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## PREFACE

The National Bureau of $S$ tandards is developing equipments and systems for improved letter sorting by automation. Therefore it is necessary to determine the nature and distribution of mail in post offices.

Since the volume of mail is much too large for complete piece counts to be feasible, sampling methods of known and adequate accuracy must be used. The present paper is the first step in the effort to develop such methods as applied to mail distribution.
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36. Summary and Conclusions.

This report outlines the methods, techniques and procedure of a statistical sampling plan designed to determine, for any post office, the percentages of mail destined for all final separations. This method was applied to outgoing first class letter-mail at the San Francisco, Los Angeles and Baltimore Post Offices. The results for each of these post offices are included here. Some of the principal conclusions of this study are:

## San Francisco:

1. The largest 200 Destinations received $80 \%$ of the Total Volume.
2. Seventy-six percent of the Total Volume remained in the state of California (not including Air-mail and Go-backs).
3. Thirty-nine percent of the Total Volume remained in San Francisco.
4. Only seven Destinations received more than $1 \%$ of the Total Volume, respectively.

Los Angeles:

1. The largest 200 Destinations received $81 \%$ of the Total Volume.
2. Seventy-eight percent of the Total Volume remained in the state of California (not including Air-mail and Go-backs).

## Los Angeles (Continued):

3. Forty-two percent of the Total Volume remained in Los Angeles.
4. Only six Destinations received more than $1 \%$ of the Total Volume, respectively.

Baltimore:

1. The largest 200 Destinations received $78 \%$ of the Total Volume.
2. Sixty-six percent of the Total Volume remained in the state of Maryland (not including Air-mail and Go-backs) .
3. Fifty-one percent of the Total Volume remained in Baltimore.
4. Only four cities received more than $1 \%$ of the Total Volume, respectively.

## In General:

1. The sampling methods presented here are relatively simple to apply.
2. The final percentages given in the Tables 4,8 , and 13 may be used to determine the expected number of letters per Destination on a daily or weekly basis. This may be done by multiplying the percentage, expressed in decimals, corresponding to the Destination by the average daily or weekly Total Volume of letters.

Formulae for determining the reliability of the estimates given in this report will follow in a supplement.

When additional data of this type are needed for other post offices it is strongly recommended that a statistical sampling plan similar to that described in this report be used. The use of such a plan will result in:
a. accurate results,
b. no delay in moving the mail
through the post office,
c. relatively small cost.

In the past such data have been gathered by complete enumeration. It is our recommendation that such methods be discarded for the more scientific statistical sampling procedures.

## 2. Introduction.

This report discusses the methods, techniques, and analyses of a sampling procedure designed to estimate the distribution of mail by destination (i.e., the proportion of mail going to each Destination). In the course of this study the method has often been referred to as the "Chain ratio" method because the nature of the formulae involved in the analyses resembles a chain of ratios. The method is applied to outgoing first class letter-mail at the San Francisco, Los Angeles and Baltimore Post Offices.
lall

It was intended, initially, to study five cities: Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, Chicago and Los Angeles. Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington were chosen because they would tend to give a pattern of postal operations on the East Coast. Chicago was chosen to show Mid-west influence, and Los Angeles was selected to show the West Coast influence. San Francisco was added to the list in an effort to find out whether or not Los Angeles was atypical, because, Los Angeles services an unusually large area, as compared with other Post Offices.

The Post Office Department made special studies in Philadelphia, Chicago and New York, where in each case a complete count was made of the Total Volume of mail to each destination for either a 24 or 48 hour period of time. The NBS also made a modified version of the complete count on November 5 th, 1956, in Baltimore. In this count, only the total volume entering the system between 4:00 P.M. and 7:00 P.M. was included.

However, any complete count of large volumes of mail, even for short periods of time such as three hours, involves a considerable number of man hours and invariably tends to delay the normal function of sorting mail. Furthermore, any such complete counts are open to criticisms that may be leveled against complete enumeration methods. (The literature contains many examples $[1],[2],[3],[4]^{1}$ comparing complete

[^0]
enumeration methods with statistically designed sampling procedures, and shows the desirability, from the economics and reliability point of view, of the sampling techniques). A complete count of mail, properly done, say, for 24 hours, gives a good indication of what happens during a particular 1/365 part of a year. If one wishes to enlarge this fraction then additional complete counts can be made. Thus to represent a particular $5 / 365$ part of a year one might take five consecutive days - e.g., Monday through Friday or Thursday through Monday depending upon whether or not the weekend is to be included. This is expensive and time consuming. Furthermore tremendous effort is needed on the part of all concerned to keep tract of all the mail to each Destination. Thus errors are bound to occur. Finally, the mail itself will tend to be delayed during such exhausting counts. A sampling study, however, enables one to check the behavior of mail from time to time during any interval of time and with far less effort than needed in a complete enumeration. Thus, for example, to obtain information about mail for some given week, samples may be taken several times each day throughout the week. (Actually in the applications discussed here, two samples a day were taken during five-day periods excluding the weekends). Or if one wanted to check
the behavior of mail for any other given time period, say some particular month or during the Christmas rush, then samples could be taken from time to time during that particular time period.

Section 3 gives the definitions and notations as used in this report and the model of the flow of mail that is studied. Section 4 discusses in detail the sampling procedures, analysis and necessary volume counts of the statistical chain ratio method. Section 5 defines precisely the types of mail that were studied at San Francisco, Los Angeles and Baltimore. Sections 6, 7 and 8 present the details of the San Francisco, Los Angeles and Baltimore studies, respectively.

## 3. Definitions, The Model and Notations

3.1 Definitions. A list of definitions of terms, as used in this report, is given here for reference ${ }^{l}$ / These definitions are given in order to avoid misinterpretation and ambiguity because of postal language differences between post offices.

1. Separation. - A Separation is a classification characterized by a labeled pigeon-hole on a sorting case.

1/ Terms not defined in this section are used as given in
the "Glossary of Postal Terms in Common Use".

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - - + } \\
& \text {-. } \\
& n=-\infty \\
& --4+2-2+-2=1
\end{aligned}
$$

2. Destination. - A Destination for a given post office is a final Separation made at that post office. All directs and residues are included in this classification. 1
3. Direct. - A Direct is a Destination to a single given post office.
4. Distribution. - A Distribution is the function of physically sorting letters into their respective separation boxes.
5. Primary. - The term Primary, (of ten referred to as Mailing Primary), is the first stage of Distribution of outgoing mail.
6. Secondary. - The term Secondary (of ten referred to as State Primary), is the second stage of Distribution of outgoing mail. Secondary mail can not be distributed to final Destination on the Primary.
7. Tertiary. - The term Tertiary, (often referred to as State Secondary), is the third stage of Distribution of outgoing mail. Tertiary mail can not be distributed to final Destination on the Secondary.
8. By-pass mail. - The term By-pass mail refers to mail which receives its first Distribution in the Secondary or Tertiary cases. Also the term refers to mail which goes directly to the city section.
9. Residue. - The term Residue refers to mail destined for post offices for which no direct Separation is nrovided in case or rack.
10. Total Volume. - The term Total Volume refers to the defined classes of mail studied. (Total Volume is defined more explicitly as used in this study in Section 5)。

Nixies, Go-backs, Misfiles, Air Mail and Foreign off
Primary are also considered Destinations in this study.
3.2 The Model. The model for the operation of outgoing mail that is discussed in this report consists of a three stage sorting scheme which can be represented by a flow chart as given in Figure 1. The Total Volume in the top box consists of those types of mail indicated in Section 5 . This volume then divides into two parts, that which goes into the Primary and that which by-passes the Primary. The By-pass mail is sent either to the city section or into the Secondary. Mail leaving the Primary may go either to its Destinations or into the Secondary. Mail leaving the Secondary goes either to its Destinations or into the Tertiary. Mail leaving the Tertiary goes directly to its Destinations.
3.3 Notations. The list of notations used in this report are summarized here. Ratios without parentheses indicate that those ratios are obtained from sample figures. Ratios in parentheses ( ) indicate that those ratios are obtained from volume counts. Ratios in starred parentheses ()* indicate that those ratios are obtained from the appropriate formulae of Section 4.3.
$\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right)=$ Ratio of Primary mail to the Total Volume.
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Figure 1
Flow Chart Model for the Distribution of Outgoing Mail

$\frac{D_{P}}{T_{P}}=$| Ratio of mail to a Primary Destination to the |
| :--- |
| Primary Volume (Obtained from Primary samples) |

$S_{i}=$ Ratio of mail to an i-th Secondary to the Total Primary Volume (Obtained from Primary Samples)
$\Gamma \frac{S_{i}}{}=$ Sum of Ratios of mail to all Secondaries to Total Primary Volume (Obtained from Primary Samples)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{i}}} \quad$ Ratio of mail to an i-th Secondary Destination to the i-th Secondary (Obtained from i-th Secondary samples)
$t_{i j}=$ Ratio of mail to a j-th Tertiary (off i-th Secondary) to i-th Secondary (Obtained from i-th Secondary Samples)
$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{tj}} \quad$ Ratio of mail to a $j$-th Tertiary Destination (off $\frac{t_{i j}}{t_{i j}}=\frac{i-t h}{}$ Secondary) to the $j-t h$ Tertiary (Obtained from the i,j-th Tertiary Samples)
$\left(\frac{D_{p}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)^{*}=\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio of mail to a Primary Destination to the Total } \\ & \text { Volume }\end{aligned}$
$\binom{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{S}_{i}}}{\mathrm{~T}}^{*} \quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio of mail to an } i-\text { th Secondary Destination to } \\ & \text { the Total Volume }\end{aligned}$
$\left({ }^{D_{t}}{ }_{i j}\right)^{*} \quad$ Ratio of mail to a $j-t h$ Tertiary Destination (off i-th Secondary) to the Total Volume
$\left(\frac{S_{i}}{T}\right)=\begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio of mail to an } i-\text { th Secondary to the Total }\end{aligned}$
$\left(\frac{{ }^{B} S}{T}\right)=\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio of By-pass mail entering at the Secondary to } \\ & \text { the Total Volume }\end{aligned}$
(
$\left(\frac{{ }^{B} C}{T}\right)=$ Ratio of City By-pass mail to the Total Volume $\left(\frac{\Sigma D_{p}}{T}\right)=\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Sum of ratios of mail to all Destinations off } \\ & \text { the Primary to the Total Volume }\end{aligned}$ $\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{P}}$
$\overline{\Sigma D_{P}}=\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio of mail to a Destination off the Primary } \\ & \text { to the sum of all Destinations off the Primary } \\ & \text { (Obtained from the Primary samples) }\end{aligned}$ 4. Fundamental Sampling Procedures and Related Formulae
4.1 Volume Count Data. Certain ratios must be established in order to relate the pieces of mail counted in each separation of the sample to the Total Volume of mail. It is therefore necessary to acquire from volume counts in the post office the following data:

Daily volume information expressed in footage for:
a. All mail into the Primary.
b. All mail by-passing the Primary and entering the Secondary.
c. All By-pass mail to the city.
d. All mail into each individual type Secondary case. (This count may not be necessary, see Section 6.1).

