## Mr. Cliff Guffey

President

## Certified Mail Tracking Number:

American Postal Workers
Union (APWU), AFL-CIO
1300 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005-4128
Dear Cliff,
As information, enclosed is a copy of the first Post Implementation Review for the Dallas, TX Area Mail Processing (AMP).

If you have any questions, please contact Rickey Dean at (202) 268-7412.
Sincerely,


Patrick M. Devine
A/Manager
Contract Administration (APWU)
Enclosure
----- PIR Data Entry Page

1. Losing Facility Information
Type of Distribution Consolidated: OriginatingFacility Name \& Type: Dallas TX P\&DC
Street Address: 401 DFW Turnpike
City: DallasState: TX
5D Facility ZIP Code: 75260
District: DallasArea: SouthwestFinance Number:
Current 3D ZIP Code(s): 751-753
Miles to Gaining Facility: 20.3
EXFC office: Yes
Plant Manager: Tony Keeton
Senior Plant Manager: Brenda BaughDistrict Manager: Victor Benavides
Gaining Facility Information
Facility Name \& Type: North Texas P\&DC
Street Address: 951 W Bethel Rd
City: CoppellState: TX
5D Facility ZIP Code: 75099
District: Dallas
Area: Southwest
Finance Number:
Current 3D ZIP Code(s): 750EXFC office: Yes
Plant Manager: Brenda Baugh
Senior Plant Manager: Brenda Baugh
District Manager: Victor Benavides
2. Background Information
Approval Date: December 23, 2009
Implementation Date: Oct-01-2010
PIR Type: 1st PIR
Date Range of Data: ..... Oct-01-2010: Mar-31-2011
Processing Days per Year: 310
Bargaining Unit Hours per Year: 1,750
EAS Hours per Year: 1,825

Date of HQ memo, DAR Factors/Cost of Borrowing/ New Facility Start-up Costs Update

Date \& Time this workbook was last saved: $\square$

## 4. Other Information

Area Vice President: Linda J. Weich
Vice President, Network Operations: David E. Williams
Area AMP Coordinator: Richard C Enriquez
NAI Contact: Doris Billingslea

Approval Signatures






GAMIMG FACHITY:


AREA CEFCE:


HEADOUARTERS:

Vice President, Network Operations:
Deve E Whams
Frerted thame


Comments: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Executive Summary

Last Saved: September 72011

PIR Type: 1st PIR
Oet-01-2010 - Mar-31-2011

| Losing Facility Name and Type: | Dallas TXP\&DC |
| :---: | :---: |
| Street Address: | 401 DFW Turnpike |
| City: | Dallas |
| State: | TX |
| Current SCF ZIP Code(s): | 751-753 |
| Type of Distribution Consolidated: | Originating |
| Gaining Facility Name and Type: | North Texas P\&DC |
| Street Address: | 951 W Bethel Rd |
| Clty: | Coppell |
| State: | TX |
| Current SCF ZIP Code(s): | 750 |

## Savings/Costs



## 

## Calculation References

Combined Losing and Gaining Facility Data:
Function 1 Workhour Costs
Non-Processing Craft Workhour Costs (less Maintenance \& Transportation) PCES/EAS Workhour Costs Transportation Costs Maintenance Costs

Total Annual Cost
$\frac{\text { Total One-Time Costs }}{\text { Total First Year }}$

Staffing

| Staffing |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Craft Position Total On-Rolls | 3,156 | 3,039 | 2,567 |
| PCES/EAS Position Total On-Rolls | 177 | 170 | 153 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st PIR vs Pre-AMP | 1st PIR vs Proposed (Approved) AMP | Approved AMP |
| Function 1 Workhour Savings | \$32,573,396 | \$24,271,952 | \$8,301,444 |
| Non-Processing Craft Workhour Savings (less MaintTrans) | \$3,011,622 | \$3,011,771 | (\$148) |
| PCES/EAS Workhour Savings | \$1,877,901 | \$1,231,508 | \$646,394 |
| Transportation Savings | (\$217,946) | (\$234,776) | \$16,830 |
| Maintenance Savings | (\$254,964) | (\$672,524) | \$417,560 |
| Space Savings | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Annual Savings | \$36,990,009 | \$27,607,930 | \$9,382,079 |
| Total One-Time Costs | (\$2,381,540) | \$965,137 | $(\$ 3,346,677)$ |
| Total First Year Savings | \$34,608,469 | \$28,573,066 | \$6,035,403 |
| Staffing |  |  |  |
| Craft Position Loss | 589 | 472 | 117 |
| PCES/EAS Position Loss | 24 | 17 | 7 |

PCES/EAS Position Total On-Rolls

| Pre AMP | Proposed | 1st PIR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$165,665,110 | \$157,363,667 | \$133,091,714 |
| \$6,391,679 | \$6,391,827 | \$3,380,056 |
| \$18,602,228 | \$17,955,835 | \$16,724,327 |
| \$16,730,076 | \$16,713,246 | \$16,948,022 |
| \$41,748,042 | \$41,330,482 | \$42,003,007 |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$249,137,136 | \$239,755,056 | \$212,147,127 |
| \$0 | (\$3,346,677) | (\$2,381,540) |
| \$249,137,136 | \$236,408,380 | \$209,765,587 |

