



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Delivering Reform:

How Americans Would Fix the U.S. Postal Service

Conducted by the Program for Public Consultation, School of Public Policy, University of Maryland

Field Dates: July 2 – August 12, 2015

NATIONAL SAMPLE

Total sample size: 714

Oversample: 1542 from MD (533), OK (526), and VA (483)

Margin of error: +/-3.7%

OKLAHOMA

State of Oklahoma: 443

Oversample in OK-4: 92

Congressional District 4 total: 181

Total sample size: 535

Margin of error in OK: +/- 4.7%

Margin of error in OK-4: +/- 7.3%

VIRGINIA

Total sample size: 505

Margin of error in VA: +/- 4.4%

MARYLAND

State of Maryland: 432

Oversample in MD-7: 118

Congressional District 7 total: 174

Total sample size: 550

Margin of error in MD: +/- 4.7%

Margin of error in MD-7: +/- 7.4%

AGGREGATE

Aggregate sample size: 2256

BRIEFING

These days there is much discussion about a number of issues related to the US Postal Service. Congress is currently considering several bills for addressing these issues.

The broadest issue is that US Postal Service has been under a lot of financial pressure because of two problems.

- The level of Postal Service business went down a lot during the economic downturn.
- With the growth of the Internet, the volume of some kinds of mail have gone down, which has reduced Postal Service revenues--i.e., the money it makes. Though the Internet has been good for the Postal Service's package business, it has also reduced the use of first class mail.

Because of these two problems the US Postal Service lost quite a lot of money between 2008 and 2012 and it had to borrow money as a result.

More recently, two things have happened that have improved this situation.

- The economy improved, increasing mailing activity and thus increasing the Postal Service's revenues.
- The Postal Service made many changes in the way it operates, significantly reducing the size of its workforce and making its operations more efficient, and thus reducing costs.

But right now **the Postal Service is still not making enough money to meet the requirements that Congress has set for it.**

Numerous options have been proposed by the Postmaster General and in Congress to address this problem.

Many of these options would make the Postal Service more efficient. But they are controversial because they also require making changes that could reduce the level of service to customers. We will look at these proposals shortly.

Another option is to reduce a certain requirement that Congress has placed on the Postal Service related to its retiree health benefits program. This option has stimulated quite a lot of attention and debate because if Congress were to remove or modify this requirement this would substantially lessen the pressure on the Postal Service's finances. So we will address it first.

RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS

Here is the controversy. For many years the Postal Service paid for the current health insurance costs of employees and people who previously worked for the postal service and are now retired.

In 2006, Congress made a new requirement that the Postal Service also make payments into a fund to cover 100% of:

- the projected *future* health insurance costs of all current retirees

- the projected *future* health insurance costs of all current workers for when they retire.

These required payments were, on average, \$5.5 billion per year over ten years.

For the first few years the Postal Service was able to make these payments so that the fund reached the level of covering approximately 50% of those projected future costs.

However, with the economic downturn and the other financial problems the Postal Service encountered, the Postmaster General said it did not have the funds to keep making these payments. Thus, it missed several payments and is now \$16.7 billion in arrears.

The Postmaster General has requested that the law be changed so that the Postal Service is not required to make further payments to the fund.

So the proposal for you to now consider is for Congress to change the law and either end or reduce the requirement for making these pre-payments for projected future retirement health benefits.

Here are two arguments in **favor** of this option. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Arguments in Favor of Policy Option

[Q1.] This requirement for a \$5.5 billion payments every year is siphoning off all the Postal Service’s available money. This prevents the Postal Service from investing to improve its capacity and become more efficient. Letting it become more efficient will put the Postal Service in a stronger position to meet all its future obligations.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	30	44	74	17	9	26	1
GOP	30	43	73	17	10	27	
Dem.	35	41	76	16	7	23	1
Indep.	22	48	70	21	9	30	1
Oklahoma	28	52	80	14	5	19	<1
GOP	24	51	75	18	6	24	1
Dem.	34	55	89	8	3	11	
Indep.	26	47	73	22	5	27	
OK-4	27	49	76	17	6	23	<1

Virginia	27	54	81	13	5	18	1
GOP	30	47	77	16	6	22	1
Dem.	27	57	84	11	3	14	2
Indep.	25	58	83	13	5	18	
Maryland	28	46	74	18	6	24	2
GOP	26	48	74	19	6	25	1
Dem.	31	42	73	18	8	26	2
Indep.	23	52	75	18	4	22	4
MD-7	31	43	74	16	8	24	2

[Q2.] The requirement to prefund all future obligations at the 100% level is completely out of the ordinary. With only one exception, no other government agency is required to do this. About a third of corporations who offer retiree health benefits do any prefunding. The level of prefunding the Postal Service has already reached (about 50%) is far more than what corporations do and is fully adequate.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	49	34	83	11	6	17	1
GOP	53	29	82	12	6	18	
Dem.	52	36	88	8	3	11	1
Indep.	39	38	77	14	8	22	2
Oklahoma	49	38	87	10	3	13	<1
GOP	45	40	85	10	5	15	
Dem.	54	35	89	8	2	10	1
Indep.	40	37	77	19	4	23	
OK-4	50	38	88	9	3	12	1
Virginia	45	38	83	13	3	16	1
GOP	46	35	81	16	4	20	
Dem.	48	40	88	10	1	11	2
Indep.	46	39	85	13	3	16	

Maryland	45	38	83	10	5	15	2
GOP	47	39	86	12	2	14	1
Dem.	44	37	81	10	7	17	2
Indep.	42	38	80	11	6	17	4
MD-7	38	43	81	14	4	18	2

Here are two arguments **against** changing the prefunding requirement. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Arguments Against Policy Option

[Q3.] The responsible thing for the Postal Service to do is to make payments for these future obligations now. These benefits have already been earned by workers and it is only right to make completely sure that this obligation can be met. The Postal Service’s financial condition may get worse in the long run.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	19	35	54	27	18	45	1
GOP	24	28	52	28	20	48	<1
Dem.	16	38	54	26	20	46	
Indep.	17	43	60	27	11	38	2
Oklahoma	16	39	55	32	12	44	1
GOP	18	39	57	33	9	42	1
Dem.	15	37	52	32	15	47	1
Indep.	16	45	61	26	12	38	2
OK-4	15	36	51	36	13	49	<1
Virginia	17	36	53	30	16	46	1
GOP	14	42	56	28	15	43	1
Dem.	21	33	54	32	13	45	1
Indep.	15	34	49	31	20	51	
Maryland	22	33	55	28	15	43	1
GOP	20	35	55	32	13	45	1
Dem.	26	30	56	24	18	42	2
Indep.	13	39	52	37	12	49	
MD-7	18	36	54	27	16	43	2

[Q4.] If the Postal Service’s financial condition gets worse and it can’t cover the costs of its retiree health benefits, the government would probably have to step in and bail it out. The Postal Service needs to make sure now that it can take care of its future obligations without throwing the problem into the American taxpayers’ lap.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	31	33	64	20	16	36	1
GOP	33	31	64	16	19	35	
Dem.	28	32	60	22	18	40	
Indep.	31	38	69	21	10	31	2
Oklahoma	27	41	68	17	14	31	<1
GOP	32	42	74	17	9	26	1
Dem.	23	42	65	17	18	35	
Indep.	26	37	63	21	16	37	
OK-4	31	33	64	23	13	36	<1
Virginia	32	36	68	21	11	32	1
GOP	35	32	67	22	11	33	1
Dem.	28	34	62	25	13	38	1
Indep.	34	38	72	17	10	27	
Maryland	30	33	63	22	14	36	1
GOP	30	35	65	23	11	34	1
Dem.	33	30	63	20	16	36	2
Indep.	22	40	62	27	11	38	
MD-7	33	38	71	18	8	26	3

Now that you have evaluated the arguments for changing the prefunding requirement, please select how acceptable you would find two specific proposals.

Assessing the Proposals

[Q5a.] The first proposal is to end the requirement for further prefunding payments toward projected future health benefits. The money that has already been put in the fund (covering about 50% of projected costs) would remain and could not be used for other purposes.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	18	18	64	1	6.7
GOP	16	19	65	<1	6.9
Dem.	16	17	67		6.8
Indep.	23	17	59	1	6.1
Oklahoma	14	16	70	<1	6.9
GOP	14	15	71		
Dem.	14	14	72	1	
Indep.	14	25	61		
OK-4	15	11	73	1	7.0
Virginia	18	15	67	<1	6.7
GOP	18	11	70	1	
Dem.	19	13	68		
Indep.	17	18	64	1	
Maryland	15	17	68	1	6.8
GOP	14	17	69	1	
Dem.	14	13	72	1	
Indep.	18	25	57		
MD-7	10	15	75	1	7.2

[Q5b.] A second proposal is to reduce the prefunding level from its current requirement of covering 100% of future costs down to 80%, and to significantly stretch out the period for reaching that level.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	20	17	63	<1	6.4
GOP	22	14	63		6.3
Dem.	19	17	64		6.4
Indep.	19	22	59	1	6.3

Oklahoma	11	17	72	1	6.9
GOP	12	15	73		
Dem.	11	15	74	1	
Indep.	10	28	62		
OK-4	12	21	67	<1	6.6
Virginia	17	15	68	<1	6.6
GOP	17	16	67		
Dem.	16	12	72		
Indep.	17	15	68		
Maryland	19	13	68	<1	6.5
GOP	18	12	70		
Dem.	18	14	68		
Indep.	19	14	67		
MD-7	15	22	63	1	6.5

REVENUES

We are now going consider a number of options for giving the Postal Service permission to modify the way it operates.