From the data listed above it is possible to determine the ratio of each class and type processed to the Total Volume of mail. Several of these ratios are then utilized in the formulae of Section 4.3 to estimate the percentage of the
( 2


Total Volume going to each Destination. It is advisable to obtain these volume figures at least one day prior to drawing the sample so that decisions regarding the type of analysis that will be used can be made early. Very of ten the analysis will not make use of certain volume ratios, such as those of d above, and therefore the particular volume counts may be discontinued. (See Sections 6.1, 7.1 and 8.1 for examples). 4.2 Sampling Procedures.
4.2.1 Primary. Two feet of mail is selected as it flows into the Primary cases from the canceling machines. It is placed on the ledge of the "test" case and distributed by a clerk. Special care is taken to see to it that no mail is added to or subtracted from the sample. After Distribution has been made, the contents of each separation box are counted by the distributor and recorded by the supervising clerk. (e.g., see Figure 4 on page 24).

Special care must be given to the choice of the sample. The randomness of the selection of the two foot tray was assured by choosing the first two feet flowing into the Primary from the cancelling machine at the predetermined time for drawing the sample. The mail accumulating in the stackers of the cancellation machines is fed from a moving conveyor belt that passes seven or eight persons, each of whom faces and places on

the belt letters selected from those within his reach. Thus the letters undergo a fairly thorough mixing as they are being stacked so that the letters in any tray of mail sampled at this point would tend to have the property of randomness which is necessary in sampling studies. This method of sampling was selected in order to help eliminate the possibility of personal bias, conscious or unconscious, or personal responsibility for actual allocations. Metered mail and Patron Segregated Stamped mail which do not "run" are sampled in the same way described for Machine Cancellation mail.

However, Metered mail and Patron Segregated mail which do tend to "run" must be sampled differently. Any "bite" or "bunch" of this kind of mail may be addressed to the same Destination and therefore would not have the required property of randomness. In this case successive letters are selected every few inches apart from each tier of mail until the required two feet is obtained. The distance between successive letters should be predetermined and constant.

Two samples, each of which consists of about 580 letters, may be drawn during the morning peak period and two during the evening peak period. It is recommended that samples be taken for five successive days, exclusive of Saturday and Sunday, in order to obtain a fairly representative picture of the mail throughout the week.

4.2.2 Secondary. Mail flowing into the Secondary comes either from the Primary or from By-pass mail. Secondary cases do not simultaneously generate enough mail to be sampled at any given moment. Each sample is drawn when enough mail has generated. In each case the sample used in the study is the first two feet of mail (regardless of type) that accumulates after a case has been selected for sampling. After Distribution has been made, the contents of each separation box is counted by the distributor and recorded by the supervising clerk. One sample may be taken in the morning peak and one in the evening peak periods throughout the week.
4.2.3 Tertiary. Mail flowing into the Tertiary cases usually comes from the Secondary. Therefore, it is possible to make counts on these cases only when enough mail is generated.

However, in cases where the required two feet does not generate, then smaller samples (i.e., whatever is available) may be counted. Here again, after Distribution has been made the contents of each separation box is counted by the distributor and recorded by the supervising clerk. Samples may be taken once in the morning and once in the evening at peak periods throughout the week.

Care must be taken to record any mail dispatched during the sample period prior to the final count of each Destination on Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary cases.
4.3 Related Formulae. Three essentially different sets of formulae may be used. 1/ These depend upon the percentage of By-pass mail that enters the system at the Secondary. In all cases the aim is to estimate the ratio of mail going to a given Destination to the sum of Primary and all By-pass mail.

### 4.3.1. The case where there is no By-pass mail

that enters the system at the Secondary.
a. For a Destination off the Primary:

$$
\left(\frac{D_{p}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{p}}{T_{p}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right)
$$

b. For a Destination off the Secondary:

$$
\left(\frac{D_{S_{i}}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{S_{i}}}{S_{i}} \times \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right)
$$

c. For a Destination off the Tertiary:

$$
\left(\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{t_{i j}} \times \frac{t_{i j}}{S_{i}} \times \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right)
$$

[^1]
$\square=1=-10=5$
15 $<-18$
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4.3.2. The case where the percentage of Bypass mail that enters the system at the Secondary is small, say, less than $2 \%$.
a. For a Destination off the Primary:
$$
\left(\frac{D_{p}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{p}}{T_{P}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right)
$$
b. For a Destination off the Secondary:
$$
\left.\left(\frac{{ }^{D_{S}}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{S_{i}}}{S_{i}} \times \frac{S_{i}}{T_{P}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \times \frac{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}}+\left(\frac{{ }_{B}}{T}\right.}{T}\right)
$$
c. For a Destination off the Tertiary:
$$
\left(\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{t_{i j}} \times \frac{t_{i j}}{S_{i}} \times \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \times \frac{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}}+\left(\frac{B_{S}}{T}\right)}{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}}}
$$

Implicit in the use of these formulae is the assumption that either:
a. the ratio of the i-th Secondary mail including By-pass mail to the i-th Secondary mail excluding Bypass mail is the same for all $i$ (in which case the formulae always hold regardless of the amount of By-pass mail into the Secondary),
b. the volume of By-pass mail that flows into the Secondary is small relative to the total Secondary mail (in which case the formulae are approximations to optimum formulae).
侱
4.3.3. The case where the percentage of By-pass mail
that enters the system at the Secondary is large, say, greater than $2 \%$.
a. For a Destination of $f$ the Primary:

$$
\left(\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{P}}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)^{*}=\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{P}}}{\Sigma \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{P}}} \times\left(\frac{\Sigma \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{P}}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)
$$

b. For a Destination off the Secondary:

$$
\left(\frac{\mathrm{D}_{S_{i}}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)^{*}=\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{S}_{i}}}{\mathrm{~S}_{i}} \times\left(\frac{\mathrm{S}_{i}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)
$$

c. For a Destination off the Tertiary:

$$
\left(\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{t_{i j}} \times \frac{t_{i j}}{S_{i}} \times\left(\frac{S_{i}}{T}\right)
$$

It is to be noted that formulae $b$ and $c$ of this section depend upon special volume count data that give $\left(\frac{S_{i}}{T}\right)$.

For examples worked out in detail see the San Francisco study, Section 6 .
5. Type of Mail Studied at San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Baltimore.

The Total Volume of mail studied in the San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Baltimore Post Offices may be classified as outgoing first class letter mail of the following types:

1. Cancellation Mail (Machine and Hand)
a. Stamped Mail into Mailing Primary
b. Air Mail to Mailing Primary

c. Specials to Mailing Primary
d. Stamped Mail into Secondary by-passing Primary
e. Stamped By-pass mail to city.
2. Non-Cancellation Mail
a. Metered into Primary
b. Metered into Secondary by-passing Primary
c. Air Mail into Mailing Primary
d. Specials into Mailing Primary
e. Permit into Primary
f. Permit into Secondary By-passing Primary
g. Penalty to Primary
h. Metered and Permit By-Pass to City
3. Dis Mail
a. Transit and Red line 1 into Secondary
b. Transit and Red line into Tertiary
c. Transit and Red line to city

Not included in this study is any type of incoming letter mail nor outgoing first class letter mail of the following types:

1. All mail to Air Mail and Special Delivery Sections by-passing mailing Primary
2. Dis mail to dispatch without separation
3. Large special mailings which would tend to bias the sample

## 6. San Francisco Study

6.1 Volume Count Data. Special volume counts were made in San Francisco to determine what percentage of the Total Volume flowed into the Primary, how much by-passed the Primary

[^2]
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and flowed either into the City section for local distribution or into the Secondary. These counts were made on six days, June $21,24,25,26,27$, and 28,1957 , between the hours of 10:00 A.M. and 10:00 P.M. These control figures were begun one day prior to drawing samples, so that decisions regarding sample size and optimum sampling periods and areas could be made. Volume control counts of mail flowing into the Secondary that by-passed the Primary wereless than $1 \%$. Thus San Francisco is analyzed according to Section 4.3.2. Therefore, it was established early that a footage count of mail flowing into the Secondary could be discontinued.

The Total volume figures and the corresponding percentages are summarized in Table 1. Figure 2 shows the consistency of these percentage figures during the entire sample period, based on a day by day comparison. The flow chart given in Figure 3 contains the basic proportion figures which are then applied in the appropriate formula, as well as certain other summary figures that are a result of the sampling study.
6.2 Sampling Procedure. The sampling procedure adopted for San Francisco is the same as that described in Sections 4.2 with the added modification that, wherever possible, the samples are made to consist of equal parts of the following: stamped long, stamped short, metered long, and metered short letters. This was done because San Francisco makes a
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separation between long and short letters which is maintained throughout the Primary and Secondary cases but not, however, in the Tertiary cases. Furthermore, metered and non-metered mail are worked separately throughout the Primary and Secondary cases. Special samples were taken on the San Francisco Primary in order to determine whether or not differences exist among the distributions of the various types of mail. (See the Appendix for the data and a preliminary analysis). The volume of mail generated in the Tertiary cases was very small during the morning sampling period. Therefore, no Tertiary samples were taken during this period.

Figures 4, 5, and 6 are copies of field sheets that show the sample data for the Primary, a typical Secondary, and a typical Tertiary at the San Francisco post office. Each column represents samples taken on each of the five consecutive sampling days. Application of the formulae to an example from each stage is shown in Section 6.4.
6.3 Computational formulae. In this Section the computational formulae used to estimate the percentage of the Total Volume of mail going to any given Destination are given. As indicated above the formulae of Section 4.3 .2 are appropriate to the San Francisco study.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Q-i |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| \#171: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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6.3.1 Primary. From Figure 3 the value of $\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right)=.8674$ and therefore the appropriate formula becomes:
$$
\left(\frac{D_{P}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{p}}{T_{P}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right)=\frac{D_{p}}{T_{P}} \times .8674
$$
(The total number of letters in the samples off the Primary was 11,196 ).
6.3.2 Secondary. The computational formula for Destinations off the Secondary depends upon the ratios obtained at the Primary as well as the volume counts. Using such ratios gives the formula:
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{D_{S_{i}}}{T}\right)^{*} & =\frac{D_{S_{i}}}{S_{i}} \times\left\{\frac{S_{i}}{T_{P}} \times\left(\frac{T_{P}}{T}\right) \times \frac{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{P}}+\left(\frac{B_{S}}{T}\right)}{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{P}}}\right\} \\
& =\frac{D_{S_{i}}}{S_{i}} \times c_{i},
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

where the $c_{i}$ are the quantities in brackets which depend upon the particular Secondary. Values of $c_{i}$ corresponding to particular Secondaries are listed in Table 2.