## Summary Narrative

Last Saved: September 7, 2011

## Losing Facility Name and Type: Dallas TX P\&DC <br> Current SCF ZIP Code(s): <br> 751-753

Type of Distribution Consolidated: Originating
Gaining Facility Name and Type: North Texas P\&DC
Current SCF ZIP Code(s): 750

## Background:

This is the 1st Post Implementation Review (PIR) of the Dallas P\&DC Area Mail Processing (AMP) project. The AMP Study called for the consolidation of originating mail from the Dallas P\&DC (751-753) to the North Texas P\&DC $(750,754)$ due to the decline in originating volumes and to increase efficiencies. North Texas completed the AMP of the originating volumes from Dallas by the October 1,2010 deadline. The last day of cancellations at the Dallas P\&DC was Monday August 16, 2010. Previously a Saturday AMP had been in place. This Ist PIR used data for the first six months following implementation as a baseline to annualize the savings. The Dallas $\mathrm{P} \& D C$ is approximately 21 miles from the North Texas P\&DC.

## Financial Summary:

The 1st PIR baseline data was from the period October 1, 2010 to March 31, 2011. The average daily originating volume for the Dallas P\&DC was $1,138,472$ pieces per day at the time of the AMP study. The 1st PIR for the AMP shows an approximate annualized savings of $\$ 36,990,009$. The actual savings is significantly higher than the proposed savings in the approved AMP study. The reasons for this are the result of significant mail volume reduction from the before period at both Dallas and North Texas and other initiatives such as Function 1 Optimization that occurred concurrently with the AMP.

|  | $1^{\text {st }}$ PIR vs Pre AMP |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Annual Savings | $\$ 36,990,009$ | $\$ 27,607,930$ |
| Total First Year | $\$ 34,608,469$ | $\$ 28,573,066$ |

## Customer \& Service Impacts:

There were no changes either upgrades or downgrades to service standards for First-Class Mail or Priority Mail by processing the originating SCF 751-753 collection mail at the North Texas P\&DC.

| Dallas Before AMP EXFC |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal <br> Quarter | Overnight <br> Percentage | 2 Day <br> Percentage | 3 Day <br> Percentage |
| Q12010 | 95.91 | 93.38 | 91.28 |
| Q22010 | 95.75 | 94.75 | 93.46 |
| Q32010 | 96.75 | 95.80 | 94.57 |
| Q42010 | 96.31 | 94.42 | 95.14 |


| North Texas Before AMP EXFC |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal <br> Quarter | Overnight <br> Percentage | 2 Day <br> Percentage | 3 Day <br> Percentage |
| Q1 2010 | 95.96 | 93.92 | 89.53 |
| Q22010 | 96.05 | 94.22 | 92.03 |
| Q32010 | 96.54 | 95.94 | 93.90 |
| Q4 2010 | 97.22 | 94.34 | 93.71 |


| Dallas After AMP EXFC |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal <br> Quarter | Overnight <br> Percentage | 2 Day <br> Percentage | 3 Day <br> Percentage |
| Q12011 | 95.49 | 94.81 | 91.97 |
| Q22011 | 95.19 | 91.05 | 91.13 |


| North Texas After AMP EXFC |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal <br> Quarter | Overnight <br> Percentage | 2 Day <br> Percentage | 3 Day <br> Percentage |
| Q1 2011 | 96.18 | 93.80 | 90.83 |
| Q22011 | 95.09 | 92.04 | 89.32 |

## Transportation:

Transportation supporting the Dallas P\&DC AMP is a combination of HCR and PVS. Originally only seven Dallas stations were going to have PVS trips established to take collection mail directly to the North Texas P\&DC. PVS trips for collection mail from other Dallas stations and HCR's for 751 offices were going to hub out of the Dallas P\&DC.

The plan was changed after the study was approved to advance the arrival of collection mail volumes at the North Texas P\&DC and to support the 24 Hour Clock indicators. All PVS schedules for the Dallas stations and HCR's serving 751 offices were modified to dispatch collection mail direct to the North Texas P\&DC. The modified PVS schedules added 414,551 Annual Miles to the PVS AMP proposal. This led to an annual increase in PVS costs of $\$ 516,169$. However, the LDC 34 costs for the 1 st PIR have actually dropped by $\$ 48,794$ per year as a result of a PVS review. Total PVS schedules dropped from 194 to 186 . Mileage was added to 12 HCR contracts, but total HCR costs declined by $\$ 522,738$ per year due to the termination of HCR 752L2, Dallas P\&DC to the Houston and North Houston P\&DC's, at an annual savings of $\$ 447,218$ per year, the termination of the 752 M 3 , Dallas P\&DC to Greenville contract at an annual savings of $\$ 45,901$ per year, and the consolidation of the two THS contracts serving the two plants which resulted in a savings of $\$ 132,559$ per year. Overall transportation costs went up $\$ 217,946$ annually versus Pre AMP.

