costs that are from bulk handlings.

RESPONSE:

There are two types of costs derived in whole or in part from IOCS tallies presented in Exhibit USPS-44A: the IOCS direct tally costs by presence of walk sequence endorsement (columns 1-3), and the variable mail processing costs (column 6). By "bulk handlings" I assume that this question refers to IOCS tallies in which the employee was observed handling an item or container as opposed to handling a single piece of mail. Using this definition, the majority of the IOCS direct tally costs by presence of walk sequence endorsement presented in Exhibit USPS-44A represent bulk handlings. Since the variable mail processing costs include distributed mixed-mail and not-handling-mail costs, they have a different percentage of costs associated with bulk handlings. Bulk handlings do not represent a majority of the variable mail processing costs in Exhibit USPS-44A.

The proportions of costs by handling category are presented in the table below.

Proportions of IOCS-derived costs in USPS-ST-44, Exhibit USPS-44A, by handling category

Cost type	Handling Single Piece	Handling Item or Container	Not Handling
IOCS direct tally costs by presence of walk sequence endorsement	42	58	n/a¹
Variable mail processing costs	20%	39%²	41%

Notes:

¹ Includes direct tallies only

² Includes mixed-mail.

NAA/USPS-ST44-10. Please refer to the first and ninth rows of the first page of Exhibit 44A, Table 1 (Standard (A) Regular ECR Letters). Please confirm that non-walk-sequenced ECR letters incur \$4.854 million of costs related to barcode sorters and \$1.45 million of Costs related to optical character readers. If you cannot confirm, please provide the correct numbers.

- a. Please explain why these costs are incurred for ECR letter mail.
- b. Please refer to the following testimony of Postal Service Witness Moden (USPS-T-4) at page 16, lines 15-21: "Our delivery units have worked closely with the plants to increase the amount of DPS mail. They have worked together to identify and capture bundles of non-barcoded Enhanced Carrier Route (ECR) Basic letters in order to barcode them at the plant. By doing so, they have been able to incorporate these pieces into the carriers' DPS mail, thus eliminating the need for manual casing. As barcoding non-barcoded ECR basic letters has become a common practice and as the number of DPS zones has increased, the value of ECR Basic letters has diminished."
 Please confirm that identifying and capturing ECR basic letters in order to
 - barcode them and incorporate them into the carriers' DPS mail will result in increased mail processing costs for these ECR basic letters. If you cannot confirm this statement, please explain why.
- c. Please confirm that in-office carrier costs are reduced as a result of incorporating ECR basic letters into the DPS mailstream? If yes, please explain where these costs are included in Exhibit 44A.
- d. Did your analysis in Exhibit 44A calculate the reduction in the in-office carrier costs resulting from incorporating ECR basic letters into the DPS mailstream? If yes, please explain where these costs are included in Exhibit 44A.
- e. Did any other Postal Service witness calculate the in-office cost savings associated with incorporating ECR basic letters into the DPS mailstream? If yes, please describe which witness did this calculation and provide a reference to the calculations.
- f. Assume that (1) you have included the increase in mail processing costs associated with the barcoding and sorting of ECR basic letters in the DPS mailstream and (2) no Postal Service witness has adjusted in -office costs to take into account the subsequent in-office carrier costs savings. Under that assumption, would the unit cost differences between the walk sequenced and "non-walk-sequenced" mail shown in Table 1 of Exhibit 44A be overstated? Please explain why or why not.

RESPONSE:

Not confirmed. The analysis in Exhibit USPS-44A calculates the variable mail processing costs of non-walk-sequenced letters to be 16.553 million dollars for the BCS

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS MCGRANE TO INTERROGATORIES OF NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA costpool, and 3.911 million dollars for the OCR costpool, as shown in column 7 of Table 1 of Exhibit USPS-44A.

