

BEFORE THE  
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON DC 20268-0001

Postal Rate and Fee Changes, 2006]

DOCKET NO. R2006-1

FOLLOW-UP INTERROGATORIES OF DAVID B. POPKIN TO THE UNITED STATES  
POSTAL SERVICE [DBP/USPS-676-693]

David B. Popkin hereby requests the United States Postal Service to answer, fully and completely, the following interrogatories pursuant to Rules 25 and 26 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. To reduce the volume of paper, I have combined related requests into a single numbered interrogatory; however, I am requesting that a specific response be made to each separate question asked. To the extent that a reference is made in the responses to a Library Reference, I would appreciate receiving a copy of the reference since I am located at a distance from Washington, DC. Any reference to testimony should indicate the page and line numbers. The instructions contained in the interrogatories DFC/USPS-1-18 in Docket C2001-1, dated May 19, 2001, are incorporated herein by reference. In accordance with the provisions of Rule 25[b], I am available for informal discussion to respond to your request to "clarify questions and to identify portions of discovery requests considered overbroad or burdensome."

October 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

R20061HHH676

DAVID B. POPKIN, POST OFFICE BOX 528, ENGLEWOOD, NJ 07631-0528

---

---

DBP/USPS-676  
672.

Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-

[a] In October 2005, the New York Metro Area issued a press release indicating that extended hours of 7 PM on weekdays and 4 PM on Saturdays would be implemented at

over 300 post office in the Area. Please advise why you were unable to confirm the original Interrogatory?

[b] Please respond to the original Interrogatory.

DBP/USPS-677 Please refer to your responses to Interrogatories DBP/USPS-340 and 341 as revised on October 11, 2006.

In the last sentence of the response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-340, the Postal Service states that it is considering giving postage credit at the "forever value". In the response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-341, the Postal Service states that the use of the stamp on other than one-ounce letters will be tolerated and the postage value will be at the prevailing rate for one-ounce letters.

Please advise whether the Postal Service's current position is one of consideration as provided in the response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-340 or is a positive statement as provided in the response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-341.

DBP/USPS-678 Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-341 as revised on October 11, 2006.

In the first sentence of the response, the Postal Service states that the use of the Forever Stamp is not meant to be "forever postage" and used on items other than one-ounce letters.

In the response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-353, the Postal Service stated that the Forever Stamp could very well become the "workhorse" stamp for the first ounce, single-piece First-Class Mail letter rate.

[a] Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to confirm, that with the current "workhorse" stamp, as well as with a number of previous "workhorse" stamps, that many individual mailers will use one or more copies of that stamp, to pay, overpay, or use with additional postage on most of their mail.

[b] Please discuss the apparent conflict between the responses to Interrogatories DBP/USPS-353 and 341.

DBP/USPS-679 Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-341 as revised on October 11, 2006.

In the second sentence of the response, the Postal Service states that the use of the Forever Stamp will be tolerated if used for other than on one-ounce letters.

[a] Please define the word tolerated as used in the context of the response.

[b] Please advise how the concept of toleration of the use of Forever Stamps for other than its primary use will manifest itself in publicity and other action.

[c] Please advise if the publicity for the Forever Stamp will be limited to stating that it may be used for the postage on a one-ounce, single piece First-Class letter rate.

[d] Please advise if the publicity for the Forever Stamp will state or imply that it may only be used for the postage on other than a one-ounce, single piece First-Class letter rate

[e] Please advise if the publicity for the Forever Stamp will state that it may be used for the postage on other than a one-ounce, single piece First-Class letter rate [i.e. for any use that may be made of other postage stamps].

[f] Please advise if the publicity for the Forever Stamp will state that it may not be used for the postage on other than a one-ounce, single piece First-Class letter rate.

DBP/USPS-680 Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-340 as revised on October 11, 2006.

For purposes of the response to this Interrogatory, assume the following:

A1. The wording of the DMCS as it relates to the Forever Stamp and as presently proposed is approved by the Commission and the Board of Governors

A2. The Postal Service adopts the DMM regulations as presently proposed which will allow the Forever Stamp to be utilized for all purposes for which postage stamps may be utilized and at its "forever value".

Now assume that at some point in the future, the Postal Service wishes to change the DMM regulations to make one or more of the following changes:

B1. Allow the Forever Stamp to be utilized for all purposes for which postage stamps may be utilized at a value other than the "forever value" such as the value at which the stamp was purchased.

B2. Restrict the use of the Forever Stamp to its intended purpose of a one-ounce, single piece First-Class letter,

B3. Restrict the use of the Forever Stamp so that it may not be utilized for all purposes for which postage stamps may be utilized.

[a] Does the Postal Service believe the wording in the DMCS as noted in item A1 above would restrict them from making any of the changes as noted in items B1 through B3 above?

[b] Does the Postal Service believe that if it wished to make any of the changes as noted in items B1 through B3 above it would have to change the wording of the DMCS as noted in item A1 above which would require litigation before the Commission as would any other change to the DMCS?