As discussed above, the Postal Service is not able to meet its current requirements. While it is possible that the Congress may lessen the requirement for prefunding, right now the Postal Service must still deal with it.

Furthermore, the Postmaster General says that, even if the prefunding requirement were lifted, the Postal Service would still be under pressure from various changes, primarily due to the Internet reducing certain kinds of mail.

The Postal Service is also in a challenging position financially. Recently it has had to borrow money from the US Treasury and this credit line is now exhausted. As you may know, the Postal Service is not funded by the federal government but by its business activities.

Thus, the Postmaster General and some members of Congress have called for giving the Postal Service permission to make certain changes in the way it does business in order to make it more viable in the long term.

You will now be presented a series of options that are being considered. These options have been proposed by the Postmaster General, by the Inspector General of the Postal Service, or in bills being considered in Congress.

These include options for **increasing revenues** and for **reducing costs**. Some of these options involve changes in the nature of the role of the Postal Service. Thus, they are quite controversial. You will be asked to evaluate the arguments for and against each option.

After evaluating all the options, you will select a package of options that you think includes the best ideas.

We will explore options for increasing revenues first.

Increasing Postal Rates

One possibility for increasing revenues is to raise postal rates.

In general, the Postal Service can raise rates only at the rate of inflation for most of its mail. You may have seen the price of a stamp for a first class letter go up now and then—most recently it went up to 49 cents for an ounce. But after adjusting for inflation, the price of first class mail has actually stayed quite constant for some decades. Rates for commercial bulk mail have also remained stable after adjusting for inflation.

The problem for the Postal Service is that its costs have been going up faster than inflation. Thus, the Postal Service has requested that it be allowed to raise some of its rates faster than inflation when its costs are growing faster than inflation.

It has been proposed that Congress enable the Postal Service to raise its prices on the delivery of some classes of mail by more than the rate of inflation.

There is a Postal Regulatory Commission (PRC) that would still have to approve each rate increase. The PRC’s members are appointed by the president and approved by the Senate to oversee the Postal Service and ensure that it acts consistent with the public interest.

Here are two arguments in **favor** of the option to allow the Postal Service to raise some of its rates faster than inflation when its costs are growing faster than inflation. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Arguments in Favor of Policy Option

[Q6.] If the Postal Service is losing money, it makes no sense to prevent it from raising its rates to reflect its real costs. The prices of many things go up faster than inflation. For a number of reasons, especially the rise of e-mail and electronic billing, the volume of first-class mail has gone down. At the same time, the number of addresses served continues to grow. Postal rates have to reflect this new reality.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	36	45	81	12	7	19	1
GOP	34	43	77	14	8	22	
Dem.	39	46	85	9	6	15	<1
Indep.	33	45	78	14	7	21	2

Oklahoma	34	45	79	15	5	20	1
GOP	33	39	72	21	7	28	
Dem.	38	51	89	7	2	9	3
Indep.	29	43	72	21	7	28	
OK-4	34	45	79	11	9	20	1
Virginia	37	45	82	13	5	18	<1
GOP	37	45	82	14	4	18	
Dem.	39	48	87	9	3	12	1
Indep.	36	40	76	16	8	24	
Maryland	32	48	80	15	5	20	<1
GOP	28	49	77	20	3	23	1
Dem.	35	46	81	13	6	19	<1
Indep.	28	52	80	13	7	20	
MD-7	30	48	78	15	6	21	2

[Q7.] The only way to keep the Postal Service going, while not allowing it to raise its rates in step with its costs, is for the US government to subsidize (i.e. give taxpayer money to) the Postal Service. At present the US government does not subsidize the Postal Service and it should stay that way. The businesses and individuals who use the mail should pay its real costs, not US taxpayers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	33	36	69	16	15	31	<1
GOP	38	32	70	13	17	30	
Dem.	31	37	68	20	12	32	
Indep.	30	39	69	15	15	30	1
Oklahoma	36	36	72	18	10	28	1
GOP	41	30	71	17	12	29	1
Dem.	31	42	73	19	8	27	1
Indep.	35	35	70	21	10	31	
OK-4	43	33	76	20	4	24	<1
Virginia	33	32	65	24	10	34	<1
GOP	37	32	69	19	12	31	
Dem.	29	32	61	31	7	38	1
Indep.	36	34	70	19	11	30	

Maryland	29	38	67	21	12	33	<1
GOP	34	32	66	18	14	32	1
Dem.	27	41	68	23	9	32	<1
Indep.	27	39	66	20	14	34	
MD-7	25	40	65	18	15	33	2

Here are some arguments **against** allowing the Postal Service to raise some of its rates faster than inflation. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Arguments Against Policy Option

[Q8.] The Postmaster General has made numerous proposals to help the Postal Service be more cost-effective, but current law does not allow some of these changes to be made. Congress should first permit those changes and see how much they get the costs down. If we raise the rates now, business customers will only switch to online communication faster, undermining the purpose of the rate increase.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	34	39	73	18	7	25	1
GOP	36	35	71	22	7	29	<1
Dem.	32	41	73	18	9	27	<1
Indep.	37	41	78	14	6	20	2
Oklahoma	32	47	79	16	2	18	3
GOP	37	41	78	19	3	22	1
Dem.	30	52	82	12	2	14	4
Indep.	26	53	79	17	3	20	
OK-4	35	41	76	20	3	23	1
Virginia	32	42	74	19	6	25	1
GOP	34	39	73	21	5	26	1
Dem.	28	48	76	18	5	23	1
Indep.	36	35	71	23	7	30	

Maryland	32	43	75	17	7	24	1
GOP	36	45	81	15	4	19	
Dem.	32	40	72	19	8	27	2
Indep.	28	47	75	15	8	23	2
MD-7	39	32	71	20	7	27	2

[Q9.] Mail is a critical part of the American economy. American businesses have to be able to plan based on stable postal rates that will not go up faster than inflation. If the Postal Service can raise rates faster than inflation it could disrupt the economy.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	19	31	50	31	19	50	1
GOP	21	29	50	32	18	50	<1
Dem.	19	30	49	31	21	52	
Indep.	17	34	51	28	19	47	2
Oklahoma	17	39	56	29	13	42	2
GOP	14	41	55	30	14	44	2
Dem.	18	38	56	27	14	41	4
Indep.	19	37	56	33	11	44	
OK-4	18	35	53	30	15	45	2
Virginia	18	31	49	36	14	50	1
GOP	20	30	50	35	14	49	1
Dem.	16	29	45	40	15	55	1
Indep.	17	30	47	36	17	53	
Maryland	17	32	49	35	16	51	1
GOP	16	37	53	37	10	47	
Dem.	18	29	47	35	17	52	1
Indep.	17	35	52	29	18	47	1
MD-7	19	35	54	22	20	42	3

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here is a specific proposal for allowing the US Postal Service to increase postal rates.

Assessing the Proposal

[Q10.] The general requirement that rates cannot rise faster than inflation would be phased out over three years. The Postal Service would be allowed to raise a postal rate in step with its costs for that type of mail, even if that would mean rates would rise faster than inflation. The Postal Regulatory Commission would still have to review and approve each rate increase.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	19	19	61	1	6.3
GOP	23	18	58	2	6.1
Dem.	17	19	65		6.5
Indep.	18	22	59	1	6.4
Oklahoma	19	18	62	1	6.3
GOP	22	17	61		
Dem.	18	18	63	2	
Indep.	16	25	60		
OK-4	23	14	63	<1	6.2
Virginia	17	19	64	<1	6.4
GOP	16	18	66	1	
Dem.	14	18	68		
Indep.	20	18	62		
Maryland	21	18	61	<1	6.3
GOP	24	18	58		
Dem.	16	19	65		
Indep.	28	18	54		
MD-7	18	24	59		6.5

Another idea for the Postal Service to grow revenues is to allow it to branch out into other areas and offer a wider range of products and services than it does now.

NEW LINES OF BUSINESS

Currently, the Postal Service is prohibited by law from diversifying beyond standard postal services. Before 2006, the Postal Service had authority to offer products such as photocopier access, pre-paid phone cards and others, but this authority was removed by an act of Congress.

The Postal Service has proposed to offer a number of new, non-postal products and services to increase its revenue. However, Congress must first change the law to accommodate this request.