- a. Because employees clocked into the OCR and BCS operations are observed handling ECR letter mail.
- b. I confirm that this would generally increase mail processing costs of the pieces that are processed on this equipment.
- c. My testimony only covers the mail processing costs of ECR mail. Witness Hume's testimony, USPS-T-18, presents estimates of carrier in-office cost savings due to the DPS program and that these generally reduce carrier in-office unit costs. However, my understanding is that witness Hume's analysis does not present estimates of carrier in-office cost savings due to delivery point sequencing of ECR basic letters. See Exhibit USPS-18B, page 6, and Exhibit USPS-18C, page 6.
- d. No, my testimony only covers the mail processing costs of ECR mail.
- e. I am not aware of any Postal Service witness whose testimony addresses city carrier in-office cost savings due to delivery point sequencing of ECR basic mail.

 Also see my response to subpart (c) of this question.
- f. No. First, unit costs are not presented in Table 1 of Exhibit USPS-44A. Second, Table 1 of Exhibit USPS-44A only concerns mail processing costs. Whether or not possible changes in city carrier in-office costs are modeled has no effect on the difference in mail processing costs.

NAA/USPS-ST44-11. Does Exhibit 44B differ in any way from the document previously filed as Library Reference LR-H-182? If so, please identify and explain all differences.

RESPONSE:

No.

NAA/USPS-ST44-12. Please refer to Exhibit 44B, Table 3, page 9. Please confirm that this table presents volumes for Standard (A) Bulk Regular Carrier-Route letters at the following ounce increments, and explain how any letters at these weight increments could meet the definition of a letter:

- a. 4 ounces
- b. 5 ounces
- c. 6 ounces
- d. 7 ounces
- e. 8 ounces
- f. 9 ounces
- g. 10 ounces
- h. 11 ounces
- i. 12 ounces
- j. 13 ounces
- k. 14 ounces
- I. 15 ounces

RESPONSE:

a-I. Please see the Written Response of United States Postal Service Witness

Degen to Oral Questions of Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers (filed October 28, 1997), with

respect to the questions posed at Tr. 12/6642 lines 4-6 and 8-11, and the responses to

NAA/USPS-T36-31 and NAA/USPS-18.

NAA/USPS-ST44-13. Please refer to Exhibit 44B, Tables 3 and 4. Please provide a breakdown of city carrier in-office costs presented in those tables by the following components, presenting the costs for flats and total pieces separately:

- a. The costs associated with direct tallies;
- b. The costs arising from the assignment of the mixed tallies;
- c. The overhead costs:
- d. The piggyback costs; and
- e. The premium pay adjustment.

RESPONSE:

a-e. See Attachment 1 to this interrogatory for costs for flat-shaped mail and

Attachment 2 for costs for mail of all shapes. Please note the components listed in the question refer to stages in the development of mail processing costs under the old methodology. I have substituted the following components, which are applicable to the city carrier in-office cost development: 1) direct tally costs, 2) distributed mixed-mail costs, 3) costs arising from the application of the in-office support factor (analogous to overhead costs), and 4) costs arising from the application of the piggyback factor.

Attachment 1 to Response to NAA/USPS-ST44-13. Costs for Flat-Shaped Mail Only (thousands of dollars)

City Carrier In-Office - Commercial ECR Mail

							W	eight incre	nent (oz.)							
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 '	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Direct Costs	30,737	32,994	22,841	23,090	8,760	5,168	2,667	2,541	1,271	617	196	381	214	98	187	92
"Distributed Mixed Mail"	2,646	2,933	1,994	1,886	805	377	218	220	107	64	16	30	13	8	17	7
"Support Costs"	5,794	6.235	4,310	4,331	1,660	962	500	479	239	118	37	71	39	18	35	17
"Piggybacked Costs"	12,846	13,825	9,557	9,603	3,681	2,134	1,109	1,062	530	262	82	158	87	41	79	38
					C	ty Carrier In	-Office - St	andard (A) i	Regular							
							W	feight incre	nent (oz.)							
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Direct Costs	30,138	41,588	30,650	31,568	8,231	6,878	3,996	3,089	1,827	1,456	909	660	692	342	571	47
"Distributed Mixed Mail"	2,568	3,571	2.589	2,687	693	555	388	272	152	107	69	53	46	42	41	25
"Support Costs"	5,676	7,837	5,769	5,945	1,549	1,290	761	583	343	271	170	124	128	67	106	13
"Piggybacked Costs"	12,585	17,377	12,791	13,182	3,434	2,860	1,687	1,293	761	601	376	274	284	148	236	28