Number of Pieces in Sample and
Constants used in Computational Formula for Destinations off the Secondaries for San Francisco

| i | S $_{\text {i }}$ | No. <br> Pcs. | $\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{i}}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Ariz-New Mexico-Texas | 5,519 | .01290 |
| 2 | Ill.-Ind.-Iowa-Mass.- | 5,739 | .01774 |
| 3 | Mich.-Minn. |  |  |
| 4 | Southern States | 5,865 | .01468 |
| 5 | Rocky Mountain States | 5,252 | .02266 |
| 6 | N.Y.-N.J.-Ohio-Penn. | 6,286 | .02289 |
| 7 | Canada-Eastern | 5,535 | .01797 |
| 8 | California A-B | 4,676 | .02180 |
| 9 | California C-D | 4,945 | .02367 |
| 10 | California E-G | 4,499 | .01351 |
| 11 | California M-O | 4,989 | .02383 |
| 12 | California P-R | 4,994 | .02702 |
| 13 | California S | 5,049 | .03024 |
| 14 | California San Santa | 4,759 | .02031 |
| 15 | California T-Z | 4,893 | .03446 |
|  | Total | 4,596 | .02203 |

These constants actually represent the ratio, as estimated by using volume and Primary sample counts, of a Secondary volume of mail to the Total Volume.

6.3.3 Tertiary. The computational formula for Destinations off the Tertiary depends upon ratios obtained at the Primary and Secondary, as well as the volume counts. Using such ratios gives the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{T}\right)^{*} & =\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{t_{i j}} \times\left\{\frac{t_{i j}}{S_{i}} \times \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \times \frac{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}}+\left(\frac{B_{S}}{T}\right)}{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}}}\right. \\
& =D_{t_{i j}} \times
\end{aligned}
$$

where the $k_{i j}$ are the quantities in brackets which depend upon the particular Tertiary. Values of $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{i j}}$ corresponding to particular Tertiaries are listed in Table 3.

## TABLE 3

Number of Pieces in Sample and
Constants used in Computational Formula for Destinations off the Tertiaries for San Francisco

| $i, j$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ | No. <br> Pcs. | $\mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7,1 | California A-B | 1,665 | .00145 |
| 8,1 | California C-D | 2,507 | .00277 |
| 9,1 | California E-G | 1,727 | .00081 |
| 10,1 | California H-L | 2,648 | .00229 |
| 11,1 | California M-O | 2,086 | .00185 |
| 12,1 | California P-R | 2,262 | .00135 |
| $13+14,1$ | California S | 1,118 | .00107 |
| 15,1 | California T-Z | 2,152 | .00202 |
|  | Total |  | 16,165 |

$-\cdots$
保

These constants actually represent the ratio, as astimated by using volume and Primary and Secondary sample counts, of a Tertiary volume of mail to the Total Volume.
6.4 Examples. Applications of the formulae for each stage are given here:

Primary: (Seattle, Washington)

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
D_{P}=111 \text { pieces } & - & \text { Seattle, Washington } \\
T_{P}=11,196 \text { pieces } & - & \text { Total Primary }
\end{array}
$$

where the numbers are taken from Figure 4.
Thus,

$$
\left(\frac{D_{p}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{P}}{T_{P}} \times .8674=\frac{111}{11,196} \times .8674=.0085996
$$

Secondary: (Bell, California)

$$
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{S}_{7}}=31 \text { pieces } \quad-\quad \text { Bell, California }
$$

$$
S_{7}=4,676 \text { pieces }-\quad \text { Total Calif. A-B Secondary }
$$

where the numbers are taken from Figure 5.
Thus,

$$
\left(\frac{\mathrm{D}_{S_{7}}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)^{*}=\frac{\mathrm{D}_{S_{7}}}{\mathrm{~S}_{7}} \quad \times \quad c_{7}=\frac{31}{4676} \quad \times .02180=.0001445
$$

where the constant $c_{7}$ is taken from Table 2.
Tertiary: (Albion, California)

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{t}_{7,1}}=20 \text { pieces }- & \text { Albion, California } \\
\mathrm{t}_{7,1}=1665 \text { pieces }- & \text { Total Calif. A-B Tertiary }
\end{array}
$$

where the numbers are taken from Figure 6.
Thus,

$$
\left(\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{t}_{7,1}}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)^{*}=\frac{\mathrm{D}_{7,1}}{\mathrm{t}_{7,1}} \times \mathrm{k}_{7,1}=\frac{20}{1665} \times .00145=.0000174
$$

where $k_{7,1}$ is taken from Table 3.
6.5 Tabulation of Estimated Distribution and Observations.

The tabulation of the estimated proportions of the Total Volume mail going to each Destination is given in Table 4. These are listed in order of descending value. The largest 200 are listed by name and the remainder grouped by percentages. Figure 7 graphically portrays the largest 200 Destinations by percentage. Several observations, based on the tabulation, are given here:

1. The largest 200 Destinations received $80 \%$ of the Total Volume
2. Seventy-six percent of the Total Volume remained in the State of California (Not including Air Mail and Go backs)
3. Thirty-nine percent of the Total Volume remained in San Francisco.
4. Seven Destinations: San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, Washington State, Berkeley, New York City, and Sacramento were the only Destinations to receive more than one percent of the Total Volume.
5. Eighty percent of the Total Volume remained on the West Coast (Not including Air Mail and Go backs)
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Graph of Largest 200 Destinations for San Francisco

# TABULATION OF ESTIMATED PERCENTAGES OF THE TOTAL VOLUME TO EACH DESTINATION FOR SAN FRANCISCO <br> Largest 200 Destinations Listed by Name 

|  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 1. San Francisco Inc. City By Pass | 38.501 | 38.501 |  |
| 2. Oakland, California | 8.158 | 46.659 |  |
| 3. Los Angeles, California | 2.789 | 49.448 |  |
| 4. Washington State | 1.155 | 50.603 |  |
| 5. Berkeley, California | 1.147 | 51.750 |  |
| 6. New York City, New York | 1.116 | 52.866 |  |
| 7. Sacramento, California | 1.364 | 54.230 |  |
| 8. San Jose, California | .961 | 55.191 |  |
| 9. Seattle, Washington | .860 | 56.051 |  |
| 10. Oregon State | .775 | 56.826 |  |
| 11. San Mateo, California | .759 | 57.585 |  |
| 12. Redwood City, California | .679 | 58.264 |  |
| 13. Daly City, California | .670 | 58.934 |  |
| 14. Palo Alto, California | .654 | 59.588 |  |
| 15. Fresno, California | .612 | 60.200 |  |
| 16. Portland, Oregon | .605 | 60.805 |  |
| 17. South San Francisco | .574 | 61.379 |  |
| 18. Chicago, Illinois | .566 | 61.945 |  |
| 19. San Rafael, California | .521 | 62.466 |  |
| 20. Stockton, California | .504 | 62.970 |  |
| 21. Burlingame, California | .396 | 63.366 |  |
| 22. Menlo Park,California | .394 | 63.760 |  |
| 23. Santa Rosa, California | .352 | 64.112 |  |
| 24. San Diego, California | .349 | 64.461 |  |
| 25. Vallejo, California | .295 | 64.756 |  |



26. Reno, Nevada
27. Hayward, California
28. Richmond, California
29. San Leandro, California
30. Long Beach, California
31. Alameda, California . 264
32. San Bruno, California . 261
33. Mill-Valley, California . 252
34. San Carlos, California . 244
35. Walnut Creek, California . 234
36. Washington, D. C. (off. and unoff) . 232
37. Salt Lake City, Utah . 229
38. Santa Cruz, California . 210
39. Sunnyvale, California . 207
40. Denver, Colorado . 205
41. Watsonville, California . 195
42. Los Altos, California . 192
43. Salinas, California . 189
44. Vet. Adm., (Denver, Colo.) . 187
45. Concord, California . 185
46. Phoenix, Arizona . 183
47. Mountain View, California . 167
48. San Anselmo, California . 167
49. Millbrae, California . 164
50. Santa Clara, California . 164
51. Napa, California . 162
52. Modesta, California . 159
53. Los Gatos, California . 158
54. Bakersfield, California . 152
55. Belmont, California . 138
65.048
65.335
65.616
65.893
66.165
66.429
66.690
66.942
67.186
67.420
67.652
67.881
68.091
68.298
68.503
68.698
68.890
69.079
69.266
69.451
69.634
69.801
69.968
70.132
70.296
70.458
70.617
70.775
70.927
71.065
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56. Eureka, California
57. Sausalito, California
58. Santa Barbara, California
59. Monterey, California
60. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
61. La Fayette, California
62. Ukiah, California
63. Minneapolis, Minnesota
64. Emeryville, California
65. Pasadena, California
66. Petaluma, California
67. Chico, California
68. St. Louis, Missouri
69. Brooklyn, New York
70. Redding, California
71. Sharp Park,California
72. San Lorenzo, California
73. Long Isl. Cities, New York
74. Elcerrito,California
75. Detroit, Michigan
76. Garden City, New York
77. Merced, California
78. Dallas, Texas
79. Carmel, California
80. Castro Valley, California
81. Las Vegas, Nevada
82. San Pedro, California
83. Sonoma, Califomia
84. Houston, Texas
85. Boston, Massachusetts
.135
.134
.129
.127
.121
.116
.114
.112
.110
.110
.108
.107
.106
.106
.104
.100
.098
.097
.095
.094
.094
.094
$.093 \quad 73.569$
$.093 \quad 73.662$
$.092 \quad 73.754$
$.088 \quad 73.842$
$.087 \quad 73.929$
$.086 \quad 74.015$
$.085 \quad 74.100$
$.085 \quad 74.185$
71.200
71.334
71.463
71.590
71.711
71.827
71.941
72.053
72.163
72.273
72.381
72.488
72.594
72.700
72.804
72.904
73.002
73.099
73.194
73.288
73.382
73.476
?


