Postal Regulatory Commission
Submitted 10/5/2007 4:00:47 pm
Filing ID: 57758
Accepted 10/5/2007

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

PREMIUM FORWARDING SERVICE	:	Docket No. MC2007-3

NOTICE OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
OF FILING INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY
FROM DAVID POPKIN
DBP/USPS-22
(October 5, 2007)

The United States Postal Service hereby provides an institutional response to the following interrogatory from David B. Popkin, filed on October 4, 2007: DBP/USPS-22. This interrogatory drew a partial objection, also filed today. (The contemporaneously filed interrogatory DBP/USPS-23 drew a full objection.)

The interrogatory is stated verbatim and followed by the response.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr.
Chief Counsel, Ratemaking

Kenneth N. Hollies
David H. Rubin

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 268-3083; Fax -3084
khollies@usps.gov

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO INTERROGATORY DAVID B. POPKIN

DBP/USPS-22 Please refer to your response to Interrogatory DBP/USPS-13 subparts a and b.

[a] Please confirm, or explain if you are unable to confirm, that if I filed a temporary Change of Address Order at the Boca Raton FL post office to forward my mail to an address in Tampa FL that the Boca Raton FL post office would have every reason to believe that mail destined for me could be properly delivered by forwarding it to Tampa FL.

[b] Please explain why the Boca Raton FL post office knowing full well that mail for me could be delivered by forwarding my mail to my address in Tampa FL would still return my PFS shipment to Englewood NJ.

[c] Please explain what the Englewood NJ post office would do with the PFS that was returned to them by the Boca Raton FL post office since I would be down in Tampa FL for a period of time [one that could be longer than the example that was originally proposed in Interrogatory DBP/USPS-1].

RESPONSE:

(The Postal Service filed a partial objection to this interrogatory.)

This interrogatory refers back to the response to DBP/USPS-13, which interrogatory in turn refers back to the response to DBP/USPS-1(e). That question asked if Mr. Popkin, as a PFS customer, would "be permitted" to file a change of address order (COA) applicable to the temporary address to which his PFS mailpieces were shipped.[1] The response confirmed that such a COA would be honored for mail directed to him at that address, but not for PFS mailpieces. Part (a) of interrogatory DBP/USPS-13 repeated DBP/USPS-1(e) and elicited the same response; part (b) then asked what would become of PFS mailpieces not forwarded from the temporary address, to which the response was that it would be returned to the office serving the PFS customer's primary address, Englewood. Apparently not liking the response to interrogatory DBP/USPS-13, Mr. Popkin argues with it in parts (a) and (b) of

[1] While there is no permissive element in the processing of COAs, Mr. Popkin's question is sensible in light of his awareness that the *Domestic Mail Manual* says, "709.4.2.3 Prohibited Use. Customers cannot have a temporary or permanent forwarding order active simultaneously with enrollment in PFS."

interrogatory DBP/USPS-22, and then asks what the Englewood Post Office would do with the returned PFS mailpiece.

In the situation defined by interrogatory DBP/USPS-22, Mr. Popkin has given the Postal Service conflicting instructions regarding the processing of his mail. By enrolling in PFS, he has asked that it be shipped from his primary address to a temporary one; by filing the COA for the temporary address, he has asked that it be sent to a third location. From the Postal Service perspective, it has a confused customer whose PFS shipment is now safe at the Post Office serving his primary residential address. Without specific instructions from the customer, the mail would most likely be held at that office pending receipt of further information from the customer.