Here are arguments in **favor** of and **against** permitting the Postal Service to offer a wider range of products and services. Please select whether you find each one convincing or unconvincing:

Argument in Favor of Policy Option

[Q11.] Congress does not provide the Postal Service any subsidy, but does expect it to operate successfully as a business. But at the same time it ties the Postal Service’s hands by not allowing it to diversify or innovate. Meanwhile, the Postal Service has had serious financial difficulties. Allowing the Postal Service to experiment with offering new products and services could help its bottom line as well as provide things its customers need and want.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	64	27	91	6	3	9	1
GOP	57	30	87	10	2	12	<1
Dem.	72	24	96	2	3	5	
Indep.	61	28	89	6	5	11	1
Oklahoma	64	28	92	5	3	8	<1
GOP	62	26	88	8	4	12	1
Dem.	70	28	98	2	1	3	
Indep.	52	38	90	5	5	10	
OK-4	67	25	92	5	3	8	<1
Virginia	66	26	92	6	2	7	
GOP	62	33	95	5	1	6	
Dem.	72	19	91	7	2	9	
Indep.	65	25	90	6	4	10	

Maryland	64	26	90	7	3	10	1
GOP	58	32	90	5	1	6	5
Dem.	70	19	89	8	3	11	<1
Indep.	52	38	90	6	5	11	
MD-7	59	21	80	15	5	20	1

Argument Against Policy Option

[Q12.] The US is a free market economy. The Postal Service, while independent, is still a government agency with a huge retail network--32,000 post offices and 70,000 other stores where people can buy stamps, mail packages, etc. If the Postal Service uses this leverage to compete, this would be unfair to other businesses in those lines of work. The Postal Service doesn't pay local taxes and gets some breaks from zoning laws. Some small businesses could be driven out of the market.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	14	34	48	29	23	52	<1
GOP	17	37	54	26	20	46	<1
Dem.	14	30	44	30	27	57	
Indep.	12	36	48	30	20	50	1
Oklahoma	14	34	48	34	18	52	1
GOP	16	37	53	31	16	47	1
Dem.	10	31	41	35	23	58	1
Indep.	16	33	49	39	11	50	2
OK-4	14	34	48	36	15	51	1
Virginia	13	30	43	41	17	58	
GOP	18	26	44	42	15	57	
Dem.	9	31	40	41	18	59	
Indep.	12	30	42	39	19	58	
Maryland	11	35	46	35	19	54	1
GOP	13	39	52	34	13	47	2
Dem.	11	31	42	34	24	58	<1
Indep.	8	38	46	40	13	53	1
MD-7	14	36	50	30	20	50	1

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here are some proposals that have been made for **new products or services** that the Postal Service might offer. For each one, please indicate how acceptable it is to you.

Assessing the Proposals

[Q13.] Sell to private companies advertising space on the sides of postal trucks and in post offices.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	20	17	62	1	6.6
GOP	22	16	61	1	6.5
Dem.	18	16	66		6.7
Indep.	21	19	57	2	6.6
Oklahoma	21	15	64	<1	6.6
GOP	23	13	64		
Dem.	17	18	65		
Indep.	28	11	60	2	
OK-4	25	8	67	<1	6.5
Virginia	21	13	65	1	6.6
GOP	16	15	69	1	
Dem.	24	12	63	1	
Indep.	24	11	65		
Maryland	23	12	65	1	6.5
GOP	23	11	65	2	
Dem.	20	13	67		
Indep.	31	11	58		
MD-7	25	16	59		6.5

[Q14.] Provide self-service photocopying for a fee.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	9	6	85	1	8.0
GOP	15	7	79		7.6
Dem.	5	4	92		8.5
Indep.	7	8	83	2	8.0
Oklahoma	8	6	86	<1	8.1
GOP	9	6	85		
Dem.	5	5	90	1	
Indep.	11	11	79		
OK-4	8	6	86		8.2
Virginia	10	7	83	1	8.0
GOP	5	8	87	1	
Dem.	9	8	82	1	
Indep.	12	5	83		
Maryland	7	8	85	1	8.1
GOP	6	7	86	1	
Dem.	7	8	85		
Indep.	10	6	83	1	
MD-7	9	8	83		8.1

[Q15.] Provide Internet access in post offices for a fee

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	19	15	64	2	6.8
GOP	26	16	58		6.2
Dem.	12	12	72	4	7.4
Indep.	20	19	59	2	6.6

Oklahoma	17	14	69	<1	7.0
GOP	18	14	68		
Dem.	14	15	71	1	
Indep.	21	16	63		
OK-4	17	11	71	<1	7.1
Virginia	20	13	67	<1	6.8
GOP	14	15	71		
Dem.	20	10	70		
Indep.	23	16	60	1	
Maryland	16	18	66	<1	6.8
GOP	22	14	65		
Dem.	11	20	69		
Indep.	21	16	62	1	
MD-7	20	18	61	1	6.7

[Q16.] Provide a highly secure e-mail system that, like certified mail, would verify the identities of senders and recipients. To hack this system would be a federal crime, no different from tampering with the mails.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	14	11	73	1	7.4
GOP	20	16	64	<1	6.9
Dem.	8	8	83	1	8.0
Indep.	17	8	72	3	7.3
Oklahoma	16	11	72	1	7.2
GOP	19	10	71	1	
Dem.	15	11	73	1	
Indep.	14	10	74	2	
OK-4	14	4	82	<1	7.7
Virginia	14	8	77	1	7.4
GOP	12	9	77	2	
Dem.	11	9	80		
Indep.	17	7	75	1	

Maryland	11	11	77	1	7.5
GOP	16	11	71	3	
Dem.	7	12	81	<1	
Indep.	18	7	75		
MD-7	14	12	74		7.6

[Q17.] Expand limited money transfer services for individuals, so they can send money to individuals in a greater number of other countries.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	16	12	72	1	7.2
GOP	23	13	64		6.6
Dem.	7	8	84	<1	7.8
Indep.	18	15	65	2	7.1
Oklahoma	15	12	73	<1	7.1
GOP	19	12	69		
Dem.	11	10	79		
Indep.	16	16	69		
OK-4	13	9	78	<1	7.4
Virginia	15	11	74	1	7.3
GOP	12	10	78	1	
Dem.	11	10	78	1	
Indep.	17	13	69	1	
Maryland	10	11	79	1	7.6
GOP	13	13	74	1	
Dem.	7	10	82	2	
Indep.	13	11	77		
MD-7	19	10	70	1	7.4

[Q18.] Provide small-scale individual savings accounts at interest levels set by US Treasury bonds.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	33	16	50	2	5.6
GOP	42	13	46		4.9
Dem.	27	15	57	2	6.2
Indep.	28	20	48	4	5.5
Oklahoma	29	19	52	<1	5.7
GOP	35	18	48		
Dem.	20	23	57		
Indep.	38	12	50		
OK-4	28	14	57	<1	5.8
Virginia	30	16	54	<1	5.8
GOP	28	18	54	1	
Dem.	28	13	60		
Indep.	35	17	48		
Maryland	28	16	55	1	5.8
GOP	38	19	42	1	
Dem.	22	15	61	2	
Indep.	31	15	54		
MD-7	30	14	56	<1	6.0

[Q19.] Provide consulting services and technical help to developing countries that are extending and modernizing their postal services.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	13	12	74	1	7.3
GOP	19	9	72	1	7.0
Dem.	7	14	79	<1	7.9
Indep.	14	14	70	2	7.1

Oklahoma	14	12	74	<1	7.3
GOP	16	11	73	1	
Dem.	11	14	76		
Indep.	19	9	72		
OK-4	11	10	79	<1	7.6
Virginia	12	14	74	<1	7.4
GOP	14	15	71		
Dem.	7	11	82		
Indep.	13	14	72	1	
Maryland	10	13	78	<1	7.6
GOP	13	14	72		
Dem.	7	12	81		
Indep.	12	13	74	1	
MD-7	14	13	73	<1	7.5

Another possibility for the Postal Service to generate revenue is to allow it to **rent excess space in older post office buildings** to other organizations. Specifically, these organizations could be:

[Q20.] Local government agencies, to do things like receiving payments for paying parking and traffic tickets, getting dog licenses, or getting documents notarized.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	10	9	81	1	7.9
GOP	10	7	83		7.9
Dem.	8	9	83	1	8.0
Indep.	11	11	76	2	7.8
Oklahoma	7	11	82	1	8.2
GOP	5	11	83	1	
Dem.	7	8	84		
Indep.	9	16	74	2	
OK-4	6	5	89	<1	8.5

Virginia	7	7	85	1	8.1
GOP	6	6	87	1	
Dem.	4	9	85	1	
Indep.	11	6	83		
Maryland	5	11	83	<1	8.2
GOP	5	10	85		
Dem.	4	12	83	<1	
Indep.	8	10	82		
MD-7	4	18	78	1	8.1

[Q21.] Private companies, to do things like selling goods and services.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	15	13	72	1	7.2
GOP	15	13	72		7.3
Dem.	15	12	72	<1	7.2
Indep.	14	15	69	2	7.2
Oklahoma	16	14	69	<1	7.0
GOP	12	10	77	1	
Dem.	19	16	65		
Indep.	21	23	54	2	
OK-4	20	9	71	<1	6.8
Virginia	11	12	77	1	7.4
GOP	9	8	83	1	
Dem.	13	11	75	1	
Indep.	13	15	72		
Maryland	15	18	66	1	6.9
GOP	14	8	78		
Dem.	14	24	61	1	
Indep.	19	17	63	1	
MD-7	20	17	62	1	6.7

Finally, the Postal Service owns and leases a great deal of warehouse space that is currently not fully utilized. It could:

[Q22.] Lease warehouse space to private companies, such as delivery or mail order companies.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	6	7	86	1	8.3
GOP	6	5	89		8.3
Dem.	5	8	86	<1	8.4
Indep.	6	10	83	2	8.2
Oklahoma	5	8	86	<1	8.2
GOP	5	5	89	1	
Dem.	5	8	87	1	
Indep.	7	16	77		
OK-4	1	8	90	<1	8.6
Virginia	5	5	90	<1	8.4
GOP	3	5	92	1	
Dem.	5	4	90		
Indep.	7	5	88		
Maryland	4	12	84	1	8.2
GOP	3	8	88	1	
Dem.	2	14	83	1	
Indep.	9	11	79	1	
MD-7	7	14	78	2	8.0

OPERATING COSTS

We are now going to look at ways that the Postal Service can save money by reducing operating costs. These will have an effect on the level of service provided by the Postal Service.