## Staffing Impacts:

The AMP proposal had projected a reduction of 117 craft positions, including 111 Function 1 and 3 Function 3B positions. The baseline date for the staffing was April 15, 2009. At the end of the $1^{\text {st }}$ PIR, total craft reductions were 589 , which were 472 more positions than the 117 proposed by the AMP. The Dallas P\&DC craft positions were reduced by 544 positions, and the North Texas P\&DC craft positions were reduced by 45 from the Pre AMP complement.

Craft = FTR + PTR + PTF + Cazuals
${ }^{2}$ Craft $=F 1+$ FA at Losing: F1 only at Gaining


|  | $3 \times 182$ |  |  |  |  | Wexters |  |  |  |  | H5 NWT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pre AMP | Proposed | PIR | PIR vs Pre AMP | PIR vs Froposed | Pre AMP | Proposed | PIR | PIR vs Pre AMP | FIR vs Proposed |  |
| Craft | 1.780 | 1,515 | 1,236 | (544) | (279) | 1,376 | 1.524 | 1.331 | (45) | (193) | (589) |
| Management | 104 | 84 | 74 | (30) | (10) | 73 | 86 | 79 | 6 | (7) | (24) |

[^0]Not all of the staffing reductions are attributed to the AMP. Function 1 Optimization, the December 2009 Incentive Retirement Offer, the NRP process, as well as declining volumes contributed to the staffing reductions.

EAS staffing decreased by 17 positions from the AMP proposal and decreased by 24 positions from the Pre-AMP staffing.

## Maintenance Impacts:

The AMP proposal had projected a Maintenance Savings of $\$ 417,560$ per year. At the $1^{\text {st }}$ PIR, the Maintenance Costs had increased versus Pre AMP by $\$ 254,964$ per year. Two equipment deployments were the main contributors to the increased costs. The AMP had proposed a reduction of 13,837 hours per year in LDC 36 at the Dallas P\&DC. However these savings were offset due to the planned deployment of an FSS at the Dallas P\&DC in January 2011, which required 7 ET's. The required FSS training led to the increased Maintenance training costs at the Dallas P\&DC. LDC 38 costs at the Dallas P\&DC increased due to the excessing of Function 1 employees into residual custodial positions.

At the North Texas P\&DC, Maintenance costs increased primarily due the deployment of 10 AFCS 200 machines and the deployment of a High Speed Tray Sorter. Maintenance Stockroom and Supplies were up $\$ 1,117,068$ due to adding AFCS 200, HSTS, and LCUS spares to inventory. Training costs were up due to additional training for the AFCS 200, HSTS, LCUS, and the Tray De-palletizer. Costs were up in LDC 36, 37, and 38, due to filling vacancies.

## One Time Costs:

Total One Time Costs for the AMP were projected to be $\$ 3,346,677$ which included $\$ 2,454,977$ in equipment relocation costs and $\$ 891,700$ in one-time facility costs. The Total One-Time Costs thru the $1^{\text {st }}$ PIR were $\$ 2,381,540$, or a reduction of $\$ 965,137$ from the proposed costs.

Instead of purchasing a Tray De-palletizer \& Singular System for $\$ 660,000$, a system was relocated from the Dallas NDC for a cost of $\$ 190,000$, a savings of $\$ 470,000$. The costs for the High Speed Tray Sorter were $\$ 304,000$ less than the proposed costs. DBCS-OSS relocation costs from Dallas to North Texas were reduced due to the Multi-Mode enhancement being added to DIOSS machines.

## Space Impacts:

With the removal of the 010 system at the Dallas P\&DC, a FSS was deployed which occupies $25,846 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of work floor space.

## Service Performance and Customer Satisfaction Measurement

Last Saved: September 7, 2011

| PIR Type: |  |
| ---: | :--- |
| Implementation Date: |  |

Losing Facility: Dallas TX P\&DC
District: Dallas


Gaining Facility: North Texas P\&DC District: Dallas

(15) Notes: $\qquad$

* Customer Satisfaction Measurement (CSM) became Customer Experience Measurement (CEM) in 2010. Data reflects most recently completed quarter available in CEM.
Q1 Overall Satisfaction (Overall Experience)
Q4a Satisfaction with Receiving (Experience with receiving)
Q8a Satisfaction with Sending (Experience with sending)
Q12a Satisfaction with most frequently visited PO (Experience with most frequently visited PO)
Q16a Satisfaction with most recent contact with USPS (Experience with most recent contact with USPS)
Q19 Likely to recommend the USPS

| CFMM $\times 4.2010$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential \%ENG/G |  | Bus/Prfd \%ENG/G |
| Question \# | Residentialtop Two Box | Sm/Med Bus Top Two Box |
| Q1 | 77.3\% | 69.6\% |
| Q4a | 82.6\% | 75.0\% |
| Q8a | 86.3\% | 79.6\% |
| Q12a | 86.5\% | 81.4\% |
| Q16a | 75.4\% | 69.5\% |
| Q19 | 50.1\% | 35.9\% |
| CEMH* Q2 2011 |  |  |
| Question \# | Residential Top Two Box | Sm/Med Bus Top Two Box |
| Q1 | 78.8\% | 72.6\% |
| Q4a | 83.8\% | 76.0\% |
| Q8a | 88.2\% | 81.5\% |
| Q12a | 86.8\% | 83.2\% |
| Q16a | 79.4\% | 69.5\% |
| 019 | 64.7\% | 35.4\% |