| 86. | Tuscon, Arizona | . 083 | 74.268 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87. | Glendale, California | . 082 | 74.350 |
| 88. | Cleveland, Ohio | . 080 | 74.430 |
| 89. | Sebastapol, California | . 079 | 74.509 |
| 90. | Lodi, California | . 079 | 74.588 |
| 91. | Atherton, California | . 078 | 74.666 |
| 92. | Hawaii | . 077 | 74.743 |
| 93. | Cincinnati, Ohio | . 076 | 74.819 |
| 94. | San Antonio, Texas | . 075 | 74.894 |
| 95. | Beverly Hills, California | . 073 | 74.967 |
| 96. | Martinez, California | . 072 | 75.039 |
| 97. | Visalia, California | . 071 | 75.110 |
| 98. | Whittier, California | . 069 | 75.179 |
| 99. | Pittsburg, California | . 069 | 75.248 |
| 100. | North Hollywood, California | . 068 | 75.316 |
| 101. | Riverside, California | . 068 | 75.384 |
| 102. | Novato, California | . 068 | 75.452 |
| 103. | Turlack, California | . 068 | 75.520 |
| 104. | Paso Robles, California | . 068 | 75.588 |
| 105. | Van Nuys, California | . 067 | 75.655 |
| 106. | Kansas City, Missouri | . 067 | 75.722 |
| 107. | Saratoga, California | . 067 | 75.789 |
| 108. | Baltimore, Maryland | . 067 | 75.856 |
| 109. | Albany, Califoxnia | . 067 | 75.923 |
| 110. | Kentfield, California | . 067 | 75.990 |
| 111. | Boise, Idaho | . 066 | 76.056 |
| 112. | Cupercino, California | . 066 | 76.122 |
| 113. | New Orleans, Louisiana | . 065 | 76.187 |
| 114. | Orinda, California | . 063 | 76.250 |
| 115. | Woodland, California | . 063 | 76.313 |



| 116. | Burbank, California | . 062 | 76.375 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 117. | Santa Monica, California | . 061 | 76.436 |
| 118. | Santa Ana, California | . 061 | 76.497 |
| 119. | Inglewood, California | . 061 | 76.558 |
| 120. | San Bernadino, California | . 060 | 76.618 |
| 121. | Stanford, California | . 060 | 76.678 |
| 122. | Milwaukee, Wisconsin | . 060 | 76.738 |
| 123. | Healdsburg, California | . 060 | 76.798 |
| 124. | Campbell, California | . 059 | 76.857 |
| 125. | Sonora, California | . 058 | 76.915 |
| 126. | Fairfax, California | . 057 | 76.972 |
| 127. | San Luis Obispo, California | . 056 | 77.028 |
| 128. | Marysville, California | . 055 | 77.083 |
| 129. | Corte Madera, California | . 055 | 77.138 |
| 130. | Oroville, California | . 055 | 77.193 |
| 131. | St. Paul, Minnesota | . 055 | 77.248 |
| 132. | Ogden, Utah | . 055 | 77.303 |
| 133. | Ontario, Canada | . 054 | 77.357 |
| 134. | San Fernando, California | . 054 | 77.411 |
| 135. | Pittsburg, Pennsylvania | . 053 | 77.464 |
| 136. | Gilroy, California | . 052 | 77.516 |
| 137. | Woodside, California | . 052 | 77.568 |
| 138. | Fort Ord, California | . 051 | 77.619 |
| 139. | Livermore, California | . 050 | 77.669 |
| 140. | Terre Haute, Indiana | . 049 | 77.718 |
| 141. | Ross, California | . 049 | 77.767 |
| 142. | Monterey Park, California | . 048 | 77.815 |
| 143. | San Pablo, California | . 048 | 77.863 |
| 144. | Auburn, California | .048 | 77.911 |
| 145. | Alhambra, California | . 047 | 77.958 |

146. Tracy, California
147. Yuba City, California
148. Larkspur, California
149. Antioch, California
150. E1 Paso, Texas
151. Hanford, California
152. Ventura, California
153. Vancouver, B.C.
154. Brisbane, California
155. Pacific Grove, California
156. Omaha, Nebraska
157. Indianapolis, Indiana
158. Dayton, Ohio
159. Hollister, California
160. Madera, California
161. Fort Bragg, California
162. Guernerville, California
163. Montreal, Quebec
164. Calistoga, California
165. Arcata, California
166. Albuquerque, New Mexico
167. Santa Maria, California
168. Ft. Worth, Texas
169. Toronto, Ontario
170. Grass Valley, California
171. Anaheim, California
172. St. Helena, California
173. South Gate, California
174. Pleasantville, New York
175. Seaside, California

Percent
.047
.047
.047
.047
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.046
.045
.045
.045
. 044
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.043
. 041
. 041
.041
.041
. 041
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.040
.040
.040
.040
. 039
. 039
. 038
.038
.037
. 037
78.005
78.052
78.099
78.146
78.192
78.238
78.283
78.328
78.373
78.417
78.461
78.504
78.547
78.590
78.631
78.672
78.713
78.754
78.795
78.836
78.876
78.916
78.956
78.996
79.035
79.074
79.112
79.150
79.187
79.224

| 176. Belvedere, California | .036 | 79.260 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 177. Torrance, California | .035 | 79.295 |
| 178. Newark, New Jersey | .035 | 79.330 |
| 179. Vacaville, California | .034 | 79.364 |
| 180. Tulare, California | .033 | 79.397 |
| 181. Louisville, Kentucky | .033 | 79.430 |
| 182. Atlanta, Georgia | .033 | 79.463 |
| 183. San Gabriel, California | .033 | 79.496 |
| 184. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma | .032 | 79.528 |
| 185. Paradise, California | .032 | 79.560 |
| 186. Pomona, California | .032 | 79.592 |
| 187. Roseville, California | .032 | 79.624 |
| 188. Fullerton, California | .032 | 79.656 |
| 189. Miami, Florida | .032 | 79.688 |
| 190. Buffalo, New York | .032 | 79.720 |
| 191. Des Moines, Iowa | .032 | 79.752 |
| 192. Arcadia, California | .032 | 79.784 |
| 193. Fairfield, California | .031 | 79.815 |
| $194 . ~ D a n v i l l e, ~ C a l i f o r n i a ~$ | .031 | 79.846 |
| $195 . ~ P l e a s a n t ~ H i l l, ~ C a l i f o r n i a ~$ | .031 | 79.877 |
| $196 . ~ W i l m i n g t o n, ~ C a l i f o r n i a ~$ | .030 | 79.907 |
| 197. Lakeport, California | .030 | 79.937 |
| 198. Willits, California | .029 | 79.966 |
| 199. Porterville, California | 79.995 |  |
| 200. Placerville, California | .029 | 70.024 |


| Rank | No. in Group | Individual Percent | Group Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 201-204 | 4 | . 029 | . 116 | 80.140 |
| 205-207 | 3 | . 028 | . 084 | 80.224 |
| 208-214 | 7 | . 027 | . 189 | 80.413 |
| 215-220 | 6 | . 026 | . 156 | 80.569 |
| 221-225 | 5 | . 025 | . 125 | 80.694 |
| 226-231 | 6 | . 024 | . 144 | 80.838 |
| 232-239 | 8 | . 023 | . 184 | 81.022 |
| 240-249 | 10 | . 022 | . 220 | 81.242 |
| 250-256 | 7 | . 021 | . 147 | 81.389 |
| 257-264 | 8 | . 020 | . 160 | 81.549 |
| 265-281 | 17 | . 019 | . 323 | 81.872 |
| 282-292 | 11 | . 018 | . 198 | 82.070 |
| 293-304 | 12 | . 017 | . 204 | 82.274 |
| 305-321 | 17 | . 016 | . 272 | 82.546 |
| 322-335 | 14 | . 015 | . 210 | 82.756 |
| 336-360 | 25 | . 014 | . 350 | 83.106 |
| 361-380 | 20 | . 013 | . 260 | 83.366 |
| 381-401 | 21 | . 012 | . 252 | 83.618 |
| 402-429 | 28 | . 011 | . 308 | 83.926 |
| 430-467 | 38 | . 010 | . 380 | 84.306 |
| 468-505 | 38 | . 009 | . 342 | 84.648 |
| 506-550 | 45 | . 008 | . 360 | 85.008 |
| 551-604 | 54 | . 007 | . 378 | 85.386 |
| 605-667 | 63 | . 006 | . 378 | 85.764 |
| 668-729 | 62 | . 005 | . 310 | 86.074 |
| 730-798 | 69 | . 004 | . 276 | 86.350 |
| 799-919 | 121 | . 003 | . 363 | 86.713 |
| 920-1087 | 168 | . 002 | . 336 | 87.049 |
| 1088-1271 | 184 | . 001 | . 184 | 87.233 |
| 1272-1296 | 25 | <. 001 | . 006 | 87.239 |


| Go Backs | .753 | 87.992 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Skips | 3.564 | 91.556 |
| Air Mail | 3.200 | 94.756 |
| Nixies | .426 | 95.182 |
| Foreign | .201 | 95.383 |
| Residues | 4.617 | 100.000 |

## Breakdown on Residue

| Illinois | . 253 | Colorado | 121 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indiana | . 108 | Nevada | . 060 |
| Iowa | . 103 | Utah | . 114 |
| Massachusetts | . 194 | Wyoming | . 041 |
| Michigan | . 162 | South Dakota | . 030 |
| Wisconsin | . 103 | North Dakota | . 035 |
| Maryland | . 076 | Arizona | . 058 |
| Delaware | . 007 | New Mexico | . 037 |
| Nebraska | . 051 | Mississippi | . 046 |
| Kansas | . 106 | Alabama | . 034 |
| Maine | . 029 | Florida | . 102 |
| Vermont | . 014 | Kentucky | . 057 |
| New Hampshire | . 020 | Tennessee | . 050 |
| Connecticut | . 074 | North Carolina | . 084 |
| Missouri | . 106 | Virginia | . 073 |
| Texas | . 252 | Arkansas | . 066 |
| Minnesota | . 101 | Georgia | . 070 |
| New Jersey | . 249 | Louisiana | . 082 |
| New York | .257 | Oklahoma | . 078 |
| Ohio | . 189 | South Carolina | . 019 |
| Pennsylvania | . 373 | West Virginia | . 034 |
| Montana | . 074 | California | . 307 |
| Idaho | . 101 | All other Canadas | . 017 |
|  |  | TOTAL | 4.617 |

7. Los Angeles Study
7.1 Volume Count Data. Special volume counts were made in Los Angeles to determine what percentage of the Total Volume flowed into the Primary, how much by-passed the Primary and flowed either into the City section for local Distribution or into the Secondary. These counts were made on six days, June 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 18, 1957, between the hours of $10: 00 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{M}^{2}$ and $10: 00$ P.M. These control figures were begun one day prior to drawing samples, so that decisions regarding sample size and optimum sampling periods and areas could be made. Volume control counts of mail flowing into the Secondary that by-passed the Primary were less than $1 \%$. Thus, Los Angeles is analyzed according to Section 4.3.2. Therefore, it was established early that a footage count of mail flowing into the Secondary could be discontinued. The Total Volume figures and the corresponding percentages are summarized in Table 5. Figure 8 shows the consistency of these percentage figures during the entire sample period, based on a day by day comparison. The flow chart given in Figure 9, contains the basic percentage figures which are then applied in the appropriate formula, as well as certain other summary figures that are a result of the sampling study. It is to be noticed that the Primary mail

[^5]

| $\infty$ |
| :--- |
| $\infty$ |
|  |
|  |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| $\infty$ |
| $\infty$ |
| $\infty$ |

1/ Appropriate conversion factor is used.
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Figure 9
Los Angeles Flow Chart
is divided into three parts because Los Angeles made use of three Primary cases of different sizes, notably 36 hole, 49 hole, and 63 hole cases.
7.2 Sampling Procedure. The sampling procedure adopted in Los Angeles is the same as that described in Section 4.2 with the modification that additional samples were taken from the two special Primary cases (49 and 63 hole cases) that handle only metered mail and are used solely during the evening peak periods. Samples were taken on June 12, 13, 14, 17, and 18, 1957.