ENDING SATURDAY DELIVERY

One option for the Postal Service to reduce its costs is to eliminate delivery of letters and commercial mail on Saturdays. Packages would still be delivered and Post Offices would still be open on Saturdays.

Here are two arguments in **favor** of this proposal. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Argument in Favor of Policy Option

[Q23.] The Postal Service needs to be allowed to act like a business and adapt to Americans’ decreasing demand for paper. The US Postmaster General wants to eliminate Saturday delivery of most types of mail, saying it would save money and make good business sense. The Postal Service should be able to adapt effectively and efficiently.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	47	31	78	10	12	22	1
GOP	54	26	80	8	11	19	
Dem.	43	35	78	12	11	23	
Indep.	42	34	76	8	15	23	2
Oklahoma	48	34	82	12	6	18	1
GOP	51	33	84	10	6	16	
Dem.	47	33	80	15	5	20	2
Indep.	37	42	79	10	10	20	
OK-4	40	39	79	9	11	20	1
Virginia	45	33	78	12	9	21	<1
GOP	46	33	79	14	7	21	
Dem.	46	31	77	14	10	24	
Indep.	44	37	81	9	9	18	1
Maryland	37	33	70	16	13	29	1
GOP	47	30	77	17	5	22	1
Dem.	33	33	66	16	17	33	1
Indep.	35	37	72	17	11	28	1
MD-7	35	27	62	12	23	35	4

[Q24.] Now that most people have email, they are not as dependent on letters to communicate and they are mailing less, but sending more packages.. Reducing the number of days that letters are delivered, while keeping package deliveries, is an appropriate adaptation to the changes of modern life.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	49	28	77	12	10	22	1
GOP	55	24	79	11	10	21	
Dem.	43	31	74	15	11	26	
Indep.	48	30	78	9	10	19	2
Oklahoma	52	30	82	12	6	18	1
GOP	54	29	83	9	7	16	1
Dem.	53	31	84	10	5	15	1
Indep.	39	28	67	26	7	33	
OK-4	51	26	77	15	7	22	1
Virginia	44	32	76	14	10	24	<1
GOP	47	35	82	12	6	18	
Dem.	44	32	76	12	11	23	1
Indep.	45	27	72	17	11	28	1
Maryland	44	34	78	9	13	22	1
GOP	56	34	90	4	6	10	1
Dem.	40	33	73	11	15	26	<1
Indep.	39	35	74	12	13	25	1
MD-7	37	28	65	16	18	34	1

Here are two arguments **against** eliminating delivery of letters and commercial mail on Saturdays. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Argument Against Policy Option

[Q25.] Not having Saturday letter delivery is an inconvenience for everyone, but it is especially unfair to people living in rural communities, as well as senior citizens and low-income Americans. They are more isolated, have less access to the Internet and have greater need for the connection mail provides.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	24	24	48	24	28	52	1
GOP	23	18	41	25	34	59	1
Dem.	26	29	55	22	23	45	
Indep.	24	23	47	27	24	51	2
Oklahoma	19	29	48	27	25	52	1
GOP	12	22	34	31	35	66	1
Dem.	24	33	57	26	16	42	1
Indep.	28	35	63	19	18	37	
OK-4	24	21	45	30	24	54	1
Virginia	27	25	52	28	20	48	1
GOP	21	24	45	31	24	55	1
Dem.	31	27	58	23	18	41	1
Indep.	25	24	49	33	18	51	1
Maryland	27	25	52	25	22	47	1
GOP	16	22	38	32	29	61	1
Dem.	32	28	60	21	18	39	1
Indep.	27	24	51	25	24	49	
MD-7	28	35	63	24	11	35	2

[Q26.] Cutting Saturday delivery would hurt various businesses. Some businesses require a fast delivery of mail at a low cost, such as Amazon. Businesses who advertise by mail would not have the opportunity to target Saturdays when people have more time to look at ads in the mail and who might go shopping as a result.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	25	28	53	23	23	46	1
GOP	25	25	50	23	26	49	1
Dem.	27	31	58	22	20	42	
Indep.	21	28	49	25	24	49	2

Oklahoma	18	32	50	27	24	51	<1
GOP	14	28	42	28	32	60	
Dem.	20	37	57	25	17	42	1
Indep.	25	30	55	28	18	46	
OK-4	23	30	53	25	22	47	<1
Virginia	21	26	47	32	20	52	1
GOP	18	23	41	39	21	60	
Dem.	22	25	47	31	21	52	1
Indep.	22	29	51	28	21	49	1
Maryland	23	29	52	29	19	48	2
GOP	14	29	43	34	23	57	1
Dem.	27	29	56	25	17	42	2
Indep.	22	27	49	32	17	49	2
MD-7	34	28	62	22	14	36	2

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here is a proposal on Saturday delivery for you to evaluate.

Assessing the Proposal

[Q27.] Eliminate Saturday letter delivery, while retaining Saturday delivery of packages, such as mail order medicines, and Priority Mail. Post office hours would not be affected. This change is estimated to eventually save about \$2 billion a year.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	18	10	72	<1	7.2
GOP	17	11	73		7.3
Dem.	18	8	74		7.1
Indep.	19	11	69	1	7.1
Oklahoma	12	8	79		7.8
GOP	7	6	87		
Dem.	15	9	76		
Indep.	22	14	64		
OK-4	9	8	84		8.0

Virginia	18	10	72	<1	7.2
GOP	11	12	78		
Dem.	20	10	70	1	
Indep.	20	6	74		
Maryland	18	12	70	<1	7.0
GOP	11	8	81		
Dem.	18	13	69		
Indep.	25	12	62	1	
MD-7	27	14	59	1	6.2

We are now going to consider two more options for reducing operating costs—closing some mail processing centers and closing some post offices.

UNIVERSAL SERVICE OBLIGATION

This issue generates substantial debate about the responsibilities of the Postal Service.

To fully understand this debate it is necessary to understand what is called the Universal Service Obligation. Current law says that the postal service has an “obligation...to bind the nation together.” It sets the requirement that “the Postal Service shall provide a maximum degree of effective and regular postal services to rural areas, communities, and small towns,” even in areas “*where post offices are not self-sustaining*” (italics added).

As part of this obligation, the Postal Service maintains postal facilities and delivery services in very small and remote communities, though in some cases these are not full post offices but service counters in retail stores. Overall, there are about 102,000 locations in the postal service network.

There is a debate about whether the universal service obligation should be loosened so that the Postal Service does not have to provide a maximum level of service in places where it is costly to do so.

Here are arguments in **favor** of and **against** the idea that the obligation should be loosened. Please select whether you find each one convincing or unconvincing:

Argument in Favor of Policy Option

[Q28.] The universal service obligation was important earlier in our history, but the reality is that times have changed. People everywhere may eventually have access to E-mail and most already do. To provide people in the remotest corners of the country not only with postal service, but also with a “maximum” level of service is very costly. Given that they now have other means of communication this requirement should be relaxed somewhat.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	24	39	63	23	13	36	1
GOP	27	38	65	25	10	35	1
Dem.	22	37	59	27	15	42	
Indep.	22	44	66	16	16	32	2
Oklahoma	20	47	67	22	11	33	<1
GOP	22	46	68	21	11	32	1
Dem.	19	51	70	22	8	30	
Indep.	16	40	56	24	21	45	
OK-4	22	43	65	21	15	36	<1
Virginia	20	45	65	21	14	35	1
GOP	22	44	66	23	11	34	
Dem.	20	40	60	24	16	40	1
Indep.	18	50	68	17	14	31	1
Maryland	19	38	57	23	19	42	1
GOP	26	36	62	28	10	38	
Dem.	20	34	54	21	25	46	1
Indep.	8	50	58	23	17	40	1
MD-7	16	35	51	22	24	46	3

Argument Against Policy Option

[Q29.] Universal service is central to the whole idea of having a postal service, rather than having private companies that would change uneven rates and deliver the mail only when it is profitable. Especially in a country of vast size and diversity like the United States, it is fundamental to have a means of communication and shipping that is committed to reaching every corner of the nation, both rural and urban. Keeping universal service adds value to our society and economy and binds the country together.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	35	33	68	21	10	31	1
GOP	35	30	65	27	8	35	1
Dem.	39	35	74	16	9	25	
Indep.	31	36	67	18	14	32	1