Type of Distribution Consolidated: $\qquad$
$\square$ anducree

Len Saved nere 18, 2011

$\qquad$
andualuze





Workhour Costs - Losing Facility
Losing Facility: Dallas TX P\&DC
Lent Swed June 16, 2011

Type of Oistibution Consollidatad: $\qquad$ Originating
 aknlualize
ankualize



Date Range of Data:
Ox.01.2010
to Mans 31-20

Ankualzen



|  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| (1)OperabonNumbers Number | Annud FHP Votume (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (11) Annuaprodectuly, (13) |  |  | Amuas Worthour Cotis |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rt*MP | Propoted | 4318 R | Preamp | Propoend |  | preamp | Propomed | ${ }_{1 \times t}$ P1R | Preant | Propores | 131 PIR | preastip | Propoed | 14 PIR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | - | No calc |  | $\underline{3}$ |  | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | $\underline{ }$ | No Cale |  | 4.3 3 |  | 50 |
|  | , |  |  | R |  |  | 4 | 0 |  | + | Nocalc |  | - ${ }^{\text {che }}$ |  | 50 |
| A ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.080 |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,457615 |  |
| Totals | 1780231372 | 1,47,08547 | 1,315,605,274 | 50875789938 | 3,708, 599,092 | 3,103,811,600 | 3268s 588 | 1,448,981 | 1,229,144 | 2:233 | 18661 | 2,525 | \$913804433 | se9, 560,466 | \$54,263,761 |
|  |  | S | $\square$ |  | 3 | $\square$ |  | $\geq$ | - |  | 5 | - |  | - | $\square$ |
|  |  | moses Annum fhp Va | umo | varanc | 3 Anumi Tphor MAT | HVatume |  | ancas Annues Worto |  |  | amose Ammuap Protu |  | Vari | ceas Ancus werthe | costh |
|  | Changa Analysia | $\operatorname{cix}_{\substack{(17) \\ 0}}$ | $\operatorname{sit}+{ }^{(18)} \text { vi Propored }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Change } \\ & \text { Anslysis } \end{aligned}$ |  | (20) <br> 1द्व Pire ve Propolesd | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Change } \\ & \text { Analyzis } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Changee } \\ & \text { Analyas } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Change } \\ & \text { Anslvais } \end{aligned}$ |  | AtPR in propoond |
|  | Units | [444,026, 648) | (81, 700, 2057 | Units | (1, $, 38,767,389)$ | 198,212,508 | Units | [1, 054,304) | (579,897] | Units | 302 | 864 | Unhs | \$ $533,486,733\}$ | (1815,766.805) |
|  | Parcent | -24.8\% | -5.8\% | Percent | -39.0\% | 6.8\% | Percent | -46.3\% | 29.7\% | Parcent | 13.54\% | 52.0\% | Percent | -40.6\% | -22.5\% |

Workhour Costs - Gaining Facllity
Len Saved June 16, 2011
Gaining Facility: North Texas P\&OC

Type of Distribution Consolidatod $\qquad$ Originating




PIR Type*: 15 PI
$\frac{751}{}$ Dita

Date Range of Data:
001012040
to
Ma*S1-2011

Anvorizeo
annualizeo


Type of Distribution Consolidated: $\qquad$
$\square$ anducree

Len Saved nere 18, 2011

$\qquad$
andualuze





Workhour Costs - Losing Facility
Losing Facility: Dallas TX P\&DC
Lent Swed June 16, 2011