### 7.3 Computational Formulae.

7.3.1 Primary. Let the 36,49 , and 63 hole cases be designated by $P_{1}, P_{2}$, and $P_{3}$ respectively. The following ratios are obtained from Figure 9:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{{ }^{T} \mathrm{P}_{1}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)=.8084 \\
& \left(\frac{{ }^{T} \mathrm{P}_{2}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)=.0361 \\
& \left(\frac{\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{P}_{3}}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)=.1030
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, the following formulae were used to determine the proportion of the Total Volume of mail going to:
a. Destination on the 36 hole Primary:

$$
\left(\frac{{ }^{\mathrm{D}_{1}}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)^{*}=\frac{{ }^{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{P}_{1}}}}{{ }^{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{P}_{1}}}} \times\left(\frac{{ }^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{P}_{1}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)=\frac{{ }^{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{P}_{1}}}}{{ }^{\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{P}_{1}}}} \times .8084
$$

(The total number of letters in the samples off the 36 hole Primary was 12,162 ).
b. Destination on the 49 hole Primary:

$$
\left(\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{P}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)^{*}=\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{P}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{P}_{2}}} \times\left(\frac{{ }^{\mathrm{T}} \mathrm{P}_{2}}{\mathrm{~T}}\right)=\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{P}_{2}}}{\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{P}_{2}}} \times .0361
$$

(The total number of letters in the samples off the 49 hole Primary was 2,162 ).
c. Destination on the 63 hole Primary:

$$
\left(\frac{{ }^{D_{P}}{ }_{3}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{{ }^{D} P_{3}}{{ }_{T} P_{3}} \times\left(\frac{{ }^{T} P_{3}}{T}\right)=\frac{{ }^{D_{P}}}{T_{3}}{ }^{T_{P_{3}}} \times .1030
$$

(The total number of letters in the samples off the 63 hole Primary was 2,783 ).
7.3.2 Secondary. The formula for Destinations off the Secondary depends upon the ratios obtained at the Primary and Secondary, as well as the volume counts. Using such ratios gives the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{{ }^{D_{S}}}{T}\right) *=\frac{{ }^{D_{S}} S_{i}}{S_{i}} \times\left\{\frac{S_{i}}{T_{P}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \times \frac{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum_{i} \frac{S_{i}}{T_{P}}+\left(\frac{B_{S}}{T}\right)}{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{P}}}\right\} \\
& =\frac{D_{i}}{S_{i}} \times c_{i},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the $c_{i}$ are the quantities in brackets which depend upon the particular Secondary. Values of $c_{i}$ corresponding to the particular Secondaries are listed in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Number of Pieces in Sample and
Constants used in Computational Formula for Destinations off the Secondaries for Los Angeles

| $i$ | S $_{\text {i }}$ | No. <br> Pcs. | $c_{i}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Ariz.-Colo.-New Mexico | 3,847 | .01364 |
| 2 | Ind.-Mass.-Pennsylvania | 6,377 | .01556 |
| 3 | Illinois-Ohio | 5,847 | .01414 |
| 4 | Central States | 5,403 | .00972 |
| 5 | North States | 5,811 | .01258 |
| 6 | Northwest States | 4,780 | .00775 |
| 7 | South States | 5,699 | .00815 |
| 8 | New Jersey-New York | 7,302 | .01492 |
| 9 | Oklahoma | 4,446 | .00233 |
| 10 | East States | 5,844 | .01104 |
| 11 | Texas | 4,809 | .01014 |
| 12 | California A-B | 5,303 | .02445 |
| 13 | California C | 5,296 | .02178 |
| 14 | California D-G | 5,014 | .02392 |
| 15 | California H-L | 4,951 | .03462 |
| 16 | California M-N | 5,120 | .01905 |
| 17 | California O-P-Q-Nevada | 5,310 | .02461 |
| 18 | California R-San | 5,575 | .02932 |
| 19 | California S-Santa | 5,320 | .04248 |
| 20 | California T-Z | 5,578 | .03146 |
|  | Total | 107,632 | .37166 |

7.3.3 Tertiary. The formula for Destinations off the Tertiary depends upon ratios obtained at the Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary, as well as the volume counts. Using such ratios

$$
\left.\begin{array}{l}
\text { gives the formula: } \\
\qquad\left(\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{t_{i j}} \times\left\{\frac{t_{i j}}{S_{i}} \times\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \times \frac{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}}+\left(\frac{B_{S}}{T}\right)}{\left(\frac{T_{p}}{T}\right) \sum \frac{S_{i}}{T_{p}}}\right.
\end{array}\right\}
$$

where the $k_{i j}$ are the quantities in brackets which depend upon the particular Tertiary. Values of $k_{i j}$ corresponding to the particular Tertiaries are listed in Table 7.

## TABLE 7

Number of Pieces in Sample and
Constants used in Computational Formula for Destinations off the Tertiaries for Los Angeles

| i, ${ }^{\text {j }}$ | $t_{i j}$ | No. Pcs. | $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,1 | Arizona Scheme | 4,581 | . 00050 |
| 1,2 | Colorado-New Scheme | 5,627 | . 00074 |
|  |  | 10,208 | . 00124 |

Although percentages were computed for each Destination on these two cases, these Destinations were found to be duplicates of the Destinations on the Arizona - Colorado - New Mexico Secondary cases. Therefore, duplicates were added together to give one combined percentage for the final tabulation.



# TABULATION OF ESTIMATED PERCENTAGES OF THE TOTAL VOLUME TO EACH DESTINATION FOR LOS ANGELES 

## Largest 200 Destinations Listed by Name

|  | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Los Angeles, Inc. City By-pass | 42.403 | 42.403 |
| 2. Beverly Hills, California | 1.816 | 44.219 |
| 3. Pasadena, California | 1.377 | 45.596 |
| 4. Long Beach, California | 1.343 | 46.939 |
| 5. New York City, New York | 1.219 | 48.158 |
| 6. San Francisco, California | 1.151 | 49.309 |
| 7. Glendale, California | . 989 | 50.298 |
| 8. North Hollywood, California | . 955 | 51.253 |
| 9. Santa Monica, California | . 949 | 52.202 |
| 10. San Diego, California | . 814 | 53.016 |
| 11. Burbank, California | . 765 | 53.781 |
| 12. Chicago, Illinois | . 759 | 54.540 |
| 13. Inglewood, California | . 753 | 55.293 |
| 14. Van Nuys, California | . 698 | 55.991 |
| 15. Sacramento, California | . 681 | 56.672 |
| 16. Washington State | . 640 | 57.312 |
| 17. Whittier, California | . 583 | 57.895 |
| 18. Compton, California | . 540 | 58.435 |
| 19. Culver City, California | . 498 | 58.933 |
| 20. Alhambra, California | . 489 | 59.422 |
| 21. Huntington Park, California | . 456 | 59.878 |
| 22. Phoenix, Arizona | . 384 | 60.262 |
| 23. Oregon State | . 378 | 60.640 |
| 24. South Gate, California | . 359 | 60.999 |
| 25. Santa Ana, California | . 341 | 61.340 |

## 

26. Montebello, California
27. Oakland, California
28. San Bernardino, California
29. Sherman Oaks, California
30. Gardena, California
31. Denver, Colorado
32. Torrance, California
33. Newark, New Jersey
34. San Gabriel, California
35. Santa Barbara, California
36. S. Pasadena, California
37. Fresno, California
38. Arcadia, California
39. Anaheim, California
40. Hawthorne, California
41. El Monte, California
42. Downey, California
43. Bakersfield, California
44. Riverside, California
45. Monrovia, California
46. Norwalk, California
47. San Fernando, California
48. Pomona, California
49. Washington, D. C.
50. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
51. Venice, California
52. Detroit, Michigan
53. San Jose, California
54. Redondo Beach, California
55. Dallas, Texas
.331
. 328
.326
.303
. 299
. 289
. 285
. 280
.269
.265
. 256
.250
.248
.248
.248
.236
.236
.235
. 233
. 228
. 228
.224
.216
.214
.212
.206
.189
.186
.183
.181
61.671
61.999
62.325
62.628
62.927
63.216
63.501
63.781
64.050
64.315
64.571
64.821
65.069
65.317
65.565
65.801
66.037
66.272
66.505
66.733
66.961
67.185
67.401
67.615
67.827
68.033
68.222
68.408
68.591
68.772



|  | Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56. Monterey Park, California | . 176 | 68.948 |
| 57. Bell, California | . 174 | 69.122 |
| 58. Cleveland, Ohio | . 172 | 69.294 |
| 59. Boston, Mass. | . 170 | 69.464 |
| 60. Reseda, California | . 170 | 69.634 |
| 61. San Marino, California | . 164 | 69.798 |
| 62. Covina, California | . 160 | 69.958 |
| 63. San Pedro, California | . 160 | 70.118 |
| 64. Tuscon, Arizona | . 159 | 70.277 |
| 65. Lancaster, California | . 148 | 70.425 |
| 66. Lakewood, California | . 148 | 70.573 |
| 67. Salt Lake City, Utah | . 148 | 70.721 |
| 68. Berkeley, California | . 148 | 70.869 |
| 69. Brooklyn, New York | . 147 | 71.016 |
| 70. Fullerton, California | . 146 | 71.162 |
| 71. Minneapolis, Minnesota | . 145 | 71.307 |
| 72. Temple City, California | . 143 | 71.450 |
| 73. Garden City, New York | . 140 | 71.590 |
| 74. St. Louis, Missouri | . 138 | 71.728 |
| 75. Manhattan Beach, California | . 134 | 71.862 |
| 76. Stockton, California | . 133 | 71.995 |
| 77. Pacoima, California | . 129 | 72.124 |
| 78. Lynwood, California | . 127 | 72.251 |
| 79. Pacific Palisade, California | . 126 | 72.377 |
| 80. Canoga, Park, California | . 124 | 72.501 |
| 81. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania | . 123 | 72.624 |
| 82. Houston, Texas | . 123 | 72.747 |
| 83. Garden Grove, California | . 121 | 72.868 |
| 84. Wilmington, California | . 121 | 72.989 |
| 85. Cincinnati, Ohio | . 118 | 73.107 |