Oklahoma	33	39	72	19	9	28	1
GOP	28	42	70	20	9	29	1
Dem.	37	37	74	17	8	25	2
Indep.	35	36	71	19	9	28	2
OK-4	27	42	69	20	9	29	1
Virginia	37	35	72	21	7	28	1
GOP	28	38	66	26	8	34	1
Dem.	43	36	79	14	7	21	1
Indep.	38	32	70	24	7	31	1
Maryland	37	37	74	18	7	25	1
GOP	31	41	72	22	7	29	
Dem.	41	34	75	16	8	24	1
Indep.	37	39	76	20	5	25	
MD-7	40	34	74	21	4	25	2

Having evaluated the arguments, here is the proposal:

Assessing the Proposal

[Q30.] The Postal Service would not always provide a maximum level of service in places where it is costly to do so.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	35	20	45	1	5.2
GOP	31	20	49		5.5
Dem.	38	19	43		4.9
Indep.	35	22	41	2	5.1
Oklahoma	33	17	51	<1	5.4
GOP	27	18	55		
Dem.	35	15	50	1	
Indep.	43	17	40		
OK-4	38	10	52	1	5.3

Virginia	37	18	44	1	5.0
GOP	25	19	56	1	
Dem.	45	15	40	1	
Indep.	36	22	41	1	
Maryland	41	17	42		4.9
GOP	35	14	51		
Dem.	42	18	40		
Indep.	44	18	38		
MD-7	49	19	33		4.2

We will now look at some specific proposals for reducing the level of service in some places.

REDUCING DOOR DELIVERY

Right now, in urban and suburban areas many people receive their mail directly at their door while others receive their mail in curbside mailboxes or neighborhood cluster mailboxes (called cluster boxes). One option that would save money would be to require most customers to put a mailbox on the curb instead, or to get their mail at neighborhood cluster boxes down the street. Exceptions would be made for people who have disabilities.

Here are arguments in **favor** of and **against** reducing door delivery by requiring most customers to receive curbside or clusterbox delivery of their mail. Please select whether you find each one convincing or unconvincing:

Argument in Favor of Policy Option

[Q31.] Moving away from delivering mail directly to people’s doors is a common sense change: it will save the Postal Service a great many labor hours once they do not have to walk all the way to each door. Currently rural Americans all across the country do not get delivery to their door. It is only fair that people get equal levels of service. There is no reason why able-bodied people in many denser areas cannot do a little walking.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	44	29	73	12	14	26	1
GOP	49	30	79	8	12	20	1
Dem.	43	24	67	15	18	33	<1
Indep.	41	34	75	12	11	23	2

Oklahoma	46	32	78	13	9	22	<1
GOP	50	29	79	14	7	21	
Dem.	44	34	78	12	10	22	
Indep.	36	35	71	10	17	27	2
OK-4	46	35	81	12	7	19	<1
Virginia	41	31	72	15	12	27	1
GOP	44	36	80	9	11	20	
Dem.	40	26	66	21	12	33	1
Indep.	42	33	75	13	11	24	2
Maryland	38	30	68	17	15	32	<1
GOP	51	28	79	17	5	22	
Dem.	32	31	63	15	21	36	<1
Indep.	36	31	67	23	11	34	
MD-7	30	25	55	16	28	44	1

Argument Against Policy Option

[Q32.] It is not clear that this plan would really save a lot of money, because there would be a substantial and unknown cost to build new, secure cluster boxes in urban areas where space is very expensive. Putting up curbside mailboxes would also be a substantial cost that would have to be borne by the customer, the Postal Service, or possibly by taxpayers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	28	32	60	23	17	40	1
GOP	32	27	59	27	14	41	
Dem.	29	34	63	20	17	37	<1
Indep.	22	36	58	22	20	42	2
Oklahoma	23	36	59	28	13	41	<1
GOP	21	37	58	28	14	41	1
Dem.	27	37	64	27	10	37	
Indep.	19	35	54	33	14	47	
OK-4	21	33	54	33	13	46	1

Virginia	26	34	60	27	12	39	1
GOP	20	38	58	32	10	42	
Dem.	32	30	62	24	12	36	1
Indep.	26	34	60	27	12	39	2
Maryland	23	41	64	23	12	35	1
GOP	20	39	59	23	18	41	
Dem.	24	42	66	22	11	33	1
Indep.	24	40	64	28	8	36	
MD-7	39	32	71	16	12	28	1

Having evaluated the arguments, here is the first proposal:

Assessing the Proposals

[Q33*.] The Postal Service would be required by law to convert 30 million mail boxes--about a quarter of all addresses--from door delivery to curbside mail boxes or cluster boxes over the next ten years. This would mean about 80 percent of all door delivery mail boxes would be changed.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	27	16	58	<1	6.0
GOP	24	11	65		6.2
Dem.	30	17	53	2	5.7
Indep.	21	21	57		6.2
Oklahoma	29	15	56	<1	6.0
GOP	27	12	61		
Dem.	29	18	54		
Indep.	24	24	49	3	
Virginia	29	15	56	<1	5.8
GOP	27	13	61		
Dem.	25	19	56		
Indep.	22	24	55		

Maryland	31	17	53	5.7
GOP	34	20	46	
Dem.	26	24	50	
Indep.	29	18	54	

Here is the second proposal:

[Q34*.] Do not require that people change their mail delivery away from door delivery, but let the local Postal Service managers try to work with people in neighborhoods to make the change to curbside or cluster box delivery on a voluntary basis.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	32	16	51	1	5.6
GOP	34	15	51	<1	5.5
Dem.	36	15	50		5.4
Indep.	24	21	53	2	6.1
Oklahoma	27	16	56	<1	6
GOP	25	14	61		
Dem.	31	17	53		
Indep.	34	9	53	3	
Virginia	24	18	57		6.1
GOP	24	10	65	1	
Dem.	35	17	49		
Indep.	28	19	53		
Maryland	28	21	50		5.7
GOP	25	11	64		
Dem.	33	21	46		
Indep.	30	14	55		

* Compared to other questions in the survey, fewer respondents received question 33 and question 34 in Maryland (285), Oklahoma (248) and Virginia (383), increasing the margins of error for these two questions to 5.8% (MD), 6.2% (OK) and 5% (VA). This had no effect on the margin of error for the national sample.

SPEED OF DELIVERY; PROCESSING CENTERS

One proposal that has been made by the Postal Service to save money is to allow it to reduce the number of mail processing centers.*

This would involve Congress choosing not to oppose the Postal Service lowering the standards for how rapidly mail is delivered. Based on current standards, about 58 percent of all first class mail is delivered overnight and the rest within two to three days, depending on how far it has to go. Lowering these standards would make it possible to reduce the number of mail processing centers, which would save money. Priority mail and packages would not be affected by this change.

Here are two arguments in **favor** of the proposal to allow the Postal Service to lower the standards for how rapidly mail is delivered allowing it to close some processing centers. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Arguments in Favor of Policy Option

[Q35.] The Postal Service has no choice but to change how it operates to reflect current business conditions. The amount of first-class mail keeps falling, so that in many mail processing centers, expensive, high-volume sorting machines are only being run four hours a day. To survive, the Postal Service has to be allowed to downsize its operation to fit the actual flow of mail.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	34	44	78	13	8	21	1
GOP	32	47	79	13	8	21	<1
Dem.	35	42	77	15	8	23	1
Indep.	36	43	79	11	9	20	1
Oklahoma	32	48	80	13	7	20	<1
GOP	36	47	83	11	6	17	1
Dem.	29	49	78	15	7	22	
Indep.	28	50	78	17	5	22	
OK-4	33	45	78	16	5	21	1

* While the description in this question of the anticipated relationship between the speed of delivery and the number of processing centers was consistent with the views of the Postmaster General at an earlier point, during the period that the questionnaire was in the field the Inspector General challenged these assumptions based on new evidence. Thus, while this question, and the ones immediately following, are shown in the questionnaire, they are not discussed in the accompanying report as it is not clear that the premises are correct.