Attachment 2 to Response to NAA/USPS-ST44-13. Costs for All Shapes (thousands of dollars)

City Carrier In-Office - Commercial ECR Mail

							W	/eight Incre	ment (cz.)							
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9`	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Direct Costs	133,091	50,101	31,188	27,060	9,334	5,426	2,784	2,591	1,271	719	265	361	214	145	187	137
"Distributed Mixed Mail"	11,503	4,358	2,697	2,181	851	397	225	224	107	67	19	30	13	9	17	11
"Support Costs"	25,094	9,452	5,881	5,075	1,768	1,011	522	489	239	136	49	71	39	27	35	26
"Piggybacked Costs"	51,928	19,558	12,169	10,501	3,658	2,091	1,080	1,011	495	282	102	148	81	55	73	53
					CI	ty Carrier In	-Office - St	endard (A) F	Regular							
							W	/eight Increi	ment (oz.)							
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Direct Costs	194,331	69,972	40,129	37,648	9,905	7,893	4,518	3,837	2,381	2,257	1,390	1,361	1,642	1,511	781	306
"Distributed Mixed Mail"	17,781	6,154	3,349	3,265	868	629	411	304	180	140	80	77	96	80	47	34
"Support Costs"	36,812	13,212	7,546	7,101	1,870	1,479	855	719	444	416	255	250	302	276	144	59
"Piggybacked Costs"	77,776	27,914	15,942	15,002	3,950	3,125	1,807	1,519	939	879	539	527	637	583	304	125

NAA/USPS-ST44-14. Please refer to Exhibit 44B, Tables 3 and 4. Please provide a breakdown of mail processing costs presented in those tables by the following components, presenting the costs for carrier-route flats and total costs separately:

- a. The costs associated with direct tallies:
- b. The costs arising from the assignment of the mixed tallies;
- c. The overhead costs;
- d. The piggyback costs; and
- e. The premium pay adjustment.

RESPONSE:

a-e. See Attachment 1 to this interrogatory for costs for flat-shaped mail and

Attachment 2 for costs for mail of all shapes. Please note that changes in the mail

processing cost methodology made some of the requested components obsolete.

What I have provided is: 1) costs of direct tallies with piece weight information, 2) in the
row labeled "mixed mail," the difference between the direct tally costs and the
attributable mail processing cost pool amounts distributed to weight increment (this can
be thought of sum of overhead and mixed-mail costs, although these terms are
obsolete in the new methodology; see witness Degen's testimony for a complete
discussion of the new mail processing methodology), 3) the change in cost due to the
premium pay adjustment, and 4) the costs arising from the application of the piggyback
factors.

Attachment 1 to Response to NAA/USPS-ST44-14. Costs for Flat-Shaped Mail Only (thousands of dollars)

Mail Processing - Commercial ECR Mail

							V	Veight Incre	ment (oz.)							
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
"Direct Costs"	14,553	17,441	13,762	18,795	5,934	2,993	1,137	1,281	589	662	445	129	51	66	0	276
"Distributed Mixed Mail"	12,106	13,979	9,220	14,201	4,049	1,874	1.068	815	414	533	288	20	37	271	0	239
"Premium Pay"	-1,096	-1,291	-945	-1,358	-410	-200	-91	-86	-41	-49	-30	-6	-4	-14	0	-21
"Piggybacked Costs"	13,742	16,977	11,685	17,965	5,092	2,449	1,286	1,224	571	657	416	71	37	273	0	281
						Mail Proces	ssing - Stan	dard (A) Re	gular							
							٧	velght Incre	ment (oz.)							
Companent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
"Direct Costs"	63,862	102,295	75,181	90,078	30,068	18,716	8,438	10,818	5,152	3,575	3,198	3,454	1,728	2,370	1,314	1,604
"Distributed Mixed Mail"	40,839	66,886	43,790	59,466	18,380	16,109	4,813	7,316	3,154	3,476	2,052	2,157	1,720	1,617	735	1,358
"Premium Pay"	-4,414	-7,133	-5,016	-6,305	-2,043	-1,468	-559	-765	-350	-297	-221	-237	-145	168	- 8 6	-125
"Piggybacked Costs"	54,451	87,152	60,257	77,952	24,481	19,832	6,915	10,307	4,386	4,728	2,726	3,066	1,909	2,521	1,145	1,879