86. Encino, California
87. West Covina, California
88. Oxnard, California
89. Palm Desert, California
90. Altadena, California
91. La Cresenta, California
92. Rivera, : California
93. Ventura, California
94. Azusa, California
95. Las Vegas, Nevada
96. La Canada, California
97. Bellflower, California
98. Kansas City, Missouri
99. Ontario, California
100. Studio City, California
101. Palo Alto, California
102. Hermosa Beach, California
103. La Puente, California
104. El Segundo, California
105. Baldwin Park, California
106. Northridge, California
107. Sun Valley, California
108. Woodland Hills, California
109. Maywood, California
110. Palm Springs, California
111. Milwaukee, Wisconsin
112. Baltimore, Maryland
113. Laguna, California
114. Puente, California
115. La Habra, California
.117
.114
. 114
. 111
. 108
. 108
. 104
. 104
. 102
. 101
.099
. 098
. 098
.097
. 094
.093
. 092
. 092
.091
.091
. 089
. 087
. 087
. 086
. 082
. 081
.080
.080
. 079
. 079
73.224
73.338
73.452
73.563
73.671
73.779
73.883
73.987
74.089
74.190
74.289
74.387
74.485
74.582
74.676
74.769
74.861
74.953
75.044
75.135
75.224
75.311
75.398
75.484
75.566
75.647
75.727
75.807
75.886
75.965

| 116. | Newport Beach, California | . 077 | 76.042 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 117. | San Luis Obispo, California | . 077 | 76.119 |
| 118. | Rosemead, California | . 077 | 76.196 |
| 119. | Indianapolis, Indiana | . 077 | 76.273 |
| 120. | Albuquerque, New Mexico | . 076 | 76.349 |
| 121. | Dayton, Ohio | . 073 | 76.422 |
| 122. | Lawndale, California | . 072 | 76.494 |
| 123. | Chula Vista, California | . 072 | 76.566 |
| 124. | La Jolla, California | . 072 | 76.638 |
| 125. | Fontana, California | . 071 | 76.709 |
| 126. | Orange, California | . 071 | 76.780 |
| 127. | Palos Verdes Estate, California | . 071 | 76.851 |
| 128. | Costa Mesa, California | . 070 | 76.921 |
| 129. | Redlands, California | . 070 | 76.991 |
| 130. | Oceanside, California | . 070 | 77.061 |
| 131. | St. Paul, Minnesota | . 069 | 77.130 |
| 132. | El Paso, Texas | . 068 | 77.198 |
| 133. | Tujunga, California | . 068 | 77.266 |
| 134. | Paramount, California | . 066 | 77.332 |
| 135. | Louisville, Kentucky | . 066 | 77.398 |
| 136. | Fort Worth, Texas | . 066 | 77.464 |
| 137. | El Centro, California | . 065 | 77.529 |
| 138. | Santa Maria, California | . 065 | 77.594 |
| 139. | Sierra Madre, California | . 065 | 77.659 |
| 140. | San Antonio, Texas | . 065 | 77.724 |
| 141. | Pico, California | . 064 | 77.788 |
| 142. | South San Gabriel | . 064 | 77.852 |
| 143. | New Orleans, Louisiana | . 064 | 77.916 |
| 144. | Terre Haute, Indiana | . 064 | 77.980 |

145. La Mesa, California
146. Claremont, California
147. Columbus, Ohio
148. Omaha, Nebraska
149. Vet. Adm. Denver, Colorado
150. San Mateo, California
151. Granada Hills, California
152. Sunland, California
153. Vista, California
154. Salinas, California
155. Buena Park, California
156. Sepulveda, California
157. San Clemente, California
158. Saugus, California
159. La Mirada, California
160. Camarillo, California
161. Tarzana, California
162. Richmond, California
163. San Ysidro, California
164. Modesto, California
165. Chino, California
166. Carona, California
167. Bronx, New York
168. Pleasantville, New York
169. Glendory, California
170. El Cajon, California
171. Escondido, California
172. Indio, California
173. Lomita, California
. 063
. 063
. 062
. 062
. 061
. 060
. 058
. 058
. 058
. 057
. 055
.055
. 055
. 054
. 054
. 054
.054
. 054
.054
.053
. 053
. 052
. 052
. 052
. 051
. 051
. 050
. 050
. 050
78.043
78.106
78.168
78.230
78.291
78.351
78.409
78.467
78.525
78.582
78.637
78.692
78.747
78.801
78.855
78.909
78.963
79.017
79.071
79.124
79.177
79.229
79.281
79.333
79.384
79.435
79.485
79.535
79.585
174. Toledo, Ohio
175. Tulsa, Oklahoma
176. Upland, California
177. Palmdale, California
178. Santa Rosa, California
179. Duarte, California
180. Des Moines, Iowa
181. Hayward, California
182. Malibu, California
183. Montrose, California
184. Taft, California
185. Santa Cruz, California
186. Memphis, Tennessee
187. Colton, California
188. Los Altos, California
189. Camp Pendleton, California
190. Universal City, California
191. Victorville, California
192. Vallejo, California
193. Visalia, California
194. Rolling Hills, California
195. Reno, Nevada
196. National City, California
197. Buffalo, New York

Cumulative Percent
.050
.049
.048

Percent | Cumulative |
| :--- |
| Percent |

79.635
79.684
79.732
79.780
79.828
79.875
79.921
79.967
80.012
80.057
80.102
80.147
80.192
80.237
80.281
80.324
80.367
80.409
80.451
80.493
80.535
80.577
80.619
80.661
80.702
80.743
80.783
1


| Rank | No. in Group | Individual Percent | Group Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 201- | 1 | . 039 | . 039 | 80.822 |
| 202-203 | 2 | . 038 | . 076 | 80.898 |
| 204-205 | 2 | . 037 | . 074 | 80.972 |
| 206-209 | 4 | . 036 | . 144 | 81.116 |
| 210-214 | 5 | . 035 | . 175 | 81.291 |
| 215-217 | 3 | . 034 | . 102 | 81.393 |
| 218-219 | 2 | . 033 | . 066 | 81.459 |
| 220-224 | 5 | . 032 | . 160 | 81.619 |
| 225-227 | 3 | . 031 | . 093 | 81.712 |
| 228-233 | 6 | . 030 | . 180 | 81.892 |
| 234-236 | 3 | . 029 | . 087 | 81.979 |
| 237-238 | 2 | . 028 | . 056 | 82.035 |
| 239-247 | 9 | . 027 | . 243 | 82.278 |
| 248-253 | 6 | . 026 | . 156 | 82.434 |
| 254-256 | 3 | . 025 | . 075 | 82.509 |
| 257-265 | 9 | . 024 | . 216 | 82.725 |
| 266-276 | 11 | . 023 | . 253 | 82.978 |
| 277-281 | 5 | . 022 | . 110 | 83.088 |
| 282-286 | 5 | . 021 | . 105 | 83.193 |
| 287-300 | 14 | . 020 | . 280 | 83.473 |
| 301-311 | 11 | . 019 | . 209 | 83.682 |
| 312-316 | 5 | . 018 | . 090 | 83.772 |
| 315-327 | 11 | . 017 | . 187 | 83.959 |
| 328-343 | 16 | . 016 | . 256 | 84.215 |
| 344-356 | 13 | . 015 | . 195 | 84.410 |
| 357-373 | 17 | . 014 | . 238 | 84.648 |
| 374-388 | 15 | . 013 | . 195 | 84.843 |
| 389-408 | 20 | . 012 | . 240 | 85.083 |
| 409-428 | 20 | . 011 | . 220 | 85.303 |
| 429-455 | 27 | . 010 | . 270 | 85.573 |


| Rank | No. in Group | Individual Percent | Group <br> Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 457-489 | 33 | . 009 | . 297 | 85.870 |
| 490-528 | 39 | . 008 | . 312 | 86.182 |
| 529-584 | 56 | . 007 | . 392 | 86.574 |
| 585-646 | 62 | . 006 | . 372 | 86.946 |
| 647-716 | 70 | . 005 | . 350 | 87.296 |
| 717-839 | 123 | . 004 | . 492 | 87.788 |
| 840-980 | 141 | . 003 | . 423 | 88.211 |
| 981-1178 | 198 | . 002 | . 396 | 88.607 |
| 1179-1413 | 235 | . 001 | . 235 | 88.842 |
| 1414-1587 | 174 | $<.001$ | . 030 | 88.872 |
| Air Mail |  |  | . 485 | 89.357 |
| Postage Due |  |  | . 375 | 89.732 |
| Uncanceled |  |  | 5.483 | 95.215 |
| Foreign |  |  | . 529 | 95.744 |
| Go Backs |  |  | . 392 | 96.136 |
| Residue |  |  | 3.864 | 100.000 |

Breakdown of Residue:

| Illinois | .267 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Ohio | .161 |
| Michigan | .158 |
| Minnesota | .098 |
| North Dakota | .025 |
| South Dakota | .063 |
| Wisconsin | .092 |
| Arizona | .050 |
| Colorado, New Mexico | .074 |
| North Carolina | .055 |
| Kentucky | .057 |


| Maryland | . 030 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Texas | . 200 |
| Idaho | . 033 |
| Montana | . 033 |
| Nebraska | . 061 |
| Utah | . 069 |
| Wyoming | . 023 |
| Iowa | . 091 |
| Kansas | . 073 |
| Missouri | . 094 |
| Tennessee | . 048 |
| Indiana | . 122 |
| Massachusetts | . 110 |
| Pennsylvania | . 218 |
| Nevada Scheme | . 025 |
| California Scheme | . 087 |
| Arkansas | . 083 |
| Alabama | . 043 |
| Florida | . 062 |
| Georgia | . 044 |
| Louisiana | . 074 |
| Mississippi | . 051 |
| South Carolina | . 022 |
| Delaware | . 010 |
| Connecticut | . 051 |
| Maine | . 019 |
| New Hampshire | . 021 |
| Rhode Island | . 013 |
| Virginia | . 050 |
| West Virginia | . 030 |
| New Jersey | . 125 |


| New York State | .206 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oklahoma | .056 |
| California A-B | .057 |
| California C | .056 |
| California H-L | .141 |
| California M-N | .058 |
| California T-Z | .071 |
| She Scheme | .039 |
| California R. San | .043 |
| Colorado, N. Mex. Res. | .008 |
| Elp and La. No. 4 | .001 |
| Alb. and La. 18-20 | .001 |
| Res. to Arizona | .007 |
| Alb. to La., N.M. | .001 |
| Alb. and La., Colo. | .001 |
| Gr. Jct. and Ogd. | .002 |
| Om. and Ogd., Colo. | .001 |

7.4 Tabulation of Estimated Distribution and Observations.

The tabulation of the estimated percentages of the Total Volume of mail going to each Destination is given in Table 8. These are listed in order of descending value. The largest 200 are listed by name and the remainder grouped by percentages. Figure 10 graphically portrays the largest 200 Destinations by percentage. Several observations, based on the tabulation, are given here:

1. The largest 200 Destinations received $81 \%$ of the Total Volume
2. Seventy-eight percent of the Total Volume remained in the state of California (not including Air Mail and Go backs).
3. Forty-two percent of the Total Volume remained in Los Angeles.
4. Six Destinations: Los Angeles, Beverly Hills, Pasadena, Long Beach, New York City, and San Francisco, were the only cities that received more than one percent of the Total Volume.
5. Seventy-nine percent remained on the West Coast (not including Air Mail and Go backs).
6. Baltimore Study.

Baltimore represents the initial attempt to develop a method of sampling for estimating the distribution of mail by Destination. Baltimore was a conveniently located post office that gave an opportunity to try a new procedure in an office where a previous complete count study was made.

8.1 Volume Count Data. Special volume counts were made in Baltimore to determine what percentage of the Total Volume flowed into the Primary, how much by-passed the Primary and flowed either into the Secondary or into the city section for local Distribution. These counts were made on January 17, 18, $21,22,23,24,25,28,29,30,1957$, between 11:00 A.M. and 11:00 P.M. Volume control counts of mail flowing into the Secondary that by-passed the Primary was about $10.5 \%$ of the Total Volume. Therefore, Baltimore is analyzed according to Section 4.3.3., and therefore footage counts of mail into each Secondary had to be obtained. These figures were kept for the entire sampling period.

