

Postal Rate Commission  
Submitted: 2/22/06 3:24 pm  
Filing ID: 47202-06  
Accepted 2/22/2006

USPS-T-1

BEFORE THE  
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20268-0001

---

REPOSITIONABLE NOTES  
MINOR CLASSIFICATION CHANGE

---

Docket No. MC2006-2

DIRECT TESTIMONY  
OF  
KIRK KANEER  
ON BEHALF OF  
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

CONTENTS

	Page
CONTENTS .....	i
AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	ii
I. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY.....	1
II. PROPOSED CHANGE OF THE RPN PROVISIONAL SERVICE EXPIRATION DATE.....	1
A. Reasons for Proposed Change .....	2
B. Statutory Criteria.....	3
C. Revenue and Cost Impact.....	4

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

My name is Kirk T. Kaneer and I am employed by the Postal Service as an economist in Pricing and Classification. I have held this position since 1998. My current duties are to develop pricing and classification proposals, cost analyses, forecasts, and implementation databases. Prior to this, I did similar work in Pricing from 1992 to 1998. Before working in Pricing, I was employed in the Labor Economics Research Division as an economist involved in labor negotiations. I have been employed by the Postal Service since 1988. I was the rate design witness for Repositionable Notes in Docket No. MC2004-5 (USPS-T-2). I was a rate design witness for post office box service, special handling, and parcel airlift in Docket No. R2001-1 (USPS-T-38), and I was a cost and classification witness for post office box service in Docket No. R2000-1 (USPS-T-40). In Docket No. R97-1, I was the Periodicals Nonprofit and Classroom rate design witness (USPS-T-35) and rebuttal witness for post office box service (USPS-RT-19). I was the pricing witness for the Classroom subclass of Periodicals in Docket No. MC96-2 (USPS-CT-3) as well.

Prior to coming to the Postal Service, I worked from 1983 to 1988 at the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), Office of Prices and Living Conditions, Consumer Expenditure Surveys Research Division. While employed at BLS, I published an article titled: *Distribution of Consumption by Aggregate Expenditure Share*, MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW, 109(2), 50-53, April 1986.

In 1982, I received a Master of Science degree in Economics from Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida. In 1978, I received a Bachelor of Science Degree with double majors in Economics and Business Administration from the University of Central Florida in Orlando, Florida.

1 **I. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

2 The purpose of my testimony in this docket is to present the Postal Service's  
3 proposal for changing the expiration date for the provisional Repositionable Notes  
4 (RPN) classification and associated rates. The provisional service was  
5 recommended by the Commission in Docket No. MC2004-5, and implemented on  
6 April 3, 2005. In accordance with Domestic Mail Classification Schedule provisions,  
7 the provisional service will expire on April 3, 2006.

8 My testimony explains the reasons for the proposed expiration date change,  
9 addresses the relevant statutory criteria for evaluating this proposal, and provides an  
10 estimate of the potential magnitude of the impact on postal costs and revenues.

11 **II. PROPOSED CHANGE OF THE RPN SERVICE EXPIRATION DATE**

12 The Postal Service proposes to change the expiration date of the provisional  
13 Repositionable Notes classification and rates so that they remain in effect pending  
14 consideration of a further request to make substantive modifications in the service. In  
15 the event that the Postal Service decides not to make a further request, then the  
16 service would expire at a time specified by the Postal Service, not to exceed a year  
17 from the original expiration date. No substantive classification changes or changes in  
18 rates are proposed. This allows the continuation of the current RPN service without  
19 interruption for those customers who are using the service or may be planning to use  
20 it. This proposal also allows additional time for the Postal Service and other

1 interested parties to consider the Commission's white paper, filed as a library  
2 reference on January 9, 2006.<sup>1</sup>