Type of Oistibution Consollidatad: $\qquad$ Originating
 aknlualize
ankualize



Date Range of Data:
Ox.01.2010
to Mans 31-20

Ankualzen



|  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| (1)OperabonNumbers Number | Annud FHP Votume (1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (11) Annuaprodectuly, (13) |  |  | Amuas Worthour Cotis |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rt*MP | Propoted | 4318 R | Preamp | Propoend |  | preamp | Propomed | ${ }_{1 \times t}$ P1R | Preant | Propores | 131 PIR | preastip | Propoed | 14 PIR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | - | No calc |  | $\underline{3}$ |  | 50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | $\underline{ }$ | No Cale |  | 4.3 3 |  | 50 |
|  | , |  |  | R |  |  | 4 | 0 |  | + | Nocalc |  | - ${ }^{\text {che }}$ |  | 50 |
| A ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.080 |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,457615 |  |
| Totals | 1780231372 | 1,47,08547 | 1,315,605,274 | 50875789938 | 3,708, 599,092 | 3,103,811,600 | 3268s 588 | 1,448,981 | 1,229,144 | 2:233 | 18661 | 2,525 | \$913804433 | se9, 560,466 | \$54,263,761 |
|  |  | S | $\square$ |  | 3 | $\square$ |  | $\geq$ | - |  | 5 | - |  | - | $\square$ |
|  |  | moses Annum fhp Va | umo | varanc | 3 Anumi Tphor MAT | HVatume |  | ancas Annues Worto |  |  | amose Ammuap Protu |  | Vari | ceas Ancus werthe | costh |
|  | Changa Analysia | $\operatorname{cix}_{\substack{(17) \\ 0}}$ | $\operatorname{sit}+{ }^{(18)} \text { vi Propored }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Change } \\ & \text { Anslysis } \end{aligned}$ |  | (20) <br> 1द्व Pire ve Propolesd | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Change } \\ & \text { Analyzis } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Changee } \\ & \text { Analyas } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Change } \\ & \text { Anslvais } \end{aligned}$ |  | AtPR in propoond |
|  | Units | [444,026, 648) | (81, 700, 2057 | Units | (1, $, 38,767,389)$ | 198,212,508 | Units | [1, 054,304) | (579,897] | Units | 302 | 864 | Unhs | \$ $533,486,733\}$ | (1815,766.805) |
|  | Parcent | -24.8\% | -5.8\% | Percent | -39.0\% | 6.8\% | Percent | -46.3\% | 29.7\% | Parcent | 13.54\% | 52.0\% | Percent | -40.6\% | -22.5\% |

Workhour Costs - Gaining Facllity
Len Saved June 16, 2011
Gaining Facility: North Texas P\&OC

Type of Distribution Consolidatod $\qquad$ Originating




PIR Type*: 15 PI
$\frac{751}{}$ Dita

Date Range of Data:
001012040
to
Ma*S1-2011

Anvorizeo
annualizeo







(27) notes:
$\qquad$ mhxa w wherawayd

Other Workhour Move Analysis
Losing Facility: Dallas TX PSDC Gaining Facility: North Texas P\&DC Date Range of Data:
10/01/10
1st PIR PIR Other Gaining Craft Workhours
Losing Facility





Distribution to Other PIR Worksheet Tabs



## Staffing - Craft

Last Saved: September 7, 2011
PIR Type: 1st PIR




## Transportation - PVS

Last Saved: September 7, 2011

|  | PIR Type: | 1st PIR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date Range of Data: | Oct-01-2010 - to $-\quad$ Mar-31-2011 |  |


| Finance Number: | (1) <br> Pre AMP | (2) <br> Proposed | (3) <br> 1st PIR | (4) <br> Variance 1st PIR vs Pre AMP | (5) <br> Variance 1st PIR vs Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PVS Owned Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seven Ton Trucks | - | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Eleven Ton Trucks | 16 | 21 | 21 | 5 | 0 |
| Single Axle Tractors | 18 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| Tandem Axle Tractors | + | 26 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| Spotters | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| PVS Transportation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Schedules | 194 | 201 | 186 | (8) | (15) |
| Total Annual Mileage | 2,160,514 | 2,255,994 | 2,670,545 | \$510,031 | \$414,551 |
| Total Mileage Costs | \$1,728,411 | \$1,804,795 | \$2,136,436 | \$408,025 | \$331,641 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVS Leases |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Vehicles Leased | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total Lease Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVS Workhour Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| LDC 31 (617, 679, 764) | \$97.477 | \$97,477 | \$221,960 | \$124,484 | \$124,484 |
| LDC $34(765,766)$ | \$12,169,104 | \$12,169,104 | \$12,120,311 | (\$48,794) | $(\$ 48,794)$ |
| Total Workhour Costs | \$12.266,581 | \$12,266,581 | \$12,342,271 | \$75,690 | \$75,690 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

(11) Total 1st PIR vs Pre AMP Transportation-PVS Savings \$516,169
(This number added to the Executive Summary

Gaining Facility: North Texas P\&DC
Finance Number:

|  | (6) <br> Pre AMP | (7) <br> Proposed | (8) <br> PIR | (9) <br> Variance ist PIR vs Pre AMP | (10) Variance 1st PIR vs Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PVS Owned Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seven Ton Trucks | - | 0 |  |  |  |
| Eleven Ton Trucks | ( $\mathrm{S}=0$ | 0 |  |  |  |
| Single Axle Tractors | + | 0 |  |  |  |
| Tandem Axle Tractors | - 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Spotters | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| PVS Transportation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Schedules | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total Annual Mileage | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total Mileage Costs | 0 | \$0 |  | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVS Leases |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Vehicles Leased | - 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total Lease Costs | 4 S 50 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVS Workhour Costs |  |  |  |  |  |
| LDC 31 (617, 679, 764) | \$222,817 | \$222,817 | \$255,271 | \$32,454 | \$32,454 |
| LDC $34(765,766)$ | 4 | \$0 | \$0 |  |  |
| Total Workhour Costs | \$ \$222817 | \$222,817 | \$255,271 | \$32,454 | \$32,454 |
|  | - |  |  |  |  |

(12) Total 1st PIR vs Proposed Transportation-PVS Savings:
\$439,785
(This number added to the Executive Summary)
(13) Notes: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Losing Facility: Dallas TX P\&DC

