

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

EVOLUTIONARY NETWORK DEVELOPMENT
SERVICE CHANGES, 2006

Docket No. N2006-1

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE NOTICE OF FILING OF REVISED RESPONSE
OF WITNESS WILLIAMS TO APWU INTERROGATORIES APWU/USPS-T2-1(g-h)
(July 10, 2006) [ERRATA]

The United States Postal Service hereby files a revised response of witness Williams to the following interrogatories of the American Postal Workers Union: APWU/USPS-T2-1(g-h). The revision in the response to subparts (g-h) merely corrects the number of the Library Reference into which certain documents will be filed. The entire interrogatory is stated verbatim and is followed by the response, with the only change being as described above in the response to subparts (g-h). This revised response supersedes the answer that was filed on May 8, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Daniel J. Foucheaux
Chief Counsel, Ratemaking

Michael T. Tidwell

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 268-2998; Fax -5402
michael.t.tidwell@usps.gov

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO INTERROGATORIES OF THE AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION
Revised: July 10, 2006**

APWU/USPS-T2-1

On page 8 of your testimony, you state “there were about two dozen local AMP studies in progress” while the END model was being developed and that AMP review activity was generally suspended.

- a) Please provide a complete list of these approximately “two dozen” AMP studies that were underway. Please provide the date of initiation and the person requesting each AMP. Were any of these projects initiated because of the Postal Service’s ongoing network redesign efforts? Were any of these projects initiated based on the END models?
- b) Were there any AMP studies not put on hold during END model development? If so, which ones went ahead?
- c) Were the ten projects that were used to test the “internal administrative processes that might be useful in a ‘full-up’ implementation of END” selected from this group of approximately “two dozen” AMP studies that had been undertaken?
- d) Please provide the criteria for the selection of the 10 AMP studies presented in your submission to the Commission in N 2006-1, and identify the person or persons who made the selection.
- e) For any of the AMP studies on the list in (a), but not among the ten listed in Library Reference N2006-1/5, did the Postal Service choose not to move forward to completion because of results from END simulations? If so, explain; if not, state the reasons for not permitting the other studies to move forward.
- f) List all AMP studies begun since December 31, 2001.
- g) For all AMP studies completed since December 31, 2001, that are not among the 10 studies included in your submission to the Commission in N 2006-1,
 - present a report in which the locations and other identifying information are redacted to protect the Postal Service’s “competitive interests.”
 - With all identifying information redacted, the report will identify locations only by assigned letters (A, B, C, etc.).

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO INTERROGATORIES OF THE AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION
Revised: July 10, 2006**

APWU/USPS-T2-1 (continued)

- Within each AMP study, ZIP codes must be replaced using a single number for each ZIP code (thus, an AMP report with 24 ZIP codes would have ZIP codes numbered 1, 2, 3 etc. through 24).

- h) For every report produced in response to interrogatory g above, include all the data redacted from the 10 AMP reports included in your submission to the Commission in N 2006-1, including without limitation
 - each facility's total mail volume,
 - each facility's total mail volume disaggregated on mail-class specific and service-specific bases
 - on Worksheet 4 facility-specific data reflecting estimated operation-specific originating and/or destinating mail volumes and processing costs, made specific for one class or service where appropriate
 - on Worksheet 7 mail class-specific origin-destination volume data reflecting the volume per mail class that originates or destinate at a single facility, or travels from one specific 3-digit ZIP Code area to another specific 3-digit ZIP Code area.

RESPONSE

(a) That list is as follows:

<u>Proposed AMP Site</u>	<u>AMPC</u>
1 Ashland, KY P&DF	Huntington, WV P&DC
2 Batesville, AR PO	Jonesboro, AR PO
3 Beaumont, TX P&DF	Houston, TX P&DC
4 Beckley, WV PO	Charlestown, WV P&DC
5 Bluefield, WV PO	Charlestown, WV P&DC
6 Bridgeport, CT P&DF	Stamford, CT P&DC
7 Bristol, VA PO	Roanoke, VA P&DC
8 Canton, OH P&DC	Akron, OH P&DC
9 Chillicothe, OH PO	Columbus, OH P&DC
10 Fort Smith, AR PO	Fayetteville, AR P&DF
11 Greensburg, PA PO	Pittsburgh, PA P&DC
12 Greenville, TX PO	North Texas, TX P&DC
13 Harrison, AR PO	Fayetteville, AR P&DF
14 Kinston, NC P&DC	Fayetteville, NC P&DC

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO INTERROGATORIES OF THE AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION
Revised: July 10, 2006**

15	Lufkin, TX PO	East Texas, TX P&DC
16	Marysville, CA P&DF	Sacramento, CA P&DC
17	Mojave, CA PO	Santa Clarita, CA P&DC
18	Pasadena, CA P&DC	Los Angeles, CA P&DC
19	Russellville, AR PO	Little Rock, AR P&DC
20	Salinas, CA P&DF	San Jose, CA P&DC
21	Waterbury, CT P&DF	Southern Connecticut, CT P&DC
22	Wheeling, WV PO	Pittsburgh, PA P&DC Lehigh Valley, PA P&DC and Scranton, PA P&DF
23	Wilkes Barre, PA P&DF	
24	Zanesville, OH PO	Columbus, OH P&DC

- (b) There were six AMPs approved in 2004: Oil City, PA; Bradford, PA; Du Bois, PA; Steubenville, OH; Bronx, NY; West Jersey, NJ; and Marina, CA.
- (c) Seven of the 10 AMP studies approved in October 2005 were included in the group of suspended AMP studies.
- (d) After consultation with local management, area management proposed to headquarters AMP studies which met current and future network requirements to proceed with.
- (e) No.
- (f) 2002 – None.
- 2003 1 - Pendleton, CA PO into Pasco, WA P&DF.
- 2004 6 – See the response to subpart (b).
- 2005 11 - See USPS LRs N2006-1/5 and N2006-1/6.
- 2006 46 - See the 41 listed in the Attachment to USPS T-2. The other

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO INTERROGATORIES OF THE AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS UNION**

Revised: July 10, 2006

RESPONSE to APWU/USPS-T2-1 (continued):

five are as follows: (1) Alamogordo, NM PO into El Paso, TX P&DC; (2) Las Cruces, NM PO into El Paso, TX P&DC; (3) Rockford, IL P&DC into Palatine, IL P&DC; (4) Flint, MI P&DC into NE Metro MI P&DC; (5) Detroit, MI P&DC into NE Metro MI P&DC.

(g-h) Of the seven 2003-2004 AMP studies referenced in response to subpart (f), for which records would be responsive, the Postal Service has only been able to locate records pertaining to the final six. Redacted copies of those documents will be filed as USPS Library Reference N2006-1/11. Unredacted copies will be filed as USPS Library Reference N2006-1/19, subject to protective conditions resulting from Presiding Officer's Ruling No. N2006-1/7.