

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

PERIODIC REPORTING
(PROPOSALS THREE THROUGH EIGHT)

Docket No. RM2014-6

NOTICE OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE OF
REVISION TO REPLY COMMENTS COVER SHEET -- ERRATA
(August 13, 2014)

The United States Postal Service hereby gives notice of the filing today of a revised version of the cover page to the Postal Service Reply Comments filed yesterday, August 12, 2014. The spelling of the word "SERVICE" has been corrected in the caption of the revised version. No other changes were made. A copy of the revised version of the cover page, with the corrected caption, is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorney:

Eric P. Koetting

475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 277-6333
August 13, 2014

Revised: 8/13/14

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

PERIODIC REPORTING
(PROPOSALS THREE THROUGH EIGHT)

Docket No. RM2014-6

REPLY COMMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
(August 12, 2014)

Commission Order No. 2103 (June 26, 2014) established July 28 as the deadline for initial comments in this proceeding regarding Proposals Three through Eight, and August 12 as the date for reply comments. On July 28, 2014, the only comments filed were offered by the Public Representative. The Postal Service hereby files its reply to those comments. The comments of the Public Representative are generally supportive of Proposals Three through Seven, albeit with some caveats and suggestions. With regard to Proposal Eight, however, the Public Representative sought more information.

Proposal Three

The Public Representative supports Proposal Three, but believes its precision could be improved. The Public Representative's primary suggestion, however, is ill-conceived. The Postal Service proposal is to adjust transportation costs by the ratio of the estimated cube of the partner pieces to the estimated cube of the proxy pieces. The Public Representative agrees that cube drives transportation costs, yet objects to the proposal because of a concern that cube is not known directly, but rather is estimated based on the established relationship between cube and weight presented in USPS-FY13-NP16 and employed by the Commission and the Postal Service for transportation costing purposes in many contexts. Even while acknowledging that cube is a more