PIR Type: 1st PIR
Type of Distribution Consolidated: Originating Data of HCR Data File: July 2010

| (1) <br> Route \# | (2) <br> Pre AMP <br> Annual <br> Mileage | (3) <br> Proposed Annual Mileage | (4) <br> 1st PIR Annual Mileage | (5) <br> Pre AMP <br> Annual Cost | (6) <br> Proposed Annual Cost | (7) <br> 1st PIR Annual Cost | (8) <br> Pre AMP <br> Annual <br> Cost/Mile | (9) <br> Proposed Annual Costmile | (10) <br> 1st PIR <br> Annual Cost/Mile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 75230 | 27.603 |  |  | \$36,655 |  |  | \$1.33 |  |  |
| 75233 | 57,803 |  |  | \$106,409 |  |  | \$1.84 |  |  |
| 75332 | 204,627 |  |  | \$451,129 |  |  | \$ \$2.20 |  |  |
| 752 L 3 | 45,594 |  |  | \$87,590 |  |  | - \$1.92 |  |  |
| 752 L 7 | 211.873 |  |  | \$231,653 |  |  | \$1.09 |  |  |
| 752L8 | 75,439 |  |  | \$111,546 |  |  | \$1.48 |  |  |
| 752M0 | 71,472 |  |  | \$107,917 |  |  | \$1.51 |  |  |
| 752M1 | 17,532 |  |  | \$40,634 |  |  | \$2.32 |  |  |
| 752 M 5 | 89,041 |  |  | \$207,686 |  |  | \$2.33 |  |  |
| 752M6 | 139,082 |  |  | \$170,953 |  |  | -\$1.23 |  |  |
| 752M7 | 107,649 |  |  | \$138,857 |  |  | \$1.29 |  |  |
| 753 L 2 | 177,447 |  |  | \$415,050 |  |  | \$2.34 |  |  |
| 75213 | 65,614 |  |  | \$114,118 |  |  | \$ \$1.74 |  |  |
| 752M3 | 38,643 |  |  | \$46,060 |  |  | \$1.19 |  |  |
| 75253 | 0 |  |  | - \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75254 | 0 |  |  | - \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 |  |  | - \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 752L2 | 0 |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | - \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |


| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | S0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$ $\$ 0$ |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| Totals | 1,329,420 | 1,244,003 | 1,580,334 | \$2,266,258 | \$2,132,957 | \$1,743,520 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Var | ces Total Annual | osts |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Change Analysis | (11) <br> 1st PIR vs Pre AMP | (12) <br> 1st PIR vs Proposed |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Dollars | (\$522,738) | (\$389,437) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Percent | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  |

Transportation - HCR
Last Saved: June 16, 2011
Gaining Facility: North Texas P\&DC
Type of Distribution Consolidated: Originating
CET for Inbound Dock:
PIR Type: Originating
CET for OGP: $\qquad$
Date of HCR Data File: July 2010
CET for Cancellations:

| (5) <br> Pre AMP Annual Cost | (6) <br> Proposed Annual Cost | (7) <br> 1st PIR Annual Cost | (8) <br> Pre AMP <br> Annual <br> Costmile | (9) <br> Proposed Annual Cost/Mile | (10) <br> 1st PIR Annual Cost/Mile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$246,009 |  |  | \$6.38 |  |  |
| - \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0: |
| \$0 |  |  | - |  | \#DIV/0! |
| S0 |  |  | , |  | \#DIV/0! |
| - ${ }^{\text {SO}}$ |  |  | , |  | \#DIV/0! |
| - \$0 |  |  | (20 |  | \#DIV/0: |
| \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| - 50 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0: |
| - \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0: |
| - 80 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| - \$0 |  |  | (2mer |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$ \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \% 80 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV10! |
| - \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVI0! |
| - \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| - \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$ \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0: |
| \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| \$0 |  |  | - |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$ 80 |  |  | , |  | \#DIV/0: |
| - \$0 |  |  | + |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$ \$0 |  |  | - |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$0 |  |  | , |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$0 |  |  | , |  | \#DIV/0! |
| - \$0 |  |  | - |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$0 |  |  | , |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| - \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO |
| - $\$ 0$ |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$ \$0 |  |  | - |  | \#DIV/0! |
| \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |

PIR Transportation HCR - Gaining

| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  | - |  | \#DIVIO! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  | - |  | \#DIVIO! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 80 |  |  | (2xil |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  | ( |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  | , |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  | 2-20 |  | \#DIV10! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| Totals | 38,570 | 45,964 | 98,648 | \$246,009 | \$286,096 | \$470,524 | , |  |  |


| Variances Total Annual Costs |  |  | Summary HCR Losing \& Gaining |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Change Analysis | $(11)$ <br> 1st PIR vs Pre AMP | (12) <br> 1st PIR vs Proposed |  |  |  |
|  | $\$ 224,515$ | $\$ 184,428$ |  |  |  |
| Percent | $91.3 \%$ | $64.5 \%$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | (13) <br> 1st PR ve Pre <br> AMP | (14) <br> 1st PIR vs Proposed |  |  |
| Losing | $(\$ 522,738)$ | $(\$ 389,437)$ |  |  |  |