Attachment 2 to Response to NAA/USPS-ST44-14. Costs for All Shapes (thousands of dollars)

Mail Processing - Commercial ECR Mail

							V	eight Incre	ment (az.)							
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
"Direct Costs"	61,769	30,627	19,470	22,291	6,239	3,590	1,183	1,516	697	782	508	129	51	109	177	327
"Distributed Mixed Mail"	49,764	24,306	13,583	16,725	4,259	2,045	1,099	999	569	695	329	20	37	299	223	423
"Premium Pay"	4,584	-2,258	-1,358	-1,604	-431	-232	-94	-103	-52	-61	-34	-6	-4	-17	-16	-31
"Piggybacked Costs"	64,235	31,329	17,823	21,546	5,453	2,820	1,361	1,490	928	831	518	71	37	342	250	379
						Mail Proces	ssing - Stan	dard (A) Re	gular							
							٧	/eight Incre	ment (oz.)					•		
Component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	- 8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
"Direct Costs"	363,528	174,662	109,090	115,394	37,413	26,422	12,017	17,609	8,181	7,621	7,112	9,691	5,999	7,073	5,614	4,971
"Distributed Mixed Mail"	252,057	123,882	70,652	78,242	25,672	25,702	7,569	13,176	5,836	7,075	4,441	6,819	5,200	5,039	3,608	4,160
"Premium Pay"	-25,953	-12,587	-7,578	-8,164	-2,660	-2,198	-826	-1,298	-591	-620	-487	-696	-472	-511	-389	-385
"Piggybacked Costs"	361,776	163,943	96,262	104,163	32,978	31,273	11,388	19,515	8,739	10,286	6,875	10,630	6,940	8,492	6,535	6,255

NAA/USPS-ST44-15. Please refer to Exhibit 44B, Tables 3 and 4. Please provide a breakdown of window service costs presented in those tables by the following components, presenting the costs for carrier-route flats and total costs separately:

- a. The costs associated with direct tallies;
- b. The costs arising from the assignment of the mixed tallies;
- c. The overhead costs;
- d. The piggyback costs; and
- e. The premium pay adjustment.

RESPONSE:

a-e. See Attachment 1 to this interrogatory for costs for flat-shaped mail and Attachment 2 for costs for mail of all shapes. Please note the components listed in the question refer to stages in the development of mail processing costs under the previous methodology. I have substituted the following components, which are applicable to the development of window service costs: 1) direct tally costs, 2) distributed mixed-mail costs, and 3) costs arising from the application of the piggyback factor.

Attachment 1 to Response to NAAUSPS-\$T44-16. Costs for Flat-Shaped Mail Only (thousands of dollars)

Window Service - Commercial ECR Mail

								Weight Inch	ement (oz.)							
Component	-	ч	٣	4	ທ	9	~	, 	Os	5	-	5	₽	4	č	ဂ ်
Direct Costs "Distributed Mixed Mail" "Piggybacked Costs"	8 0 8	000	000	\$ ₹ ႘	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000
					>	Vindow Serv	to - sop	ndow Service - Standard (A) Re	egukar							
Component	-	8	60	4	w	₩	_	Weight Incr	नाम्बन्धं (0 2.) 9	5	=	12	5	4	15	6
Direct Costs -Distributed Mixed Maif -Piggybacked Costs*	262 11	268 6 116	185 9 28	349 5 149	4 4 K	ữ ₄ 8	000	000	000	000	£0.8	000	000	000	000	000

