

-----Original Message-----

From: MURPHY, FRANCIS J (SBCSI)
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2002 10:16 AM
To: PERDIOU, DENO (ATT); KERBER, MARK A (Legal); CONROW, KATHY (ATT); HARRISON, SHARON J (SBCSI)
Cc: MCFADDEN, RUSS (SBCSI); SLIWA, JOAN M (ATT); KLEKER, JIM (SBCSI); KELLY, JON (Legal)
Subject: RE: Ohio and Illinois date stamp



FW: FW: Ohio and
Illinois date...

Attached is a response from Randy Holt of the USPS. Thank-you Sharon for providing the information. Essentially, Randy states the following:

"with respect to having mailer information in the keyline of the mailpiece (permitted to the right of the postage paid information, but not interfering with readability) and this information being a date, I don't see a problem, but it wouldn't be recognized by the Postal Service as an actual mailing date - not like a postmark or meter date mark would."

Again, I have to emphasize what we are doing today (placing the date on the outside of the envelope) will be no different than what we are proposing from a Postal Service view. There is no official USPS recognition of that date on the envelope today. There will be no official USPS recognition of the date within the key line of the statement with our proposal. The change is something that will help improve the efficiency of our operations and save company dollars. In my opinion, the change enhances the product to the customer by providing the date on the actual statement and not on the outside of the envelope - which the customer has a tendency to throw away once received.

Deno, let me know what additional information you may need for us to move forward.

Thanks,

Francis James Murphy
916-376-2155 Voice Mail
916-601-7663 Cingular Service

-----Original Message-----

From: PERDIOU, DEN
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2002 9:35 AM

To: MURPHY, FRANCIS J (SBCSI); KERBER, MARK A (Legal); CONROW, KATHY (ATT); HARRISON, SHARON J (SBCSI)
Cc: MCFADDEN, RUSS (SBCSI); SLIWA, JOAN M (ATT); KLEKER, JIM (SBCSI); KELLY, JON (Legal)
Subject: RE: Ohio and Illinois date stamp

Fran,

Would the USPS concur that the manifest mailing date corresponds to the mailed-out date we place on the bill?

Deno Perdlou
Ameritech Illinois Regulatory
(217) 789-5174 office
(217) 789-5223 fax
(217) 971-2269 cell

-----Original Message-----

From: MURPHY, FRANCIS J (SBCSI)
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2002 6:10 PM
To: PERDIOU, DENO (ATT); KERBER, MARK A (Legal); CONROW, KATHY (ATT); HARRISON, SHARON J (SBCSI)
Cc: MCFADDEN, RUSS (SBCSI); SLIWA, JOAN M (ATT); KLEKER, JIM (SBCSI); KELLY, JON (Legal)
Subject: RE: Ohio and Illinois date stamp

Deno,

Thanks for the information. I want to also respond to your statement and let you know that getting the post office to recognize our stamp as a post mark will not happen. Sharon Harrison, our expert on postal issues, within BST can confirm my concern when she returns from vacation next week.

Because of the volume of mail we send out, we are authorized to mail without affixing postage and any postmark. Our responsibility is that we must bear a permit imprint indicia showing that that postage is paid. The system we use is a manifest mailing. With the manifest that we provide the postal service, the USPS will accept and verify the mailing date. There are no requirements from the USPS to put the month, day, and year on each envelope as would be necessary if we were to meter or use stamps for our mail.

Currently, we are providing the "mailed out" date on the outside of the envelope as a convenience to our customers. It is not a post mark that is authorized by the USPS. Our proposal is that we move the "mailed out" date from the outside of the envelope to the statement and will satisfy the current convenience.

In my opinion, the tariff is flawed because it assumes each piece of mail has an authorized postmark. That probably was true six to eight years ago when the mailing practices required a postmark.

Sharon,

Please confirm or elaborate on the issue when you return from vacation on Monday.

Fran

Francis James Murphy
916-376-2185 Voice Mail
916-001-7863 Cingular Service

-----Original Message-----

From: PERDIOU, DENO (ATT)
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2002 2:06 PM
To: MURPHY, FRANCIS J (SBCSI); KERBER, MARK A (Legal); CONROW, KATHY (ATT)
Cc: MCFADDEN, RUSS (SBCSI); SLIWA, JOAN M (ATT); KLEKER, JIM (SBCSI); KELLY, JON (Legal)
Subject: RE: Ohio and Illinois date stamp

Fran,

I met with ICC staff and they are supportive of the date stamp change. However, the Commission staff wants written confirmation from the post office that the date stamp on the bill will be recognized as the post mark date. The Commission rule defines the date stamp as the post mark date, so staff wants to make sure that moving the date stamp to the bill page will not change what the post office considers the post mark date.

The Commission staff also thought it would be a good idea to put out a bill page message to our customers describing the date stamp change.

Deno Perdiou

~~Ameritech-Illinois-Regulatory~~

(217) 789-5174 office

(217) 789-5223 fax

(217) 971-2269 cell

-----Original Message-----

From: MURPHY, FRANCIS J (SBCSI)
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2002 3:14 PM
To: KERBER, MARK A (Legal); CONROW, KATHY (AIT); PERDIOU, DENO (AIT)
Cc: MCFADDEN, RUSS (SBCSI); SLIWA, JOAN M (AIT); KLEIKER, JIM (SBCSI); KELLY, JON (Legal)
Subject: FW: Ohio and Illinois date stamp

Mark, Kathy, and Deno,
It looks like we are making headway in Ohio. What are the prospects for getting the change in Illinois?

<< File: one only.ppt >>

Fran Murphy
Senior Manager BST
(918) 378-2155 VM
(918) 601-7863 Cingular Wireless

-----Original Message-----

From: KELLY, JON (Legal)
Sent: Wednesday, April 03, 2002 5:35 AM
To: MURPHY, FRANCIS J (SBCSI); WARDIN, KENT W (AIT); WILLIAMS, MARGARET E (AIT); MACKAY, MARYANN H (AIT)
Cc: KERBER, MARK A (Legal); MCFADDEN, RUSS (SBCSI); HARRISON, SHARON J (SBCSI); VENLOS, WILLIAM C (AIT); TERWILLIGER, CYNTHIA M (SBCSI)
Subject: RE: Ohio and Illinois date stamp

Fran,

Thanks for the quick response. Here is the response to the attorney examiner's questions that I sent to him this morning.

<< Message: Ameritech Ohio postmark waiver application >>

Jon F. Kelly
Counsel - State Regulatory and Government Relations
SBC Ameritech
150 E. Gay Street, Room 4-A
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Telephone: 614 223 7928
Fax: 614 223 5955
jon.kelly@ameritech.com

This e-mail, and any attachments hereto, is intended for use only by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain confidential information subject to the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, and other applicable privileges. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments hereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me by telephone at 614 223 7928 and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout thereof. Thank you.