(13) Total 1st PIR vs Pre AMP Transportation-HCR Savings:
(\$298,223)
(from losing and gaining facilities)
(14) Total 1st PIR vs Proposed Transportation-HCR Savings: $\quad(\$ 205,009)$ (from losing and gaining facilities)

| Total Transportation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (15) <br> 1st PIR vs Pre <br> AMP | $(16)$ <br> 1st PIR vs Proposed |
| HCR | $(\$ 298,223)$ | $(\$ 205,009)$ |
| PVS | $\$ 516,169$ | $\$ 439,785$ |

(15) Total 1st PIR vs Pre AMP Transportation (PVS \& HCR): $\$ 217,946$
(This number carried forward to the Executive Summary)
(16) Total 1st PIR vs Proposed Transportation (PVS \& HCR):
$\$ 234,776$
(This number carried forward to the Executive Summary)

## MPE Inventory

Last Saved: September 7, 2011
Data Extraction Date: 04/22/11
PIR Type: $\qquad$ Date Range of Data: $\qquad$ - to - $\qquad$ Mar-31-2011

Gaining Facility: North Texas P\&DC
Losing Facility: Dallas TX P\&DC

| Equipment | (1) <br> Pre AMP | (2) <br> Proposed | (3) <br> 1st PIR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AFCS | 7. | 0 | 0 |
|  | \% |  |  |
| AFSM-ALL | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| APPS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| closs | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| CSBCS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DBCS | 30 | 40 | 37 |
| DBCS-OSS | 6. | 0 | 2 |
| DIOSS | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| FSS | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SPBS | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| UFSM | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| FC / MICRO MARK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ROBOT GANTRY | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| HSTS/HSUS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LCTS / LCUS | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| LIPS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MLOCR-ISS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MPBCS-OSS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TABBER | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| POWERED INDUSTRIAL VEHICLE | $46$ | 46. | 46 |
|  | \% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | [ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\pm 104$ | 2 97 | 99 |


| Equipment | (4) <br> Pre AMP | (5) <br> Proposed | (6) 1st PIR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AFCS | 7. | 11 | 13 |
| AFCS 200 | S | $\cdots$ | 11 |
| AFSM-ALL | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| APPS | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| closs | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| csBcs | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DBCS | 31 | 25 | 28 |
| DBCS-OSS | 5 | 9 | 2 |
| DIOSS | 7 | 9 | 11 |
| FSS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SPBS | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| UFSM | +4 $1 \times$ | 1 | 0 |
| FC / MICRO MARK | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ROBOT GANTRY | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HSTS/HSUS | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| LCTS /LCUS | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| LIPS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MLOCR-ISS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MPBCS-OSS | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TABBER | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| POWERED INDUSTRIAL VEHICLE | $78$ | 78 | 78 |
| LCREM |  |  | 1 |
|  | W |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Totals | - 138 | 144 | 159 |


| (7) <br> Proposed Relocation Costs | (8) <br> 1st PIR <br> Relocation Costs | (9) <br> Variance in Costs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$892,519 | \$866,513 | $(\$ 26,006)$ |
| \$82,056 | \$8,800 | (\$73,256) |
| \$0 | $\$ 0$ | \$0 |
| \$10,929 | \$400 | (\$10,529) |
| \$0 | \$0 | 50 |
| \$77,387 | \$5,200 | (\$72,187) |
| \$17,115 | \$3,200 | (\$13,915) |
| \$8,723 | \$2,000 | $(\$ 6,723)$ |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$33,600 | \$19,600 | (\$14,000) |
| \$7,021 | \$0 | (\$7,021) |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| $\$ 0$ | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$1,320,000 | \$1,016,000 | (\$304,000) |
| \$5,627 | \$5,627 | \$0 |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$0. | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| \$0 |  |  |
| \$0 |  |  |
| \$0 |  |  |
| \$0 |  |  |
| \$2,454,977 | \$1,927,340 | (\$527,637) |

(10) Notes:
L_

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Space Evaluation and } \\
\text { Other Costs }
\end{gathered}
$$

## Maintenance

Last Saved: Soptember 7, 2011

(13) Notes: $\qquad$

## Distribution Changes

Last Saved: September 7, 2011
Losing Facility : Dallas TX P\&DC
PIR Type: $\qquad$
Type of Distribution Consolidated: Originating
Date Range of Data: $\qquad$ - to --Mar-31-2011

## Place a " X " next to the DMM labeling list(s) revised

 as result of the approved AMP.
## Identify the date of the Postal Bulletin that contained DMM labeling list revisions.

