

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 VALPAK DIRECT MARKETING SYSTEMS, INC.,
AND VALPAK DEALERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.
[VP/USPS-T42-26-27]
(July 12, 2006)

The United States Postal Service hereby provides the responses of witness McCrery to the above-listed interrogatories of Valpak Direct Marketing Systems, Inc., and Valpak Dealers' Association, Inc., filed on June 28, 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

RESPONSES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS MCCRERY TO
INTERROGATORIES OF VALPAK DIRECT MARKETING SYSTEMS, INC. AND
VALPAK DEALERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.

VP/USPS-T42-26.

Please refer to your testimony at page 13, lines 18-21, where you state “there are only limited opportunities to increase efficiencies within letter mail processing operations through the application of **proven** technologies.” (Emphasis added.) Is the Postal Service considering or experimenting with any technologies that might not be now considered “proven” but which could result in more efficient letter mail processing? If so, please describe briefly any technological improvements of which you are aware that might evolve and be deployed after the Test Year in this docket.

Response:

Yes, Engineering is pursuing new, unproven technologies, but they are proprietary to their respective vendors and cannot be disclosed at this time.

RESPONSES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS MCCRERY TO
INTERROGATORIES OF VALPAK DIRECT MARKETING SYSTEMS, INC. AND
VALPAK DEALERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.

VP/USPS-T42-27.

Please refer to your testimony at page 36, lines 11-13, where you state that “a few very large schemes (e.g., the initial outgoing and incoming schemes, i.e., the ‘primaries’) may be run on multiple sorters due to time constraints.”

- a. Please define, with more specificity, the term “large schemes” as you use it here.
- b. What is the **maximum** number of separations in the “large scheme” you mention?
- c. To qualify as a “large scheme,” what is the **minimum** number of separations that would be needed?
- d. Could large volume for a “medium” size sort scheme also result in mail for the same scheme being run on multiple sorters? Please explain.
- e. Your response to VP/USPS-T42-3(a) identified 97 facilities as having 6-10 DBCS machines. What percentage of these facilities would be likely to run the same initial outgoing or incoming schemes on multiple machines?
- f. Your response to VP/USPS-T42-3(a) identified 160 facilities as having greater than 10 DBCS machines. What percentage of these facilities would be likely to run the same initial outgoing or incoming schemes on multiple machines?

Response:

a - d. “Large” schemes referred to schemes that have a high volume compared to other schemes at the same facility. The number of separations is immaterial.

e - f. I would expect that the outgoing and incoming primaries would run on multiple DBCSs at virtually all facilities with 6 or more DBCSs.