Virginia	30	51	81	14	5	19	<1
GOP	33	50	83	12	4	16	
Dem.	28	52	80	14	6	20	1
Indep.	32	48	80	15	5	20	
Maryland	32	44	76	16	7	23	<1
GOP	35	49	84	11	5	16	1
Dem.	31	44	75	15	10	25	<1
Indep.	29	38	67	28	5	33	
MD-7	28	44	72	19	9	28	1

[Q36.] With all the alternative means of communication that exist today through the Internet, it is just unrealistic to think that it is vital whether stamped letters arrive a day sooner or later. We should allow the Postal Service to organize its mail processing in a rational way--we're not living in the twentieth century anymore.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	30	38	68	18	13	31	1
GOP	35	33	68	21	10	31	2
Dem.	27	40	67	16	17	33	<1
Indep.	28	42	70	15	14	29	1
Oklahoma	29	41	70	20	11	31	
GOP	35	38	73	16	11	27	
Dem.	26	41	67	22	11	33	
Indep.	16	48	64	28	9	37	
OK-4	31	42	73	17	11	28	
Virginia	30	41	71	19	10	29	1
GOP	30	39	69	20	11	31	
Dem.	26	43	69	18	12	30	1
Indep.	32	39	71	21	8	29	
Maryland	31	35	66	21	13	34	<1
GOP	36	34	70	22	8	30	
Dem.	33	33	66	19	16	35	
Indep.	20	44	64	26	9	35	1

MD-7	28	32	60	19	20	39	1
------	----	----	-----------	----	----	-----------	---

Here are two arguments **against** allowing the Postal Service to lower the standards for how rapidly mail is delivered, and allowing it to close some processing centers. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Arguments Against Policy Option

[Q37.] Lowering the standards of how rapidly the mail is delivered would surely end up hurting people and businesses in some areas more than others. This would be unfair and inconsistent with the spirit and letter of the universal service obligation of the Postal Service. It will create a second-class service for people who live far away from the remaining processing centers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	27	36	63	27	9	36	1
GOP	28	32	60	30	9	39	1
Dem.	30	38	68	24	8	32	1
Indep.	22	37	59	29	10	39	2
Oklahoma	26	41	67	25	8	33	<1
GOP	22	37	59	28	13	41	1
Dem.	30	45	75	22	4	26	
Indep.	30	42	72	21	7	28	
OK-4	26	38	64	24	11	35	1
Virginia	26	39	65	26	8	34	1
GOP	19	43	62	28	8	36	2
Dem.	27	42	69	22	9	31	1
Indep.	31	31	62	32	5	37	1
Maryland	28	40	68	21	11	32	1
GOP	23	46	69	24	6	30	
Dem.	32	37	69	17	13	30	1
Indep.	22	41	63	29	8	37	
MD-7	42	32	74	19	5	24	2

[Q38.] For the Postal Service to shut down processing centers might save money in the short run, but in the long run it will cost money. As the delivery of mail slows, this will drive customers away and diminish mail revenues even more. This would be a short-sighted business decision and Congress should not encourage it by accepting slower delivery of mail.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	36	33	69	21	9	30	1
GOP	37	30	67	22	11	33	
Dem.	35	35	70	20	7	27	2
Indep.	34	35	69	20	10	30	2
Oklahoma	36	38	74	19	7	26	<1
GOP	33	36	69	21	9	30	1
Dem.	41	42	83	14	4	18	
Indep.	35	35	70	26	5	31	
OK-4	30	37	67	23	10	33	
Virginia	34	36	70	23	6	29	1
GOP	30	33	63	30	6	36	1
Dem.	36	39	75	17	7	24	1
Indep.	38	35	73	22	6	28	
Maryland	34	39	73	19	8	27	<1
GOP	30	40	70	23	8	31	
Dem.	38	37	75	16	8	24	1
Indep.	29	44	73	22	5	27	
MD-7	43	36	79	13	8	21	1

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here is a proposal:

Assessing the Proposal

[Q39.] The Postal Service would set lower standards for how rapidly mail is delivered, enabling it to reduce the number of mail processing centers. Delivery of a letter would typically take two to three days, rather than the current one to three days as it does now.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	33	16	51	<1	5.5
GOP	36	10	54		5.5
Dem.	34	20	45		5.2
Indep.	27	17	55	1	5.9
Oklahoma	30	17	53	<1	5.7
GOP	25	12	63	1	
Dem.	35	19	46		
Indep.	29	24	46	2	
OK-4	28	15	56	1	5.9
Virginia	31	17	52	1	5.6
GOP	22	16	61	1	
Dem.	36	17	47		
Indep.	32	17	49	1	
Maryland	34	17	49	<1	5.4
GOP	32	16	52		
Dem.	33	19	49	<1	
Indep.	38	15	46	1	
MD-7	39	18	41	2	4.7

Another option for lowering costs is to close and consolidate some post offices that are losing money.

CLOSING AND CONSOLIDATION OF POST OFFICES

In 2012, there were 31,272 post offices in the United States. The Postmaster General has identified a list of 3,653 post offices that are losing money—about 12% of the total--and has proposed that the Postal Service should be able to close them without Congressional interference. The Postal Service estimates that doing this would save it \$200 million a year.

Currently there are some in Congress who are opposed to closing these post offices and say that the Postal Service should not be able to make this decision without Congressional involvement.

Here are two arguments in **favor** of the proposal to allow the Postal Service to close most or all of the list of 3,653 post offices that are losing money. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Arguments in Favor of Policy Option

[Q40] Since the volume of first-class mail is projected to keep declining, it is expected that the Postal Service will have serious losses if the Postal Service isn't allowed to make changes to its operations. When some post offices are losing money hand over fist, the Postal Service needs to be able to shut them down if alternative access to postal services is available nearby.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	44	37	81	12	6	18	1
GOP	49	38	87	10	3	13	1
Dem.	46	34	80	12	9	21	
Indep.	33	42	75	17	7	24	2
Oklahoma	40	42	82	13	5	18	<1
GOP	46	42	88	6	6	12	
Dem.	37	41	78	18	3	21	1
Indep.	29	47	76	16	9	25	
OK-4	46	39	85	11	3	14	<1
Virginia	40	42	82	11	6	17	1
GOP	46	42	88	7	4	11	1
Dem.	35	47	82	11	7	18	1
Indep.	44	37	81	12	7	19	1
Maryland	39	40	79	14	7	21	<1
GOP	45	42	87	10	3	13	
Dem.	39	36	75	14	11	25	<1
Indep.	29	47	76	20	2	22	1
MD-7	44	29	73	13	13	26	1

[Q41.] Closing post offices could be done without hurting consumers in rural areas, by opening service counters in shops and stores that people go to regularly. Thus, the Postal Service could close money-losing post offices and still be able to meet the universal service obligation.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	59	28	87	7	6	13	<1
GOP	64	27	91	5	3	8	
Dem.	56	30	86	7	8	15	
Indep.	55	27	82	10	6	16	2
Oklahoma	55	30	85	8	6	14	<1
GOP	66	23	89	5	6	11	
Dem.	49	33	82	10	7	17	1
Indep.	43	39	82	11	7	18	
OK-4	59	29	88	5	7	12	<1
Virginia	53	34	87	8	5	13	1
GOP	60	32	92	5	3	8	
Dem.	49	36	85	11	4	15	1
Indep.	55	33	88	5	7	12	1
Maryland	51	33	84	10	5	15	1
GOP	60	32	92	8		8	
Dem.	47	35	82	9	7	16	2
Indep.	49	31	80	14	5	19	1
MD-7	46	35	81	8	9	17	4

Here are two arguments **against** allowing the Postal Service to close most or all of the list of 3,653 post offices that are losing money. For each, please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Arguments Against Policy Option

[Q42.] When post offices are shut down and replaced by service counters, there are still various services these service counters would not provide, such as sending a money order, an odd-shaped package, or a package to another country. Thus, to get those services in rural areas, people would have to travel greater distances to get to a post office. This violates the universal service obligation.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	25	38	63	25	10	35	2
GOP	25	32	57	28	14	42	1
Dem.	26	43	69	22	7	29	1
Indep.	23	39	62	26	10	36	3
Oklahoma	21	41	62	26	11	37	1
GOP	15	37	52	33	16	49	1
Dem.	26	49	75	17	7	24	2
Indep.	22	33	55	36	7	43	2
OK-4	16	39	55	34	10	44	1
Virginia	23	38	61	28	9	37	1
GOP	15	40	55	35	9	44	1
Dem.	26	37	63	25	10	35	1
Indep.	26	40	66	26	9	35	1
Maryland	19	45	64	25	10	35	1
GOP	16	37	53	35	11	46	1
Dem.	20	50	70	18	11	29	1
Indep.	21	42	63	31	6	37	
MD-7	29	34	63	28	8	36	2

[Q43.] In many rural areas the post office is the hub of numerous community functions, with bulletin boards, educational materials and more. It is key to a sense of local identity. Closing them can really hurt these communities and leave them without a center.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	23	26	49	26	24	50	1
GOP	22	21	43	28	29	57	
Dem.	28	27	55	27	17	44	1
Indep.	17	31	48	21	28	49	3

Oklahoma	20	28	48	27	25	52	1
GOP	14	25	39	29	32	61	
Dem.	27	30	57	23	19	42	1
Indep.	19	32	51	30	19	49	
OK-4	16	29	45	31	23	54	<1
Virginia	20	28	48	28	23	51	1
GOP	15	26	41	33	25	58	1
Dem.	22	28	50	28	22	50	1
Indep.	21	27	48	26	26	52	1
Maryland	22	28	50	30	21	51	1
GOP	16	27	43	31	26	57	1
Dem.	25	28	53	27	20	47	<1
Indep.	20	27	47	37	17	54	
MD-7	25	30	55	26	19	45	1

Having evaluated the arguments, here again is the proposal:

Assessing the Proposals

[Q44.] Permit the Postal Service to close most of the post offices that operate at a significant loss. This would be as much as 12% of post offices nationwide. The Postal Service estimates that doing this would save \$200 million a year.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	23	15	62	1	6.3
GOP	18	14	67	<1	6.8
Dem.	27	14	60	<1	6.0
Indep.	24	18	56	2	6.0

