

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

EVOLUTIONARY NETWORK DEVELOPMENT
SERVICE CHANGES, 2006

Docket No. N2006-1

RESPONSES OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO APWU INTERROGATORIES REDIRECTED FROM WITNES WILLIAMS
(APWU/USPS-T2-90 THROUGH 97)
(July 7, 2006)

The United States Postal Service hereby submits its responses to the following interrogatories of the American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO, filed on June 8, 2006: APWU/USPS-T2-90 through 97. The interrogatories have been redirected from witness Williams to the Postal Service for institutional response.

The interrogatories are stated verbatim and followed by the responses.

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

APWU/USPS-T2-90 Which parts of the Area Mail Processing Notifications Tool Kit presented in Library Reference N2006-1/12 have been used for the AMPs presented in Library Reference N2006-1/5? Which parts of it were used for the AMPs presented in Library Reference N2006-1/11?

RESPONSE

The Area Mail Processing Notifications Tool Kit presented in USPS Library Reference N2006-1/12 was issued in May 2006 after approval of the AMPs in USPS LR-N2006-1/5 & LR-N2006-1/11. However, there were two notifications to Worksheet #3 stakeholders for the 10 AMPs in USPS LR N2006-1/5: notification of AMP feasibility study intention and notification of the decision based on that study.

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

APWU/USPS-T2-91 What are the USPS' goals in using the documents presented in Library Reference N2006-1/12? What information is it hoping to convey and what type of input is it hoping to solicit from the mail-using stakeholders?

RESPONSE

The Area Mail Processing Notifications Tool Kit is intended to ensure consistent informational messaging regarding the initiation of an AMP feasibility study to all stakeholders with each AMP study undertaken. It is not intended for the purpose of soliciting input.

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

APWU/USPS-T2-92 Have the documents in the Notification Tool Kit that are marked for “media” or “community leaders/organizations” been tested to see how well they are understood by those groups? In particular are those groups familiar enough with phrases such as “originating, destinating, originating/destinating” mail to have an accurate understanding of what actions are being proposed?

RESPONSE

No. The Postal Service is not aware of members of the media or community leaders failing to grasp these fairly basic concepts.

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

APWU/USPS-T2-93 What information is included in the “AMP Summary Brief” that is going to be attached to some of the documents in the Notification Tool Kit? Is that the same as the “Executive Summary” page in the AMP package or something different? Please provide an example if it is not a document that has already been provided.

RESPONSE

USPS-LR-N2006-1/16 contains information about the “AMP Summary Brief.”

Specific examples of the summaries can be found on usps.com for AMP studies which have completed the public input process.

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

APWU/USPS-T2-94 Are these documents suggestions or are they expected to be used verbatim except for the places where it is clearly expected that information such as the facility names, dates, etc. are to be filled in?

RESPONSE

The AMP notification documents provided in the Area Mail Processing Notifications Tool Kit are templates.

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

APWU/USPS-T2-95 When are the documents contained in the Public Input Process section of the Notifications Tool Kit (pages 16-21 of LR N2006-1/12) distributed in relation to the public meetings? Specifically, how much notice is given to interested parties in advance of these public meetings?

RESPONSE

The AMP Summary brief is mailed with notification of the public meeting to stakeholder approximate 10 days prior to the meeting. Please refer to USPS LR N2006-1/16.

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

APWU/USPS-T2-96 According to the timeline provided on pages 4 and 5 of LR N2006-1/12, upon completion of the AMP study, a “public input process summary is completed and submitted to HQ.” What information is contained in the “public input process summary?” Is there a specific “public input process summary” document, worksheet or form that is completed? If so, please provide a copy of this document. If not, please explain why there is no uniform way to summarize public comment and concerns.

RESPONSE

Please refer to response to APWU/USPS-T2-93 and USPS Library Reference N2006-1/16.

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

APWU/USPS-T2-97 The Notifications Tool Kit contains notices that seemingly address every possible outcome of an AMP study, i.e. notice of a decision to consolidate, to close, or to take no action regarding a particular facility. Yet the notices contained on page 8 and page 10 of LR N2006-1/12, states “I will provide you with appropriate notice, if any is required, when a decision is made on the study results. “ When is notice deemed to be required? Are there situations in which no further information is provided about an AMP study once the initial notice of intent to conduct a study has been given? If so, please explain.

RESPONSE

Each notification of an AMP feasibility study is expected to be followed by at least one notification of a decision.