The Total Volume figures and corresponding percentages are summarized in Table 9. Figure 11 shows the consistency of these percentage figures during the entire sample period, based on a day by day comparison. Table 10 gives the basic volume data used to determine ratios of Secondary mail to Total Volume and Figure 12 shows the consistency of these ratios for each Secondary, based on a day by day comparison. The flow chart given in Figure 13 contains the basic percentage figures which are then applied in the appropriate formula.
8.2 Sampling Procedure. The sampling procedure adopted for Baltimore is the same as that described in Section 4.2.


| $1-24-57$ |
| ---: |
| 811,490 |
| 65.49 |
|  |
| 44,500 |
| 22,571 |
| 58,774 |
| 29,190 |
| 155,035 |
| 12.51 |
|  |
| 53,800 |
| 218,774 |
| 272,574 |
| 22.00 |
| $1,239,099$ |
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TABLE 10
for Baltimore
Volume Data for Determining Percentage of Total Volume to Each Secondary
to 11:00 P.M)
11:00 A.M.

| Date | Maryland, $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ |  | Delaware, $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ |  | New York, $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Pcs. | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent |
| 1/17 | 145,459 | 33.56 | 7,102 | 1.64 | 27,235 | 6.28 |
| 1/23 | 126,730 | 30.15 | 7,395 | 1.76 | 23,224 | 5.52 |
| 1/24 | 132,627 | 32.16 | 6,284 | 1.52 | 21,774 | 5.28 |
| 1/25 | 125,762 | 31.35 | 6,670 | 1.66 | 15,954 | 3.98 |
| 1/29 | 138,498 | 29.64 | 5,123 | 1.10 | 30,908 | 6.62 |
| 1/30 | 152,370 | 34.49 | 6,791 | 1.54 | 26,582 | 6.02 |
| Total | 821,446 | 31.89 | 39,365 | 1.53 | 145,677 | 5.65 |
| Date | Massachu <br> No. Pcs. | ts, $S_{4}$ <br> Percent | New Je No. Pcs. | $y, s_{5}$ <br> Percent | Conn., Me., Vermont, No. Pcs. | ${ }_{\text {,R.I. }}$ <br> Percent |
| 1/17 | 8,723 | 2.01 | 20,977 | 4.84 | 12,171 | 2.81 |
| 1/23 | 9,304 | 2.21 | 21,122 | 5.02 | 9,811 | 2.33 |
| 1/24 | 11,865 | 2.88 | 17,714 | 4.30 | 10,658 | 2.58 |
| 1/25 | 9,811 | 2.45 | 15,200 | 3.79 | 9,062 | 2.26 |
| 1/29 | 11,359 | 2.43 | 19,164 | 4.10 | 15,514 | 3.32 |
| 1/30 | 9,691 | 2.19 | 20,058 | 4.54 | 10,440 | 2.36 |
| Total | 60,753 | 2.36 | 114,235 | 4.43 | 67,656 | 2.63 |

TABLE 10 (Continued)

| Date | Pennsylvania, $\mathrm{S}_{7}$ |  | Virginia, $\mathrm{S}_{8}$ |  | Florida, $\mathrm{S}_{9}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Pcs. | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent |
| 1/17 | 36,250 | 8.36 | 37,869 | 8.74 | 8,749 | 2.02 |
| 1/23 | 38,449 | 9.15 | 34,485 | 8.20 | 16,335 | 3.89 |
| 1/24 | 37,868 | 9.19 | 35,694 | 8.66 | 8,821 | 2.14 |
| 1/25 | 34,653 | 8.64 | 40,406 | 10.07 | 10,850 | 2.71 |
| 1/29 | 44,636 | 9.55 | 30,764 | 6.58 | 10,851 | ${ }_{2.32}$ |
| 1/30 | 35,041 | 7.93 | 41,349 | 9.36 | 15,563 | 3.52 |
| Total | 226,897 | 8.81 | 220,567 | 8.56 | 71,169 | 2.76 |
| Date | Georgia, S.C., $\mathrm{S}_{10}$ |  | Miss, Tenn,.Ala., La., $\mathrm{S}_{11}$ |  | North Carolina, $\mathrm{S}_{12}$ |  |
|  | $\overline{\text { No. Pcs. }}$ | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent | $\overline{\text { No. Pcs. }}$ | Percent |
| 1/17 | 12,253 | 2.83 | 7,806 | 1.80 | 20,590 | 4.75 |
| 1/23 | 12,396 | 2.95 | 11,236 | 2.67 | 19,189 | 4.56 |
| 1/24 | 11,431 | 2.77 | 9,569 | 2.32 | 15,152 | 3.67 |
| 1/25 | 8,942 | 2.23 | 9,738 | 2.43 | 17,519 | 4.37 |
| 1/29 | 10,271 | 2.20 | 12,542 | 2.68 | 22,016 | 4.71 |
| 1/30 | 11,382 | 2.58 | 11,165 | 2.53 | 13,340 | 3.02 |
| Total | 66,675 | 2.59 | 62,05 | 2.41 | 107,806 | 4.18 |
| Date | Texas, $\mathrm{S}_{13}$ |  | Ind. -Ky., $\mathrm{S}_{14}$ |  | California, $\mathrm{S}_{15}$ |  |
|  | $\overline{\text { No. Pcs. }}$ | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent | $\overline{\text { No. Pcs. }}$ | Percent |
| 1/17 | 5,997 | 1.38 | 5,678 | 1.31 | 8,797 | 2.03 |
| 1/23 | 10,005 | 2.38 | 6,597 | 1.57 | 7,467 | 1.78 |
| 1/24 | 6,524 | 1.58 | 8,845 | 2.14 | 9,521 | 2.31 |
| 1/25 | 7,660 | 1.91 | 8,482 | 2.11 | 9,449 | 2.36 |
| 1/29 | 6,307 | 1.35 | 7,999 | 1.71 | 15,877 | 3.40 |
| 1/30 | 5,365 | 1.21 | 4,326 | 0.98 | 10,779 | 2.44 |
| Total | 41,858 | 1.62 | 41,927 | 1.63 | 61,890 | 2.40 |

TABLE 10 (Continued)

| Date | West States, $\mathrm{S}_{16}$ |  | Mo.-Mich., $\mathrm{S}_{17}$ |  | Ia-Ill-Wisc., $\mathrm{S}_{18}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Pcs. | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent |
| 1/17 | 13,560 | 3.13 | 11,551 | 2.67 | 10,875 | 2.51 |
| 1/23 | 12,518 | 2.98 | 10,512 | 2.50 | 8,965 | 2.13 |
| 1/24 | 14,355 | 3.48 | 10,440 | 2.53 | 12,010 | 2.91 |
| 1/25 | 14,065 | 3.51 | 11,914 | 2.97 | 10,923 | 2.72 |
| 1/29 | 21,338 | 4.57 | 18,269 | 3.91 | 7,830 | 1.68 |
| 1/30 | 13,436 | 3.04 | 12,712 | 2.88 | 11,068 | 2.51 |
| Total | 89,272 | 3.47 | 75,398 | 2.93 | 61,671 | 2.39 |
| Date | West Virginia, $\mathrm{S}_{19}$ |  | Ohio, $\mathrm{S}_{20}$ |  | Star Route, $\mathrm{S}_{21}$ |  |
|  | No. Pcs. | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent | No. Pcs. | Percent |
| 1/17 | 10,610 | 2.45 | 17,593 | 4.06 | 3,552 | . 82 |
| 1/23 | 10,850 | 2.58 | 16,650 | 3.96 | 7,153 | 1.70 |
| 1/24 | 11,745 | 2.85 | 13,775 | 3.34 | 5,703 | 1.38 |
| 1/25 | 10,561 | 2.63 | 16,118 | 4.02 | 7,347 | 1.83 |
| 1/29 | 12,083 | 2.59 | 23,103 | 4.94 | 2,755 | . 59 |
| 1/30 | 11,382 | 2.58 | 15,612 | 3.53 | 3,285 | . 74 |
| Total | 67,231 | 2.61 | 102,851 | 3.99 | 29,795 | 1.16 |
| Date | TOTALS |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/17 | 433,397 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/23 | 420,393 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/24 | 412,375 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/25 | 401,086 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/29 | 467,207 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/30 | 441,737 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total | ,576,195 |  |  |  |  |  |
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However, samples were taken once a day and consisted of four feet, rather than two feet, of letters each.
8.3 Computational formulae.
8.3.1 Primary. From Figure 13 the value of
$\left(\frac{\Sigma D_{p}}{T}\right)=, 3499$ and therefore the appropriate formula becomes:
$\left(\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{p}}}{\mathrm{T}}\right)^{*}=\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{p}}}{\Sigma \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{p}}} \times\left(\frac{\Sigma \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{p}}}{\mathrm{T}}\right)=\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{p}}}{\Sigma \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{p}}} \times .3499$
(The total number of letters in the samples off the Primary was 10,978$)$. .
8.3.2 Secondary. The formula for Destinations off the Secondary depends upon the ratios obtained at the Secondary and the volume counts. Using such ratios gives the formula:

$$
\left(\frac{D_{S_{i}}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{S_{i}}}{S_{i}} \times\left(\frac{S_{i}}{T}\right)=\frac{D_{S_{i}}}{S_{i}} \times c_{i}
$$

where the $c_{i}$ are constants that depend upon the particular Secondary and are listed in Table 11.

Number of Pieces in Sample and Constants used in Computational Formula for Destinations off the Secondaries for Baltimore

| i | $S_{i}$ | No. Pcs. | $c_{i}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Maryland | 3,293 | . 13966 |
| 2 | Delaware | 1,719 | . 00669 |
| 3 | New York | 5,631 | . 02477 |
| 4 | Massachusetts | 4,410 | . 01033 |
| 5 | New Jersey | 3,129 | . 01942 |
| 6 | New England (Conn. Maine,N.H.,R.I., Vermont) | 2,956 | . 01150 |
| 7 | Pennsylvania | 1,890 | . 03858 |
| 8 | Virginia | 2,057 | . 03750 |
| 9 | Florida | 2,776 | . 01210 |
| 10 | Georgia-S.C. | 2,751 | . 01134 |
| 11 | Ala.-La.-Miss.-Tenn. | 2,290 | . 01055 |
| 12 | North Carolina | 2,875 | . 01833 |
| 13 | Texas | 1,130 | . 00712 |
| 14 | Ind., -Kentucky | 1,356 | . 00713 |
| 15 | California | 3,137 | . 01053 |
| 16 | West States | 1,865 | . 01518 |
| 17 | Mo.-Michigan | 2,701 | . 01282 |
| 18 | Ia. -Ill.-Wisc. | 1,142 | . 01049 |
| 19 | West Virginia | 3,676 | . 01143 |
| 20 | Ohio | 5,055 | . 01749 |
| 21 | Star Route | 1,958 | . 00507 |
|  | Total | 57,797 | . 43803 |

8.3.3 Tertiary. The formula for Destinations off the Tertiary depends upon ratios obtained at the Secondary and Tertiary, as well as the volume counts. Using such ratios gives the formula:

$$
\left(\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{T}\right)^{*}=\frac{D_{t_{i j}}}{t_{i j}} \times\left\{\frac{t_{i j}}{s_{i}} \times\left(\frac{s_{i}}{T}\right)\right\}=\frac{{ }^{t_{i j}}}{t_{i j}} \times k_{i j},
$$

where the $k_{i j}$ are the quantities in brackets that depend upon the particular Tertiary. Values of $k_{i j}$ corresponding to the particular Tertiaries are listed in Table 12.