Oklahoma	20	15	65	<1	6.4
GOP	14	16	71		
Dem.	22	14	63	1	
Indep.	33	16	52		
OK-4	21	15	64	<1	6.5
Virginia	21	15	63	<1	6.3
GOP	15	13	73		
Dem.	23	16	61		
Indep.	24	14	62	1	
Maryland	28	15	56	1	5.9
GOP	23	8	69	1	
Dem.	28	19	53	<1	
Indep.	34	15	49	1	
MD-7	30	17	53	1	5.8

Here is a second proposal:

[Q45.] The Postal Service would be permitted to close no more than five percent of existing unprofitable post offices each year.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	25	23	52	<1	5.8
GOP	26	21	53		5.9
Dem.	26	21	54		5.8
Indep.	23	27	48	2	5.5
Oklahoma	20	20	60	1	6.1
GOP	18	23	58	1	
Dem.	21	14	64	1	
Indep.	22	28	50		
OK-4	24	16	59	1	6.0

Virginia	25	19	56	<1	5.9
GOP	22	19	60		
Dem.	25	16	59		
Indep.	30	20	50	1	
Maryland	27	19	54	<1	5.8
GOP	29	13	58	1	
Dem.	26	20	54		
Indep.	29	24	47		
MD-7	30	26	43	1	5.4

LABOR RELATIONS

Another proposal deals with labor relations. It would change how collective bargaining disputes between the Postal Service and the labor unions that represent postal workers are resolved.

Currently, if the Postal Service and a union cannot reach agreement, after a certain period they are both required to present their cases to a federal arbitrator, whose decision is binding.

At present, arbitrators make their decisions based on what issues are raised by each side in the dispute, often including the long-term financial condition of the Postal Service. Arbitrators must weigh all factors raised by either side.

This proposal would *require* the arbitrator to take into account the current and long-term financial condition of the Postal Service in every case.

Here are arguments in **favor** of and against the proposal to *require* the arbitrator to take into account the current and long-term financial condition of the Postal Service in every case. Please select whether you find it convincing or unconvincing:

Arguments in Favor of Policy Option

[Q46.] Because the Postal Service has to run as a business and receives no money from Congress, its serious financial problems should always be considered when dealing with union demands. It is appropriate for Congress to make this a legal requirement because Congress ultimately has to make sure that the public interest is being served.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	31	40	71	19	9	28	1
GOP	36	38	74	19	8	27	<1
Dem.	26	39	65	20	14	34	2
Indep.	34	43	77	17	5	22	2
Oklahoma	29	47	76	16	7	23	2
GOP	35	47	82	14	5	19	1
Dem.	23	48	71	18	8	26	3
Indep.	28	43	71	21	9	30	
OK-4	33	44	77	15	6	21	2
Virginia	33	44	77	17	6	23	1
GOP	43	40	83	12	5	17	1
Dem.	25	48	73	20	7	27	1
Indep.	32	42	74	18	7	25	1
Maryland	31	41	72	16	11	27	1
GOP	41	41	82	14	3	17	1
Dem.	30	37	67	16	16	32	1
Indep.	19	54	73	17	8	25	2
MD-7	25	40	65	21	11	32	3

Arguments Against Policy Option

[Q47.] This proposed requirement is completely unnecessary. The Postal Service's finances have always been considered in these disputes. This proposed requirement is really meant to make all considerations secondary to the financial condition of the Postal Service. It is also important to think about other factors, such as how a given decision might harm customers or Postal Service workers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Refused / Don't know
National	25	37	62	25	11	36	1
GOP	22	31	53	31	15	46	1
Dem.	31	42	73	22	4	26	2
Indep.	22	40	62	22	15	37	2
Oklahoma	20	45	65	26	8	34	1
GOP	14	43	57	29	14	43	
Dem.	25	50	75	21	3	24	2
Indep.	21	38	59	35	7	42	
OK-4	18	38	56	33	9	42	1
Virginia	21	42	63	26	9	35	1
GOP	12	39	51	34	15	49	
Dem.	28	43	71	22	5	27	2
Indep.	24	43	67	27	6	33	1
Maryland	26	38	64	26	9	35	2
GOP	12	39	51	39	10	49	1
Dem.	34	38	72	17	9	26	2
Indep.	21	38	59	33	7	40	1
MD-7	27	33	60	31	7	38	2

Now that you have evaluated the arguments, here again is the proposal:

Assessing the Proposal

[Q48.] When the Postal Service and a union are bargaining, cannot reach agreement and go into federal arbitration, the arbitrator would be required to take into account the current and long-term financial condition of the Postal Service.

Please select how acceptable you find this proposal on the scale below.

	Not Acceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't know	Mean
National	15	15	69	1	6.9
GOP	13	12	74	1	7.2
Dem.	19	18	63		6.4
Indep.	12	16	71	2	7.1
Oklahoma	12	15	72	1	7.0
GOP	5	12	83	1	
Dem.	16	17	67	1	
Indep.	22	19	57	2	
OK-4	11	18	71		7.0
Virginia	11	16	72	<1	6.9
GOP	7	11	83		
Dem.	13	19	67	1	
Indep.	13	17	70		
Maryland	19	16	66		6.6
GOP	6	13	80		
Dem.	27	15	59		
Indep.	13	22	65		
MD-7	22	21	56	1	6.1

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Congratulations, you have completed evaluating the series of proposals being considered for dealing with the Postal Service’s problems. You’re almost done.

Having considered these various proposals, we would now like you to complete the most important part of this exercise—which is **making your final recommendations**.

On the next screen you will see all of the proposals you just evaluated. You will then select your own recommended package of proposals.

As you will see, many proposals are mutually exclusive. Thus, you will only be able to choose one of them.

For each area, if you wish, you can keep things as they are now—or you can make one of the changes proposed.

[Q49.] **PRE-FUNDING FUTURE RETIREE HEALTH BENEFITS**

You may select **only one** of the following options:

- 1) End the requirement for further prefunding payments toward future retiree health benefits. The money that has already been put in the fund (covering about 50% of projected costs) would remain and could not be used for other purposes.
- 2) Reduce the prefunding level from its current requirement of covering 100% of future costs down to 80% and to significantly stretch out the period for reaching that level.
- 3) Maintain the current requirement for making payments toward pre-funding 100% of future retiree health benefits.

	Selected 1	Selected 2	Selected 3
National	36	47	13
GOP	38	48	10
Dem.	41	45	13
Indep.	27	51	17
Oklahoma	35	49	13
GOP	42	46	9
Dem.	30	54	14
Indep.	33	43	21
OK-4	36	47	14
Virginia	36	47	14
GOP	42	43	12
Dem.	32	49	16
Indep.	38	50	9
Maryland	34	48	16
GOP	40	52	6
Dem.	30	46	21
Indep.	36	46	16
MD-7	39	35	21

INCREASING REVENUES

[Q50.] Postal Rates

*You may select **only one** of the following options:*

- 1) Permit postal rates to rise in step with the Postal Service's costs, phasing out the rule that postal rates cannot rise faster than inflation
- 2) Maintain the requirement that postal rates cannot rise faster than inflation

	<u>Selected 1</u>	<u>Selected 2</u>
National	59	40
GOP	56	42
Dem.	60	40
Indep.	60	38
Oklahoma	54	44
GOP	56	43
Dem.	55	44
Indep.	48	52
OK-4	59	40
Virginia	61	38
GOP	65	34
Dem.	67	32
Indep.	60	38
Maryland	56	44
GOP	59	41
Dem.	57	43
Indep.	49	50
MD-7	45	53

[Q51.] **New Lines of Business**

You may select **only one** of the following two options:

- 1) Permit the Postal Service to offer a wider range of new non-postal products and services
- 2) Do NOT permit the Postal Service to provide new non-postal products or services

	<u>Selected 1</u>	<u>Selected 2</u>
National	89	10
GOP	86	11
Dem.	91	9
Indep.	88	9
Oklahoma	87	13
GOP	87	13
Dem.	89	11
Indep.	79	21
OK-4	85	14
Virginia	90	9
GOP	92	8
Dem.	90	10
Indep.	91	9
Maryland	90	9
GOP	90	10
Dem.	90	8
Indep.	91	10
MD-7	87	10

[Q52.] Since you have chosen to permit the Postal Service to offer a wider range of non-postal products and services, please select any of the possible new non-postal products or services listed below. You may select **as many as you wish**:

- a. Sell ad space on postal trucks and in post offices
- b. Provide self-service photocopying for a fee
- c. Provide Internet access in post offices for a fee
- d. Provide a highly secure e-mail system that would verify identities of senders and recipients

- e. Expand services for individuals to send money to individuals abroad, so they include a greater number of other countries
- f. Provide consulting to countries modernizing their postal services
- g. Offer small-scale individual savings accounts

Rent excess space in post office buildings to:

- h. local government agencies
- i. private companies

Lease warehouse space to:

