

Alternatives to balance the budget, 5 day/week delivery gives insufficient relief.  
Public comment by Wayne Robey.

While the USPS bases its request on the decline in mail volume and projects a FY 2011 deficit of \$7 billion, it admits, its proposed 5.6% rate increase (see EXIGENT REQUEST, 2010 - Docket No. R2010-4) will not by itself eliminate the gap between revenue and expenses in FY 2011. In comparison, the change to five day delivery proposal is expected to save about \$3 billion a year (see USPS Library Reference N2010-1/1), if mail delivery to street addresses that now receive six deliveries/week was reduced to three/week rather than the five/week proposed in USPS Library Reference N2010-1/1 **but mail continues to be collected from blue street collection boxes where the boxes are not serviced by delivery carriers and at Post Offices**, the savings are likely to be around \$9 billion/year (estimated by extrapolation). This should be sufficient to avoid the projected FY 2011 deficit and pay back the current debt within a reasonable period of time without a rate increase. Additional savings may be obtainable as described by postal employee Bill Hall in his comment (file Greetings Everyone.pdf). In my experience, an additional 0 to 2 days delay in mail delivery (up to 1 day delay when mail is not picked up by a delivery carrier) is not a problem. More urgent information tends to be delivered electronically already while UPS and FedEx provide faster package delivery (with better delivery confirmation) to most locations. Businesses that rely on high mail volume generally have Post Office boxes and would be unaffected. In this 3 day/week scheme, I envisage delivery services operating six days a week as they do now but each street address would only receive them three days/week. (From a customer point of view delivery Monday, Wednesday, and Friday is preferable but probably not practical from the standpoint of employee scheduling.) This is the best way to keep the USPS cost effective.