

**MTAC Workgroup 129 - In person meeting**  
**USPS HQ, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, Washington DC**  
Date: 04/29/09      Time: 9:00 am-11 am (Eastern Time)

**Chairpersons - Greg Hall and Wanda Senne:**

- ✓ Welcomed workgroup members and reviewed MTAC Workgroup purpose
- ✓ Encourage to put yourself in the other's shoes
- ✓ There needs to have a balance in solutions
- ✓ Keep in mind caveats such as "Yeah -- BUT"
- ✓ Review issues collected, ideas are still coming in
- ✓ Further clarification of issues, especially from originators
- ✓ Will continue to provide information on issues
- ✓ Prioritize issues for resolution

**Introductions of workgroup members and asked why are you involve?**

- Interested in the rules and regulations impacting clients
- Would like to streamline rules & regulations
- Assist clients in better understanding of regulations
- Interested in what MTAC workgroup can do
- Assist in resolving customer's specific issues
- Enjoys involvement with MTAC
- Need to learn the MTAC process
- Act as a conduit & filter issues in regards to Presort Service
- Would like to come up with new concepts
- To simplify mail acceptance
- To offer support from USPS field stand-point
- Interested in learning classes of mail
- Identify opportunities in Parcel area
- Participate in hopeful revenue growth
- Newspaper's addressing & branding issues
- Better communication with addressing & non-profit (churches)
- Make standard mail more inviting & successful
- Assist non-profit organizations with direct mail
- Assist with strategies

**The workgroup reviewed the current list of ideas to add clarity.**

**Item number and comments listed. Will need to prioritize the list during a future meeting.**

1. Already under consideration, follow up with Steve Derring. However, need to make it an option. Some clients want to have it
2. Need input from Operations & Pricing. Define what an "attachment" is? ( letters & flats)

3. Makes it difficult for verification with statistics staff. Possibility of abused -for example: look-a-likes of Express Mail
4. Encourage lower minimum, 500 is too high
5. In process with self-folded mailers testing. Need to see results from Operations. Set issue aside for now
6. Reasons for this have to do with Inspections. Explore with Pricing. Is this more of a rate issue?
7. Extensive research conducted shows equipment not able to meet lighter weight, causes scoring and double feed among other things. A workaround solution is to use “fluff?”
8. Allow letters that are square to be mailed at automation rates. Similar to item #15
9. This is a communication issue with BMA, BME & Mailers. This item is more procedural and should be moved to Business Mail Support to assist with changing Mailing Agreements. Not in the scope of this workgroup.
10. More specifically – inside the piece
11. Too vague – not enough information, will be removed from the list.
12. Address placement on Flats does not include barcode
13. In the pipeline to make CMM product auto- compatible, need to move up in ranking once ranking of ideas is done
14. USPS considering increasing 5 inch to 6 inch. Might impact Audio visuals mailing
15. Same as Issue #8
16. Clarify the 1 inch glue spot in DMM  
Missing Issue # 17 & 18 (not on list)
19. More of a “Content Issue”. Recommend leaving alone at this time
20. Issue being handled in other location
21. Same as # 20
22. Online business reply system does exist, but needs revision to make it easier to use
23. Same as another - Issue # 4
24. Encourage linking CSR with the DMM
25. Recommended clear or “see through” substrates for marketing alternative
26. Return address for precancelled stamp should be allowed inside the piece
27. Same as # 3
28. Information is clearly stated same concept as Issue #3
29. Issue is clearly stated and relates to other permit imprint concerns
30. Relates to Issue # 2
31. Items 31 and 32 were clear
- 32.
33. Consistent request from churches however it’s a legal issue with US Code. There is a CSR that further explains
34. Items 34, 35, and 36 are related and clear
- 35.
- 36.
37. Decrease in USPS Mailpiece Design Analyst staff has caused even more delay in review of mailpiece design approval
38. Touch base with Sharron Harrison if more information is needed. It was very detailed when submitted

39. Can review with Sharon if more info is needed. It was clear. Also under review at USPS HQ under Sam Pulcrano, VP Sustainability
40. Could be a new concept or product category
41. Have good description of issue
42. Check with Pricing for Delivery Confirmation for Flats
43. Periodical Advisory Board will be able to provide input, but need to retain on our issue list to gather input from MTAC
44. Issue clearly defined by Eddie Mayhew and will remain on our issue list for input
45. New definition for defining a “ page”
46. Need ideas or templates for clients for selection of ancillary endorsements
47. Still pending engineering approval. More technical work needed with testing that has already been in the test mode for two years. Why is it such a lengthy process to bring new substrates to “market” in the postal area? The person who submitted the idea can provide a video of the product running through USPS equipment if the workgroup would like to review it.

**Closing - Greg & Wanda:** Wanda read a few of the 20 other ideas/ issues from Laine (?). Issue list will be consolidated, categorize and prioritize from the result of today’s meeting.

**Next Meeting is a conference call scheduled for May 13, 2009 Eastern Time. Other meetings will be every other week in a conference call format.**