

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

Postal Rate Commission
Submitted 9/14/2004 7:32 am
Filing ID: 41707
Accepted 9/14/2004

RATE AND SERVICE CHANGES TO IMPLEMENT
FUNCTIONALLY EQUIVALENT NEGOTIATED
SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH BANK ONE
CORPORATION

Docket No. MC2004-3

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE NOTICE OF THIRD ERRATA TO DIRECT
TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL K. PLUNKETT (THIRD ERRATA)
(September 14, 2004)

The United States Postal Service provides notice that it is filing a third errata to witness Plunkett's testimony. Three revised pages are attached for inclusion in the text of witness Plunkett's testimony and two revised pages in Appendix B. The changes were prompted by the revisions to Appendix A made on August 6, 2004 and on September 1, 2004. The revised pages are dated September 13, 2004, because these changes were already incorporated into the copies of witness Plunkett's testimony provided to the Commission on September 13, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr.
Chief Counsel, Ratemaking

Nan K. McKenzie

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 268-3089 Fax -5402
September 14, 2004

1 Standard Mail, and percent of marketing mail converted from Standard Mail to First-
2 Class Mail.

3 As Bank One witness Rappaport explains, the price incentives in the NSA are
4 expected to produce a First-Class Mail volume response of 19 million pieces for the first
5 year of the agreement and 99 million additional pieces in Year 2 and Year 3. BOC-T-1
6 at 8. The new contribution must account for any substitution leakage that would result
7 from the loss of contribution from Standard Mail pieces converted to First-Class Mail
8 marketing pieces. To be conservative, witness Rappaport has estimated that 100
9 percent of incremental volume would be converted from Standard Mail. (BOC-T-1 at 8).
10 The Postal Service believes that the incremental volumes will exceed the forecast. *Id.*
11 (See Part C., Conservatism of Assumptions, below).

12 The final value determinant is the expected discount exposure. The discount
13 exposure lowers the value of the NSA and is the result of price incentives applied to any
14 volume that would have occurred without a price incentive. As described by Postal
15 Service witness Eakin, in the baseline case, setting a threshold below forecast volume
16 is economically efficient because it reduces the mailer's marginal price of First-Class
17 Mail relative to other forms of solicitation, and reduces the gap between marginal price
18 and marginal cost of the mailer's First-Class Mail. Docket No. MC2002-2; USPS-RT-2
19 at 4-5.

20 I estimate the value to the Postal Service of the Bank One agreement, when
21 considering all three value drivers over the three years of the NSA, as follows:

22	ACS Cost savings:	\$7.8 million
23	Increased contribution (less incremental discounts):	\$6.8 million

1 Bank One, because its potential cost savings are not nearly as large as the potential
2 cost savings for Capital One, which is a larger originator of First-Class Mail marketing
3 solicitations than Bank One. Fears that the customer would have significantly increased
4 mail volumes should be mitigated in the current environment of declining First-Class Mail
5 volumes and potentially adverse business conditions.

6 The conditions that the Commission cited to support a cap on the discounts in the
7 baseline case do not apply here. The major concern expressed over the course of the
8 Capital One case was that mail volume would have grown in the absence of a discount
9 so that the discounts would exceed the cost savings. By comparison, Bank One's
10 volume history is stable, and even if its marketing mail volume were to match its historic
11 high, the Postal Service would receive a positive benefit from the NSA. Specifically,
12 Bank One's highest annual marketing letter First-Class Mail volume was 79 million pieces
13 in 2001, prior to the most recent rate increase. If Bank One, without price incentives,
14 could reach this same level for all three years of the agreement, it would receive \$8.0
15 million in discounts on their before-rates volumes over the term of the agreement (as
16 opposed to the \$2.9 million estimate presented above in Section IV.A.). This discount
17 earned by Bank One would correlate to exposure for the Postal Service. But, despite the
18 increase in exposure, the NSA would be contribution-positive because of ACS savings.
19 Under the situation described above, the Postal Service would have underestimated the
20 savings from ACS and, in absolute terms, the savings at 79 million marketing pieces
21 would have been \$10.5 million (as opposed to the \$7.8 million presented above in
22 Section IV.A.). This means that the NSA would still generate \$2.4 million in additional
23 contribution for the Postal Service.

1 counting of the 36,080,000 (Y1BR – Beginning Threshold: 571,080,000 – 535,000,000)
2 mail pieces occurs in the discount and exposure calculations, because the 36,080,000
3 pieces are in the exposure calculation. The Y1AR volume of 590,135,000 is made up of
4 the Y1BR volume plus the 19,055,000 additional marketing pieces. To account for this
5 double counting, the Postal Service subtracts the discount from the exposure, to get the
6 “real” discount calculation of \$597,325 (Appendix A, page 11).

7

8 **UAA Calculations**

9 In lieu of receiving physical returns, Bank One will accept electronic diversion of
10 address changes or corrections, as Capital One does. This results in cost savings to
11 the Postal Service by replacing costly physical returns with the less costly transmission
12 of electronic information. The estimated Capital One physical and electronic return unit
13 costs described in USPS-LR-1/MC2002-2 will be used in the Bank One model. The
14 total return costs savings vary from the Capital One model because of the different
15 marketing mail volumes and return rate forecasts (9 percent for Bank One’s marketing
16 mail letters) and the inclusion of the contingency on the base cost.

17 To calculate the cost savings, multiply the expected volume of Bank One’s UAA
18 mail times the unit costs savings for each piece processed through the ACS times the
19 percentage of Bank One’s UAA mail that will be processed. The calculation relies upon
20 the evidence in Docket No. MC2002-2 for (1) the estimated percentage of Bank One’s
21 UAA mail that will be processed through the ACS system (85 percent) and (2) the unit
22 savings for each UAA piece processed through the ACS system. The contingency is
23 not applied until page 11.

1 **Standard Mail Revenue Calculations and Standard Mail Cost Calculations**

2 The Standard Mail Regular and Enhanced Carrier Route (ECR) Revenues are
3 based on the Standard Mail Regular and ECR billing determinants of Bank One. The
4 revenue per piece for both Regular and ECR is a weighted average of the revenue per
5 piece and the percent of Bank One volume. The Standard Regular and ECR unit costs
6 are based on Docket No. R2001-1 for TY 2003 unit costs (Docket No. R2001-1, USPS
7 LR-J-58). These data are based on the USPS version of the cost models, due to the
8 fact that a PRC-version is not available for some of the data. Specifically, the total unit
9 costs of Standard letters and Standard ECR letters are needed for this analysis. These
10 data are found in the USPS Weight Study (Docket No. R2001-1 USPS LR-J-58), and
11 there is no PRC version of this document. The format for 2004 unit costs follows the
12 First-Class Mail Unit Cost estimates on pages 4 and 5 of Appendix A. This provides the
13 customer-specific revenue and cost data on Bank One's Standard Mail. The standard
14 mail cost is adjusted by the contingency, as was the First-Class Mail cost.

15

16 **Contribution Inputs**

17 The Contribution Inputs calculate the contribution per piece of Bank One's
18 operational mail and marketing mail letters. This per piece calculation provides the
19 Postal Service with before and after rates revenue, cost, and contribution for First-Class
20 Mail and Standard Mail on a customer-specific basis. It also allows for forecasting future
21 contribution per piece in the out-years of the agreement by allowing the inflationary
22 growth to be multiplied by the cost of each subclass. Unit revenue remains constant
23 over the three-year agreement.

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.

Nan K. McKenzie

475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
September 14, 2004