

Before The  
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

RATE ADJUSTMENT DUE TO EXTRAORDINARY  
OR EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES

Docket No. R2013-11R

**REPLY OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE TO  
GCA'S OPPOSITION TO POSTAL SERVICE MOTION TO STRIKE**  
(July 16, 2015)

On July 8, 2015, the Postal Service filed a Motion to Strike quantifications provided for the first time in their Reply Comments by GCA/NPPC ("GCA") and by Valpak. On July 14, 2015, GCA filed its Opposition to the Motion to Strike. The Postal Service hereby very briefly responds to that Opposition.

The Postal Service moved to strike because of the fundamental unfairness of waiting to provide concrete quantification in Reply Comments, when the parties had every opportunity to provide those quantifications in Initial Comments. In so doing, the parties deprived the Postal Service of its due process right not only to address conceptual deficiencies that were not apparent until the parties revealed concrete application of the approach upon which they wish the Commission to rely, but also to identify any more basic computational errors committed in converting vague generalizations to specific quantified results.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Postal Service trusts that the Commission will not be improperly swayed by the implicit suggestion (GCA Opposition at 3-4) that, merely because the Postal Service has the burden of proof, the constraints of due process and fundamental fairness do not apply to submissions presented by other parties.

In its Opposition, GCA offers no excuse for why it failed to provide with its Initial Comments the results of a quantification exercise that those Comments (page 11) claimed “can easily be undertaken.” Likewise, GCA does not identify any new aspect of the Postal Service’s Initial Comments in response to which it suddenly became necessary in its Reply Comments to reverse course and submit the exact quantification it chose *not* to file with its Initial Comments. Instead, GCA merely claims that its new quantification “followed the steps identified in the GCA/NPPC opening comments.” GCA Opposition at 2. GCA further alleges that the results of the quantification generated by its new spreadsheets “simply present in a numerical format the methodology described in the GCA/NPPC initial comments, **and the Postal Service does not contend otherwise.**” *Id.* (emphasis added).

Contrary to the latter assertion, the Postal Service most assuredly does contend otherwise. The presence of severe computational errors noted in the Motion to Strike causes a complete divergence between the methodology described and the actual calculations upon which GCA now wishes the Commission to rely. The GCA spreadsheets did *not* follow the steps described, and the meaningless numbers they generate are far removed from the results obtained if one literally did follow those steps (which the Postal Service would not recommend for other reasons). We did not set forth the specific quantification errors in our Motion to Strike only because we did not believe it was procedurally appropriate to do so. GCA now alleges that, “based solely on the GCA/NPPC [Initial] Comments,” the “Commission staff is perfectly capable of generating on

its own” the calculations proffered for the very first time in GCA’s new spreadsheets. Opposition at 2. In fact, however, the only way the Commission could replicate those results would be by making the exact same computational errors that disqualify the GCA quantification. But if GCA is actually convinced that its quantification is truly unnecessary, then it fails to explain why it bothered to offer the new materials with its Reply Comments, or why it does not offer to withdraw them now.

Due process prevents the Commission from relying on quantitative results to which the Postal Service was unfairly deprived of any opportunity to respond. The motion to strike should be granted. Alternatively, if the Commission wishes for the Postal Service to explain the deficiencies that it was unable to address in its Reply Comments because the parties omitted the quantification from their Initial Comments, the Postal Service stands ready to do so expeditiously.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Richard T. Cooper  
Managing Counsel, Corporate & Postal  
Business Law

R. Andrew German  
Managing Counsel, Legal Strategy

Eric P. Koetting

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137  
(202) 277-6333  
July 16, 2015