Attachment 2 to Response to NAAUSPS-ST44-15. Costs for All Shapes (thousands of dollars)

Window Service - Commercial ECR Mail

Component	-	8	to.	4	ĸ	ဖ	≯	Weight increment (oz.	ent (oz.) 9	5		5	ध	#	₹ <u>.</u>	9
Direct Costs "Distributed Mail" "Piggybacked Costs"	914 26 271	000	000	\$ 4 8	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000
						Window Service - Standan	ice - Stark	tard (A) Reg	utar							
Component	-	7	m	খ	ĸ	φ	3 ^	elght Increm 8	ent (az.) 9	5	=	5	£	7	15	9
Direct Costs "Distributed Mixed Mail" "Piggybacked Costs"	1,895 57 740	350 8 251	85 e 28	285 ± 285	12 4 5	200 7 7 88	000	000	8 . 8	000	5 t ts	000	804	000	000	000

NAA/USPS-ST44-16. What proportion of the total IOCS tallies were mixed mail tallies during the period that the data presented in Exhibit 44B were collected?

RESPONSE:

I will answer this question in three separate parts. For mail processing costs, the term "mixed mail" is obsolete under the new methodology presented in this case. Witness Degen has provided a breakdown of tally counts into categories appropriate under the new methods. This can be found at Tr. 12/6227-6228. For city carrier costs there were 287,962 tallies, of which 3,343 were mixed mail tallies, for a proportion of 1.1 percent. For window service clerks there were 23,229 tallies, of which 54 were mixed mail tallies, for a proportion of 0.2 percent.

NAA/USPS-ST44-17. Please refer to the responses to ABA/USPS-1 and ADVO/USPS-28.

- a. Please provide a table similar to that provided in your response to ABA/USPS-1 showing mail processing costs only by weight increment for Standard (A) carrier-route mail, after adjustment for presort level and dropship characteristics.
- b. Please provide a table similar to that provided in your response to ABA/USPS-1 showing mail processing costs only by weight increment for Standard (A) carrier-route flats, after adjustment for presort level and dropship characteristics.

R	F	9	P	0	N	9	F	•
_	_	• 7	_		·	. 7	_	

See attachment.

i

Attachment 1 to NAA/USPS-ST44-17
Summary of FY96 Mail Processing Unit Cost and Adjusted Unit Cost by Weight Increment for Enhanced Carrier Route Mail

							Wei	ght increme	ent (ounces))						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Enhanced Carrier Route																
Original Unit Cost	1.71	1.40	0.86	2.06	88.0	0.73	0.81	2.27	1.72	3.48	3.47	1.00	0.36	5.80	5.55	10.25
less:		-			-											
Presori Adjustment	(0.48)	(0.22)	(0.02)	0.96	0.59	0.68	1.01	1.24	1.39	1.43	1.41	1.37	1.53	1.51	1.52	1,55
Dropship Adjustment	0.02	0.01	(0.01)	0.02	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.05)	0.00	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.14	0.05	0.29	0.13	0.15
Adjusted Unit Cost	2.17	1.61	0.89	1.07	0.16	0.11	(0.16)	1.03	0.31	2.01	2.00	(0.51)	(1.22)	4.00	3.90	8.55
							Wei	ight Increm	ent (ounces))						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Enhanced Carrier Route	- Flats Only															
Original Unit Cost	2.25	1.44	0.82	1.99	0.64	0.63	0.77	1.85	1.13	2.81	2.88	1.01	0,36	4.60	-	7.25
less:													•			
Presort Adjustment	(0.01)	(0.31)	(0.29)	0.55	0.02	0.12	0.44	0.67	0.82	0.86	0.85	0.81	99,0	0.94	0.96	0.98
Dropship Adjustment	0.01	(0.00)	(0.01)	0.03	(0.04)	(0.03)	00.00	0.06	0.08	0.12	0.13	0.22	0,14	0.38	0.23	0.26
Adjusted Unit Cost	2.24	1.74	1,12	1.41	0.65	0.54	0.33	1.12	0.22	1.83	1.90	(0.02)	(0.74)	3.28	(1.19)	6.01

•

NAA/USPS-ST44-18. Please refer to Tables 1 and 2 in Exhibit 44B and the response to NAA/USPS-T36-22(a).