(1)

| DMM L001 |  | DMM L011 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DMM L002 | X | DMM L201 |
| DMM L003 |  | DMM L601 |
| DMM L004 |  | DMM L602 |
| DMM L005 |  | DMM L603 |
| DMM L006 |  | DMM L604 |
| DMM L007 |  | DMM L605 |
| DMM L008 |  | DMM L606 |
| DMM L009 |  | DMM L607 |
| DMM L010 |  | DMM L801 |

(2) $\qquad$

Was the Service Standard Directory updated for the approved AMP?
${ }^{(3)}$ Yes.
(4) Drop Shipments for Destination Entry Discounts FAST Appointment Summary Report

| Month | Losing / Gaining Facility | NASS Code | Facility Name | Total Schd | No-Show |  | Late Arrival |  | Open |  | Closed |  | Unschd Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% | Count | \% |  |
| May '10 | Losing Facility | 752 | Dallas TX P\&DC | 471 | 36 | 7.64\% | 176 | 37.37\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 435 | 92.36\% | 3 |
| Jun '10 | Losing Facility | 752 | Dallas TX P\&DC | 453 | 37 | 8.17\% | 182 | 40.18\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 416 | 91.83\% | 3 |
| May '10 | Gaining Facility | 750 | North Texas P\&DC | 736 | 122 | 16.58\% | 273 | 37.09\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 614 | 83.42\% | 17 |
| Jun '10 | Gaining Facility | 750 | North Texas P\&DC | 745 | 109 | 14.63\% | 288 | 38.66\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 636 | 85.37\% | 6 |

(5) Notes: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Losing Facility: Dallas TX P\&DC
5-Digit ZIP Code: 75260
Data Extraction Date: $\qquad$ -

1. Collection Points

Number picked up before $1 \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{m}$.
Number picked up between $1.5 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$.
Number picked up after 5 p.m.
Tolal Number of Collection Points

| 3-Digit ZIP Code: 751 |  |  |  | 3-Digit ZIP Code: 752 |  |  |  | 3-Digit ZIP Code: 753 |  |  |  | 3-Digit ZIP Code: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Pre |  |  |  | Pre |  |  |  | Pre |  | PIR |  |
| Mon. Frit | Sat. | Mon. - Fri. | Sat. | Mon. Frit | Sat. | Mon. - Fri. | Sat. | Mont-Fin. | Sat | Mon. - Fri. | Sat. | Mon. Firi. | Sat. | Mon. Fri. | Sat. |
| 83 | 159 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | - 0 . | 0 |  |  | U 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 288 | 135 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 9 | 9 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| 0 | 0 |  |  | 8 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 9 |  |  | 0. | 0 |  |  |
| 374 | 294 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

2. How many collection boxes are currently designated for "local delivery"?
3. How many "local delivery" boxes were removed as a resutt of AMP? 0
4. Delivery Performance Report

Camers reluming before $5 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$.

| Pre AMP: |  | 1st PIR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quaterfy | Percent | Quarter/FY | Percent |
| Q1Frog | 51.0\% | Q1Frı1 |  |
| 04FY08 | 50.0\% | Q2FY11 |  |
| 03 Fros | 594\% |  |  |
| Q2 FYos | 64.44 |  |  |

5. Retall Unit Inside Losing Facility (Window Service Times)

|  | Preamp |  | Proposed |  | 1st PIR |  | Monday | Pre AMP |  | Proposed |  | 1st PIR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Start | End | Start | End | Start | End |  | Star | End | Stat | End | Start | End |
| Monday | 700 | 2359 | 7.00 | $23: 58$ | 7:00 | 23:59 |  | 900: | 2000 | 9.00 | $800 \mathrm{PM}{ }^{\text {- }}$ | 9:00 | 8:00 PM. |
| Tuescay | 7.09 | 2359 | 700 | 23.59 | $7: 00$ | 23:59 |  | 9.90 | 20.00 | 9.00 | $8.00 \mathrm{PM}{ }^{\text {- }}$ | 9:00 | 8:00 PM . |
| Wednesday | 7 mog | 2359 | 7.00 | 23:59 | 7:00 | 23:59 | Wednesday | 950 | 20:00 | \$900 | 8,00 PM - | 9:00 | 8:00 PM * |
| Thursday | 700 | 33.59 | 700 | $23: 59$ | 700 | 23:59 | Thurscay | 9090 | 2000 | 9:00 | B00 PM | $9: 00$ | $8: 00 \mathrm{PM}$. |
| Friday | 700 | 2359 | 7.00 | 23.59 | 7:00 | $23: 59$ | Friday | 9.00: | 20.60 | 900 | 8:00 PM * | 9:00 | 8:00 PM ${ }^{\text {* }}$ |
| Saturday | 800 | 2353 | $8: 00$ | 23.50 | 8.00 | 23:59 | Saturday | closed | cosed | closed | closed | closed | closed |

7. Can customera obtain a bocal postmark in accordance with applicable policies in the Postal Operations Marnual?
8. Notes:

Gaining Facility: North Texas P\&DC
9. What postmark is printed on collection mail?

4. Did you utilize the acquired space as planned? Explain

FSS was deployed at Dallas P\&DC in January 2011
$\qquad$
5. Notes: Instead of purchasing TDS (Tray De-palletizer \& Singular System), TDS was moved to North Texas from Dallas NDC at a cost of $\$ 190,000$ instead of the purchase price of $\$ 660,000$. Modifications to LCUS were $\$ 220,000$. Expansion of IPSS room $-\$ 14,640$. Moving CFS $\$ 8,400$. APPS incine belf - $\$ 5,200$. Remove portion of LOG $-\$ 16,000$.




[^0]:    Cratt = FTR + PTR + PTF $+C$ anuals