3 **A. Reasons for Proposed Change**

4 While the results from the service so far, and the recommendations made by  
5 the Commission regarding further testing<sup>2</sup> would provide a sufficient foundation for a  
6 proposal to test alternative prices or other modifications in the service, the Postal  
7 Service has deferred a planned proposal in order to for there to be due consideration  
8 of the white paper before proposing changes. Given the timing of the  
9 issuance of the white paper, consideration of that paper, development of a request  
10 for further testing, litigation of that request, and implementation of whatever further  
11 test is authorized cannot be completed by the current expiration date of April 3, 2006.  
12 Therefore, as noted above, and as set out in Attachment A to the request, my  
13 proposal is simply to change the DMCS provisions regarding the expiration date of  
14 the current provisional service to allow time for consideration of a further request. In  
15 this regard, these provisions are similar to those that the Commission has  
16 recommended in past experiments.<sup>3</sup> In addition, in the event no request is filed, the  
17 Postal Service would, upon making a determination not to request further testing of  
18 RPN service, specify an expiration date for the current provisional service. In no  
19 event would that date be later than April 3, 2007. An additional one year was chosen  
20 simply to provide an outside limit for the process of consideration of the white paper,

---

<sup>1</sup> Docket No. MC2004-5, PRC-LR-1, "Pricing Repositionable Notes (RPN) for Use in Postal Delivery Services: An Economic Analysis" by Frank A. Wolak.

<sup>2</sup> PRC Op., Docket No. MC2004-5, at 27, 29.

<sup>3</sup> The most recent example is DMCS section 937.61, recommended in Docket No. MC2005-1.

1 including the Commission's anticipated "public dialogue," the timing of which is not  
2 within the control of the Postal Service.<sup>4</sup> Although having the Postal Service specify  
3 an earlier expiration date is a novel aspect of an expiration provision, I believe it is  
4 appropriate, since that eventuality would only occur if the Postal Service were to  
5 determine not to pursue further testing of RPN service. At that point there would be  
6 no reason to continue the provisional service simply to use up the buffer built into the  
7 one-year outside limit.

### 8 **B. Statutory Criteria**

9 Because the classification language changes I propose maintain the current  
10 provisional service classifications and rates, my testimony (USPS-T-2) and the  
11 Commission's findings on the applicability of the statutory criteria in Docket No.  
12 MC2004-5 remain applicable. I also conclude that the new expiration language  
13 would be fair and equitable, and would be desirable from the point of view of both  
14 customers and the Postal Service.

### 15 **C. Revenue and Cost Impact**

16 In order to estimate the revenue impact of this proposal, I begin with the  
17 available monthly data for the eight months of the provisional service shown in Table  
18 1 below, which displays RPN piece counts and postage by class and shape of the  
19 host piece.

---

<sup>4</sup> See PRC Op., MC2004-5, at 3. As this testimony is being written, the Commission has scheduled a public briefing on the white paper for January 30, 2006.