- j. Private companies, such as delivery or mail order companies

	Selected A	Selected B	Selected C	Selected D	Selected E	Selected F	Selected G	Selected H	Selected I	Selected J
National	55	80	59	59	62	60	32	77	58	76
GOP	54	76	53	52	55	55	24	74	58	77
Dem.	55	83	63	65	66	65	37	80	56	76
Indep.	57	80	60	59	65	59	36	78	60	76
Oklahoma	54	80	60	58	63	61	35	80	51	75
GOP	55	82	58	55	59	64	30	80	57	77
Dem.	52	81	65	60	67	60	39	85	48	76
Indep.	53	72	54	62	64	55	41	67	47	67
OK-4	51	83	61	62	68	62	34	78	55	81
Virginia	55	80	60	61	65	64	36	78	56	79
GOP	61	82	68	61	66	59	37	79	60	80
Dem.	49	81	60	64	68	71	37	82	57	81
Indep.	56	83	57	62	64	66	36	77	54	77
Maryland	55	82	62	61	66	66	40	81	54	76
GOP	55	82	54	61	61	68	31	83	61	77
Dem.	57	82	67	62	69	67	45	81	52	77
Indep.	48	81	60	59	62	64	37	78	52	73
MD-7	50	75	57	66	65	62	39	73	57	71

REDUCING OPERATING COSTS

[Q53.] Reducing Mail Delivery Days

*You may select **only one** of the following options:*

- 1) For Saturdays: eliminate letter delivery, but keep delivery of packages and priority mail
- 2) Do NOT reduce Saturday delivery

	<u>Selected 1</u>	<u>Selected 2</u>
National	67	31
GOP	75	25
Dem.	60	37
Indep.	67	31
Oklahoma	76	24
GOP	82	17
Dem.	73	27
Indep.	62	36
OK-4	77	20
Virginia	68	32
GOP	73	26
Dem.	64	35
Indep.	70	30
Maryland	60	40
GOP	75	25
Dem.	51	48
Indep.	64	35
MD-7	49	46

[Q54.] **Mail Boxes**

You may select **only one** of the following options:

- 1) Require most door-delivery mail boxes to be converted to curbside or cluster boxes
- 2) Promote voluntary conversion from door-delivery to curbside or cluster boxes
- 3) Do NOT make any changes to door delivery

	<u>Selected 1</u>	<u>Selected 2</u>	<u>Selected 3</u>
National	41	38	19
GOP	50	32	16
Dem.	33	39	26
Indep.	40	44	15
Oklahoma	41	41	18
GOP	46	42	11
Dem.	37	39	25
Indep.	39	46	16
OK-4	45	38	17
Virginia	38	41	20
GOP	47	37	15
Dem.	31	42	26
Indep.	40	42	17
Maryland	34	40	26
GOP	47	38	14
Dem.	28	40	32
Indep.	34	41	24
MD-7	20	39	37

[Q55.] **Speed of Delivery**

You may select **only one** of the following options:

- 1) Permit lower standards for how fast mail is delivered, so that the Postal Service can reduce the number of mail processing centers
- 2) Maintain the current standards for how fast mail is delivered, thus keeping the current number of mail processing centers

	<u>Selected 1</u>	<u>Selected 2</u>
National	50	48
GOP	52	46
Dem.	48	52
Indep.	51	47
Oklahoma	53	47
GOP	60	39
Dem.	48	52
Indep.	43	53
OK-4	61	39
Virginia	53	46
GOP	62	38
Dem.	49	49
Indep.	49	50
Maryland	46	52
GOP	56	42
Dem.	40	57
Indep.	51	49
MD-7	37	60

[Q56.] **Closing and Consolidation of Post Offices**

You may select **only one** of the following options:

- 1) Let the Postal Service close most of the 3,653 post offices (12% of total) that operate at a significant loss
- 2) Let the Postal Service close no more than 5% of existing, unprofitable post offices per year
- 3) Do NOT specify the number of post offices to be closed, but continue to negotiate each closure on a case-by-case basis, with members of Congress possibly being involved

	<u>Selected 1</u>	<u>Selected 2</u>	<u>Selected 3</u>
National	30	36	33
GOP	38	35	27
Dem.	22	41	37
Indep.	29	32	37
Oklahoma	29	42	29
GOP	38	35	27
Dem.	23	49	29
Indep.	24	41	35
OK-4	29	41	29
Virginia	29	42	28
GOP	41	39	20
Dem.	22	43	34
Indep.	30	40	30
Maryland	27	36	37
GOP	40	34	26
Dem.	22	38	41
Indep.	23	36	42
MD-7	28	32	39

[Q57.] **LABOR RELATIONS**

You may select **only one** of the following options:

- 1) Require labor dispute arbitrators to always take into account the Postal Service’s long-term financial condition when considering a dispute
- 2) Continue to allow labor dispute arbitrators to independently decide how much to take into account the Postal Service’s long-term financial condition

	<u>Selected 1</u>	<u>Selected 2</u>
National	62	37
GOP	73	27
Dem.	50	49
Indep.	63	36
Oklahoma	63	36
GOP	73	26
Dem.	54	45
Indep.	57	43
OK-4	62	38
Virginia	62	38
GOP	73	26
Dem.	55	44
Indep.	59	40
Maryland	57	43
GOP	80	19
Dem.	45	55
Indep.	60	41
MD-7	52	47

[Q58.] In making your proposed package you recommended requiring that the Postal Service reach a higher level of pre-funding for future retiree health benefits than the current level. While some of the changes you have recommend will help the Postal Service in the long run, the Postal Service is not projected to have the funds to make these prefunding payments in the short run.

Where do you think the funds should come from to make these payments? Please select all the proposals that you would recommend:

- a. Borrow money against Postal Service assets (valued at approximately \$85 billion)
- b. Transfer money from the Postal Service pension fund in each year that it shows a surplus
- c. Reduce postal retirees' health care costs by increasing co-pays and requiring them to use Medicare first

OR

- d. End the requirement for further prefunding payments toward future retiree health benefits.

	Selected A	Selected B	Selected C	Selected D
National	4	4	5	1
Oklahoma	7	3	3	1
OK-4	6	3	7	1
Virginia	4	5	3	4
Maryland	6	5	4	3
MD-7	4	8	9	3

DEMOGRAPHICS

NATIONAL

Party Identification	
Republican.....	37%
Independent	25
Democrat	38
Gender	
Male.....	47
Female	54
Race	
White, Non-Hispanic.....	74
Black/ African American, Non-Hispanic	13
Hispanic.....	9
Asian, Non-Hispanic	3
Other (includes Native Americans).....	1
Age	
18-24.....	10
25-44.....	31
45-64.....	38
65+	22
Income	
Under \$30,000	16
30,000-49,999.....	17
50,000-74,999.....	21
75,000-99,999.....	15
100,000-149,999.....	16
150,000 or higher	15

OKLAHOMA

Party Identification	
Republican.....	44%
Independent	13
Democrat	44
Gender	
Male.....	46
Female	54

Race	
White, Non-Hispanic.....	87
Black/ African American, Non-Hispanic	6
Hispanic.....	5
Asian, Non-Hispanic	1
Other (includes Native Americans).....	3

Age	
18-24.....	7
25-44.....	32
45-64.....	40
65+	21

Income	
Under \$29,999	24
30,000-49,999.....	24
50,000-74,999.....	23
75,000-99,999.....	13
100,000-149,999.....	9
150,000 or higher	7

OKLAHOMA (CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 4)

Gender	
Male.....	46%
Female	54

Race	
White, Non-Hispanic.....	88
Black/ African American, Non-Hispanic	7
Hispanic.....	3
Asian, Non-Hispanic	1
Other (includes Native Americans).....	3

Age	
18-24.....	8
25-44.....	33
45-64.....	39
65+	20

Income	
Under \$29,999	21
30,000-49,999.....	22
50,000-74,999.....	25
75,000-99,999.....	14
100,000-149,999.....	11

150,000 or higher 7

VIRGINIA

Gender

Male 46
Female 54

Race

White, Non-Hispanic 73
Black/ African American, Non-Hispanic 18
Hispanic 3
Asian, Non-Hispanic 5
Other (includes Native Americans) 1

Age

18-24 8
25-44 34
45-64 38
65+ 20

Income

Under \$29,999 14
30,000-49,999 17
50,000-74,999 23
75,000-99,999 17
100,000-149,999 16
150,000 or higher 13

MARYLAND

Party Identification

Republican 26%
Independent 20
Democrat 55

Gender

Male 46
Female 54

Race

White, Non-Hispanic 64
Black/ African American, Non-Hispanic 29
Hispanic 4
Asian, Non-Hispanic 3
Other (includes Native Americans) 1

Age	
18-24.....	10
25-44.....	30
45-64.....	39
65+	21

Income	
Under \$29,999	10
30,000-49,999.....	12
50,000-74,999.....	23
75,000-99,999.....	20
100,000-149,999.....	20
150,000 or higher	15

MARYLAND (CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 7)

Party Identification	
Republican.....	18%
Independent	6
Democrat	76

Gender	
Male.....	45
Female	55

Race	
White, Non-Hispanic.....	39
Black/ African American, Non-Hispanic	55
Hispanic.....	3
Asian, Non-Hispanic	3

Age	
18-24.....	11
25-44.....	30
45-64.....	38
65+	21

Income	
Under \$29,999	16
30,000-49,999.....	16
50,000-74,999.....	23
75,000-99,999.....	16
100,000-149,999.....	15
150,000 or higher	14