

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

POSTAL RATE AND FEE CHANGES, 2006

Docket No. R2006-1

RESPONSES OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS McCRERY  
TO INTERROGATORIES OF THE GREETING CARD ASSOCIATION  
[GCA/USPS-T42-1-3]  
(May 26, 2006)

The United States Postal Service hereby provides the responses of Postal Service witness Marc D. McCrery to the above-listed interrogatories of the Greeting Card Association, filed on May 17, 2006. Each interrogatory is stated verbatim and is followed by the response.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr.  
Chief Counsel, Ratemaking

---

Sheela A. Portonovo

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137  
(202) 268-3012, Fax -6187

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS  
MARC D. McCRERY TO INTERROGATORIES OF  
THE GREETING CARD ASSOCIATION

**GCA/USPS-T42-1**

For purposes of the following questions, please assume a single-piece First-Class letter which (i) is a piece of collection mail, paid with an adhesive stamp, (ii) weighs one ounce or less, (iii) is less than 6.125 in. tall, (iv) is less than 11.5 inches long, (v) is less than 0.25 inches thick, and (vi) has an aspect ratio lower than 1:1.3.

(a) Please assume that the above-described piece was successfully processed on the facer canceller.

(i) On that assumption, please describe fully the subsequent processing of the piece.

(ii) If more than one processing flow would be possible, please indicate which processing flow(s) would be most probable.

(b) Please assume that the above-described piece was not successfully processed on the facer canceller.

(i) On that assumption, please describe fully the subsequent processing of the piece.

(ii) If more than one processing flow would be possible, please indicate which processing flow(s) would be most probable.

**Response:**

a (i) Refer to figure 1 on page 17 of the testimony of witness Bozzo (USPS-T12) for the processing flow of a machinable stamped collection mailpiece successfully processed on the AFCS.

(ii) If the mailpiece described in GCA/USPS-T42-1 is successfully processed on the AFCS, the most probable mail flow would be in the letter automated mail stream as described in response to interrogatory PB/USPS-T29-8 in Docket No. R2005-1.

b. (i) Mailpieces that could not be successfully processed on the AFCS are routed to a manual unit for processing. Certain facilities manually face and cancel the rejects and direct them to a MLOCR/DIOSS for automated

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS  
MARC D. McCRERY TO INTERROGATORIES OF  
THE GREETING CARD ASSOCIATION

processing. Refer to figure 1 on page 17 of the testimony of witness Bozzo (USPS-T12) for subsequent processing flows of the piece.

(ii) The mailpieces in the reject stacker that fail to be oriented, cancelled and processed on AFCS are cancelled by hand and sent to a manual unit for processing.

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS  
MARC D. McCRERY TO INTERROGATORIES OF  
THE GREETING CARD ASSOCIATION

**GCA/USPS-T42-2**

Please refer to the discussion of the Advanced Facer Cancellor System, at pages 2-3 of your prefiled testimony.

Please confirm that the hypothetical piece described in the introductory portion of GCA/USPS-T42-1 would be not be considered a "non-letter sized" piece. If you do not confirm, please explain fully.

**Response:**

Confirmed, but note that letters are also culled for other conditions such as stiffness or address orientation.

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS  
MARC D. McCRERY TO INTERROGATORIES OF  
THE GREETING CARD ASSOCIATION

**GCA/USPS-T42-3**

Please refer to the discussion of manual processing at pages 11-12 of your prefiled testimony.

On the assumption that the hypothetical piece described in the introductory portion of GCA/USPS-T42-1 would be considered non-machinable, please explain fully how it would be "excluded from automated processing" (USPS-T-42, page 12, line 1).

**Response:**

The mailpiece described in GCA/USPS-T42-1 has a certain probability of being rejected on the AFCS due to location of the stamp relative to the orientation of the mailpiece. A certain percentage of such mailpieces do not get cancelled or processed on the AFCS even after repetitive attempts on the AFCS. The rejected mailpieces are cancelled by hand and directed to a manual unit for processing. Furthermore, mailpieces with an aspect ratio of less than 1:1.3 have a tendency to tip over on a side during subsequent automated processing steps. This prevents the barcode from being read even after repetitive attempts for processing. The rejects from automation equipment are directed to manual units for processing.