[c] Please fully discuss your responses and provide an explanation if your responses to subparts a and b above are not an unqualified yes to both of them.

DBP/USPS-681 Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-641.

The response that was given to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-641 stated that the Postal Service is not able to confirm that some individual DPS mail may occur at a delivery unit before the carrier goes out on their route. I realize that some of the mailpieces may be observed individually while in the office, however, each and every individual mailpiece will not be likely to be observed until the carrier is out on the delivery route. Please respond to that condition.

DBP/USPS-682 Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-642 subpart c.

Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to confirm, that the Governors would not be able to unilaterally implement Certified Mail for use with Express Mail, Periodicals,

Standard Mail, or Package Services without obtaining a modification of the DMCS after receiving Commission approval.

DBP/USPS-683                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-643.

[a]     Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to confirm, that the material that is contained in the Domestic Mail Manual, the companion DMM Quick Service Guide, and the Customer's Guide to Mailing [Domestic Mail Manual 100 Series] will supplement and implement the criteria contained in the DMCS, however, that material may not be inconsistent with the criteria contained in the DMCS.

[b]     Please respond to the original Interrogatory DBP/USPS-643.

DBP/USPS-684                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-646.

While the implementation process may be ongoing, Interrogatory DBP/USPS-646 asked whether the response to subpart b of Interrogatory DBP/USPS-510 is still the current status of the Postal Service's Forever Stamp implementation plan. Please advise whether it is.

DBP/USPS-685                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-647.

Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to confirm, that any use of the Forever Stamp, whether it is the intended use or a tolerated use, must be one that is authorized by the DMCS.

DBP/USPS-686                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-647.

Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to confirm, that the Postal Service may not tolerate a procedure or policy which is not consistent with the DMCS.

DBP/USPS-687                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-657.

Your response indicates that the Postal Service has moved beyond considering giving postage credit for such uses [i.e. ones that are being characterized as tolerated uses, namely, ones that are being utilized for any purpose for which postage stamps may be utilized] and now intends to give such credit.

Please clarify since current responses such as the October 11th revision of the response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-340 as well as numerous other responses which still utilize the contemplation of considering.

DBP/USPS-688                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-657.

Your response indicates that the Postal Service has moved beyond considering giving postage credit for such uses [i.e. ones that are being characterized as tolerated uses, namely, ones that are being utilized for any purpose for which postage stamps may be utilized] and now intends to give such credit.

Please advise the reasons behind making this change in policy.

DBP/USPS-689                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-658.

[a]     Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to confirm, that the myriad rate and classification implementation details that are contained in the Domestic Mail Manual, the companion DMM Quick Service Guide, and the Customer's Guide to Mailing [Domestic Mail Manual 100 Series] may only supplement and implement the criteria contained in the DMCS, however, that material may not be inconsistent with the criteria contained in the DMCS.

[b]     Please respond to the original Interrogatory DBP/USPS-658.

DBP/USPS-690                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-663.

Please provide information on any additional guidelines that are contained in the template Notice 3-A that do more than just provide a clearer formatting of the DMM requirements. I also realize that the template also provides a convenient way to measure the mailpieces.

DBP/USPS-691                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-664.

I realize that there are many criteria of a mailpiece which would cause implementation of the nonmachinable surcharge and that they operate independently. Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to confirm, that if I have a mailpiece that has only one of the nonmachinable criteria, namely, the envelope has a metal clasp, and if I place a piece of tape over the clasp so that there will no longer be an ability for the clasp to catch on something else during processing, that the mailpiece will no longer require payment of the nonmachinable surcharge.

DBP/USPS-692                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-665.

The Postal Service should have a very strong understanding of the relevance of this line of questioning. They are proposing three separate rates for First-Class Mail based on the shape of the mailpiece, namely, whether the mailpiece is a letter vs. a flat vs. a parcel. In order to determine which of the three separate rates to apply to a specific mailpiece, the mailer and the Postal Service must not only measure the length and height of the mailpiece which probably can be done fairly easily and accurately but they also must measure the thickness of the mailpiece to determine whether it is less than 0.25 inches, between 0.25 and 0.75 inches, or over 0.75 inches. While the measurement of the thickness of a box may be accomplished fairly easily, the measurement of the thickness of an envelope raises a number of difficulties including, but not limited to, the compressibility of the mailpiece and the need to make an indirect measurement by sighting along the envelope and dealing with the inherent parallax associated with that type of measurement.

Please respond to the original Interrogatory DBP/USPS-665.

DBP/USPS-693                      Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-666.

[a]     At this point in time, does the Postal Service have any plans to provide retail window clerks with any other tools to determine the appropriate proposed First-Class Mail rate other than the Notice 3-A template, a ruler, and a scale.

[b]     If none, so state. If so, please identify.

---

---

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.

David B. Popkin     October 16, 2006

---

---