Table 1: Reported RPN Market Test Pieces and Postage

Date	First-Class Mail				Standard Mail				Periodicals				Total	
	Flat		Letter		Flat		Letter		Flat		Letter		Pieces	Postage
	Pieces	Postage	Pieces	Postage	Pieces	Postage	Pieces	Postage	Pieces	Postage	Pieces	Postage		
Apr-05	-	\$ -	61,439	\$ 307	-	\$ -	2,102,787	\$ 31,542	26,404	\$ 396	0	\$ -	2,190,630	\$ 32,245
May-05	866	\$ 4	216,259	\$ 1,081	7,807	\$ 117	4,536,959	\$ 68,054	23,039	\$ 346	0	\$ -	4,784,930	\$ 69,603
Jun-05	2,582	\$ 13	1,573,881	\$ 7,869	222,941	\$ 3,344	7,232,348	\$ 108,485	15,288	\$ 229	103	\$ 2	9,047,143	\$ 119,943
Jul-05	330	\$ 2	1,462,041	\$ 7,310	179,866	\$ 2,698	9,385,857	\$ 140,788	136,403	\$ 2,046	0	\$ -	11,164,497	\$ 152,844
Aug-05	5	\$ 0	319,168	\$ 1,596	774,848	\$ 11,623	6,620,089	\$ 99,301	47,026	\$ 705	0	\$ -	7,761,136	\$ 113,225
Sep-05	8	\$ 0	253,676	\$ 1,268	139,518	\$ 2,091	5,768,054	\$ 86,521	93,771	\$ 1,407	319	\$ 5	6,255,346	\$ 91,291
Oct-05	0	\$ -	161,284	\$ 806	287,435	\$ 4,312	11,196,022	\$ 167,940	23,097	\$ 346	0	\$ -	11,667,838	\$ 173,405
Nov-05	0	\$ -	8,923,811	\$ 44,619	336,585	\$ 5,049	13,785,331	\$ 206,780	18,810	\$ 282	2,652	\$ 40	23,067,189	\$ 256,770
Total	3,791	\$ 19	12,971,559	\$ 64,858	1,949,000	\$ 29,233	60,627,447	\$ 909,412	383,838	\$ 5,758	3,074	\$ 46	75,938,709	\$ 1,009,325
% Pieces	0.0%		17.1%		2.6%		79.8%		0.5%		0.0%		100.0%	
% Revenue		0.0%	6.4%		2.9%		90.1%		0.6%		0.0%		100.0%	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Because there are only eight months of data, there is obviously uncertainty in any projections for a potential subsequent year of the provisional service. Moreover, it is anticipated that the recent changes in host piece prices effective on January 8, 2006, will result in some changes in volume. I did not attempt to adjust for these factors, given the small magnitude of this proposal. The difficulties and uncertainties in attempting a more precise volume estimate would far outweigh the need for the information at this juncture.

Therefore, for simplicity in estimating the potential change in revenue resulting from the proposed expiration date change, I first used the data in Table 1 to calculate average monthly RPN volumes, by class and shape. These results are shown in Table 2.

Date	First-Class Mail		Standard Mail		Periodicals	
	Flat	Letter	Flat	Letter	Flat	Letter
	Pieces	Pieces	Pieces	Pieces	Pieces	Pieces
Apr-05	-	61,439	-	2,102,787	26,404	0
May-05	866	216,259	7,807	4,536,959	23,039	0
Jun-05	2,582	1,573,881	222,941	7,232,348	15,288	103
Jul-05	330	1,462,041	179,866	9,385,857	136,403	0
Aug-05	5	319,168	774,848	6,620,089	47,026	0
Sep-05	8	253,676	139,518	5,768,054	93,771	319
Oct-05	-	161,284	287,435	11,196,022	23,097	0
Nov-05	-	8,923,811	336,585	13,785,331	18,810	2,652
Monthly avg.	474	1,621,445	243,625	7,578,431	47,980	384

13

1 I then simply applied these average monthly volumes to the current RPN rates, to  
2 obtain a rough estimate of RPN revenue for a potential second year of RPN service,  
3 as follows:

4 1) First Class Average RPN revenue per month =

5  $(474 \text{ flats} + 1,621,445) \times \$0.005 = \$8,110.$

6 Projected Annual First Class RPN revenue =

7  $12 \text{ months} \times \$8,110 \text{ monthly average} = \$97,315.$

8 2) Standard Mail Average RPN revenue per month =

9  $(243,625 \text{ flats} + 7,578,431 \text{ letters}) \times \$0.015 = \$117,331.$

10 Projected Annual Standard Mail RPN revenue =

11  $12 \text{ months} \times \$117,331 \text{ monthly average} = \$1,407,970.$

12 3) Periodicals Average RPN revenue per month =

13  $(47,980 \text{ flats} + 384 \text{ letters}) \times \$0.015 = \$725.$

14

15 4) Total projected annual RPN revenue =

16  $\$97,315 \text{ First Class} + \$1,407,970 \text{ Standard} + \$725 \text{ Periodicals}$

17  $= \underline{\underline{\$1,506,010.}}$

18 These calculations show the modest nature of potential revenues resulting from the  
19 expiration date change.

20 No impact on costs has been reported to date. Therefore, RPN revenues  
21 generated by my proposed prices go entirely toward the institutional cost burden of  
22 the subclasses of the host piece. See Docket No. MC2004-5, USPS-T-2, at 9, lines  
23 1-4.