- a. Do the smaller volumes at the higher weight increments result in less reliable unit cost estimates for these weight increments? If so, in your opinion, at what point do the data become unreliable due to the "thinner" sample?
- b. Aside from the amount of dropshipping, presortation, and the average haul of the non-dropshipped mail, what are the "other factors" that could cause variations in the unit cost by weight increment?

RESPONSE:

- a. If this question intends to use the concept of reliability as a proxy for standard error, then yes, smaller volumes in the higher weight increments will lead to larger standard errors. The point at which the standard errors become too large is largely a function of the use to which the estimates are put. As I understand witness Moeller's use of these data, no reliance is made on the point estimates at any single weight increment; therefore, his use of the data is appropriate given the level of standard error in the estimates.
- b. Other factors may include shape of the mail piece; mechanical aspects of the mail piece such as flexibility, surface characteristics, open edges, binding/envelope type, address placement, and address readability; packaging characteristics such as strength of packaging materials, placement and readability of package labels, strength of tray strapping materials, and fullness of tray or sack; preparation characteristics such as the use of sacks versus pallets; regional or seasonal productivity effects; and other factors too numerous to mention.

NAA/USPS-ST44-19. Please refer to the response to NAA/USPS-T3-19. Do you have any opinion on the likely magnitude of the standard error of the estimates of the unit costs? If so, please provide your opinion and all evidence supporting this opinion.

RESPONSE:

A general impression of the standard errors of the mail processing cost estimates can be found by comparing the magnitude of the cost estimate in any weight increment cell and finding a subclass with a similar magnitude of cost in Table 6 of USPS-T-12. Similarly, the same procedure can be used to compare the city carrier in-office costs to Table 3 of USPS-T-12. Since standard errors cannot be calculated for the mail volume estimates, I have no opinion as to the standard errors of the unit cost estimate.

NAA/USPS-ST44-20. Please refer to the response to NAA/USPS-T3-17(a), which indicates that "it is believed that the majority of [city carrier street] costs are piece related." Did you arrive at this belief on your own, or was this belief given you by the Postal Service? If this was given to you by the Postal Service, please identify the person who conveyed that belief to you.

RESPONSE:

This is based upon my understanding of the city carrier street time methodology. It is important to distinguish between accrued costs and attributable costs to understand this reasoning. Accrued street time costs, aside from the elemental load cost component, are largely determined by non-volume factors such as route length, distance from carrier station, and number of stops. Attributable street time costs are determined econometrically, specifically from the variability of these costs with mail volumes. Elemental load costs have always been considered to be volume driven. Thus, attributable street time costs vary with piece volume and by shape. I understand that witness Nelson has presented an analysis that may use weight as the cost driver for the route and access costs, but I have not had the opportunity to fully explore his testimony.

NAA/USPS-ST44-21. In Exhibit 44B, why are costs so much higher at the 4 ounce increment than at the 3 or 5 ounce increments?

RESPONSE:

I have not studied this particular relationship in detail, but I note that within the 4 ounce weight increment, the maximum weight for compatibility with automated letter sorting technology is reached. This may be a possible explanation for this spike.

NAA/USPS-ST44-22. In Exhibit 44B, why are costs so much lower at the 13 ounce increment than at the 12 or 14 ounce increment?

RESPONSE:

The study does not offer an explanation for this relationship.

DECLARATION

I, Michael R. McGrane, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing answers are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

11/10/97

Date

Mičhael R. McGrane

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.

Anthony F. Alverno

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20260–1137 November 10, 1997