TABLE 12
Number of Pieces in Sample and Constants used in Computational Formula for Destinations off the Tertiary for Baltimore

| $i, j$ | $t_{i j}$ | No. <br> Pcs. | $k_{i j}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 1,1 | Md. DEF, GH | 3,821 | .00123 |
| 1,2 | Md. OPQR, T-Z | 5,721 | .00967 |
| 1,3 | Md. AB, C | 3,109 | .00827 |
| 1,4 | Md. S | 2,695 | .00619 |
| 1,5 | Maryland | 4,912 | .00119 |
| 7,1 | Penna. QRS-T-Z | 1,305 | .00359 |
| 7,2 | Penna. EFG | 525 | .00161 |
| 7,3 | Penna. HIJKL | 565 | .00184 |
| 7,4 | Penna. MNOP | 1,030 | .00247 |



TABLE 12 (Continued)

| $i, j$ | $t_{i j}$ | No. <br> PCS. | $k_{i j}$ |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 7,5 | Penna. AB, CD | 977 | .00247 |
| 8,1 | Virginia A-C, D-K | 1,643 | .00277 |
| 8,2 | Virginia L-Z | 2,108 | .00243 |
| 12,1 | North Carolina A-Z | 626 | .00131 |
|  | Total | $\frac{29,037}{.04504}$ |  |

8.4 Tabulation of Estimated Distribution and Observations.

The tabulation of the estimated percentages to each Destination is given in Table 13. These are listed in order of descending value. The largest 200 are listed by name and the remainder grouped by percentages. Figure 14 graphically portrays the largest 200 Destinations by percentages. Several observations, based on the tabulation, are given here:

1. The largest 200 Destinations received $78 \%$ of the Total Volume
2. Sixty-six percent of the Total Volume remained in the state of Maryland (not including Air Mail and Go backs).
3. Fifty-one percent of the Total Volume remained in Baltimore.
4. Four Destinations: Baltimore, Washington, New York, and Philadelphia were the only cities to receive more than one percent of Total Volume.


# TABULATION OF ESTIMATED PERCENTAGES OF THE TOTAL VOLUME TO EACH DESTINATION FOR BALTIMORE 

## Largest 200 Destinations <br> Listed by Name

|  | Percent | Cumulativ Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Baltimore Incl. Int. Rev. <br> Incl. City By-pass | 50.908 | 50.908 |
| 2. New York, New York | 1.979 | 52.887 |
| 3. Wash., D. C. (Incl. official) | 1.283 | 54.170 |
| 4. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania | 1.094 | 55.264 |
| 5. Chicago, Illinois | . 678 | 55.942 |
| 6. Glen Burnie, Maryland | . 547 | 55.489 |
| 7. Reisterstown, Maryland | . 522 | 57.011 |
| 8. Richmond, Virginia | . 498 | 57.509 |
| 9. Annapolis, Maryland | . 462 | 57.971 |
| 10. Norfolk, Virginia | . 357 | 58.328 |
| 11. Cincinnati, Ohio | . 351 | 58.679 |
| 12. Silver Spring, Maryland | . 339 | 59.018 |
| 13. Pasadena, Maryland | . 327 | 59.345 |
| 14. Brooklyn, New York | . 315 | 59.660 |
| 15. Cleveland, Ohio | . 313 | 59.973 |
| 16. Wilmington, Delaware | . 298 | 60.271 |
| 17. Hagerstown, Maryland | . 297 | 60.568 |
| 18. Westminster, Maryland | . 293 | 60.861 |
| 19. Kansas City, Missouri | . 284 | 61.145 |
| 20. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania | . 278 | 61.423 |
| 21. Sykesville, Maryland | . 267 | 61.690 |
| 22. Frederick, Maryland | . 267 | 61.957 |
| 23. Lutherville, Maryland | . 258 | 62.215 |
| 24. Ellicott City, Maryland | . 256 | 62.471 |
| 25. Bainbridge, Maryland | . 256 | 62.727 |



|  |  |  | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26. Linthicum Heights, Maryland |  | Percent | .237 |
| 27. Pleasantville, New York | .227 | 63.191 |  |
| 28. Newark, New Jersey | .217 | 63.408 |  |
| 29. Hyattsville, Maryland | .225 | 63.633 |  |
| 30. Cumberland, Maryland | .225 | 63.858 |  |
| 31. St. Louis, Missouri | .209 | 64.067 |  |
| 32. Bel Air, Maryland | .208 | 64.275 |  |
| 33. Roanoke, Virginia | .204 | 64.479 |  |
| 34. Long Island, New York | .195 | 64.674 |  |
| 35. Arlington, Virginia | .184 | 64.858 |  |
| 36. Miami, Florida | .182 | 65.040 |  |
| 37. Severna Park, Maryland | .179 | 65.219 |  |
| 38. Randallstown, Maryland | .179 | 65.398 |  |
| 39. Bethesda, Maryland | .179 | 65.577 |  |
| 40. Minneapolis, Minnesota | .176 | 65.753 |  |
| 41. Univ. of Md. (College Park), Maryland | .175 | 65.928 |  |
| 42. Rockville, Maryland | .175 | 66.103 |  |
| 43. Owings Mills, Maryland | .175 | 66.278 |  |
| 44. Garden City, New York | .173 | 66.451 |  |
| 45. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania | .169 | 66.620 |  |
| 46. Salisbury, Maryland | .165 | 66.785 |  |
| 47. Timonium, Maryland. | .161 | 66.946 |  |
| 48. Ft. George G. Meade, Maryland | .161 | 67.107 |  |
| 49. Cockeysville, Maryland | .161 | 67.268 |  |
| 50. Naval Academy, Maryland | .152 | 67.420 |  |
| 51. Charlottesville, Virginia | .151 | 67.571 |  |
| 52. Boston Station, Mass. | .145 | 67.716 |  |
| 53. Cambridge, Maryland | .144 | 67.860 |  |
| 54. Columbus, Ohio | .143 | 68.003 |  |
| 55. Alexandria, Virginia | .142 | 68.145 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 

56. Hampstead, Maryland
57. College Park, Maryland
58. Arnold, Maryland
59. Detroit, Michigan
60. York, Pennsylvania
61. Los Angeles, California
62. Flushing, New York
63. Westbury, New York
64. Glenarm, Maryland
65. Havre de Grace, Maryland
66. Charlotte, North Carolina
67. Dallas, Texas
68. Bridgeport, Connecticut
69. Easton, Maryland
70. Greensboro, North Carolina
71. Milwaukee, Wisconsin
72. Dayton, Ohio
73. Stevenson, Maryland
74. Denver, Colorado
75. Louisville, Kentucky
76. Odenton, Maryland
77. Atlanta, Georgia
78. Hartford, Connecticut
79. St. Petersburg, Florida
80. Camden, New Jersey
81. Buffalo, New York
82. Parkton, Maryland
83. Newport News, Virginia
84. New Haven, Connecticut
85. Winston Salem, North Carolina
86. Rochester, New York
.140
.140
.140
.135
.125
.124
.123
.121
.119
.115
.109
.109
.109
.106
.106
.105
.104
.103
.103
.102
.102
.099
.099
.096
.094
.092
.089
.089
.088
.088
.087

Percent
68.285
68.425
68.565
68.700
68.825
68.949
69.072
69.193
69.312
69.427
69.536
69.645
69.754
69.860
69.966
70.071
70.175
70.278
70.381
70.483
70.585
70.684
70.783
70.879
70.973
71.065
71.154
71.243
71.331
71.419
71.506

| 87. | Aberdeen, Maryland | . 085 | 71.591 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 88. | Scranton, Pennsylvania | . 084 | 71.675 |
| 89. | Elkton, Maryland | . 081 | 71.756 |
| 90. | Trenton, New Jersey | . 081 | 71.837 |
| 91. | Miami Beach, Florida | . 080 | 71.917 |
| 92. | Lancaster, Pennsylvania | . 079 | 71.996 |
| 93. | Boston (zones l-18), Mass. | . 079 | 72.075 |
| 94. | Detroit (unzoned), Michigan | . 079 | 72.154 |
| 95. | Reading, Pennsylvania | . 076 | 72.230 |
| 96. | Upper Darby, Pennsylvania | . 076 | 72.306 |
| 97. | Memphis, Tennessee | . 075 | 72.381 |
| 98. | Lynchburg, Virginia | . 075 | 72.456 |
| 99. | Houston, Texas | . 073 | 72.529 |
| 100. | Laurel, Maryland | . 073 | 72.602 |
| 101. | Emmitsburg, Maryland | . 073 | 72.675 |
| 102. | Jamaica, New York | . 070 | 72.745 |
| 103. | Jexsey City, New Jersey | . 070 | 72.815 |
| 104. | Jacksonville, Florida | . 070 | 72.885 |
| 105. | Nashville, Tennessee | . 069 | 72.954 |
| 106. | Chevy Chase, Maryland | . 069 | 73.023 |
| 107. | Durham, North Carolina | . 069 | 73.092 |
| 108. | Atlantic City, New Jersey | . 068 | 73.160 |
| 109. | Akron, Ohio | . 068 | 73.228 |
| 110. | Raleigh, North Carolina | . 068 | 73.296 |
| 111. | Birmingham, Alabama | . 066 | 73.362 |
| 112. | Altoona, Pennsylvania | . 065 | 73.427 |
| 113. | Brooklandville, Maryland | . 064 | 73.491 |
| 114. | Portsmouth, Virginia | . 064 | 73.555 |
| 115. | Orlando, Florida | . 064 | 73.619 |
| 116. | Providence, Rhode Island | . 063 | 73.682 |
| 117. | Cambridge 38, Mass. | . 063 | 73.745 |

118. Parkersburg, West Virginia
.062
73.807
119. Falls Church, Virginia
.062
73.869
120. Staunton, Virginia
121. Indianapolis, Indiana
122. Mt. Vernon, New York
123. White Hall, Maryland
124. Tampa, Florida
125. Dover, Delaware
126. Newark, Delaware
127. Ft. Knox, Kentucky
128. Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
129. Ft. Lauderdale, Florida
130. Ft. Jackson, South Carolina
131. Columbia, South Carolina
.062
73.931
.061
73.992
74.053
74.113
74.173
74.233
74.292
74.351
74.410
74.468
74.525
74.581
74.636
74.691
74.745
74.799
74.851
74.902
74.953
75.004
75.055
75.105
75.155
75.205
75.255
75.305
75.355
75.404
75.453
75.502
132. Fairmont, West Virginia
133. Madison, Wisconsin
134. Chambersburg, Pennsylvania
135. Johnstown, Pennsylvania
136. Ft. Worth, Texas
137. Portland, Oregon
138. Severn, Maryland
139. Ft. Benning, Georgia
140. Martinsburg, West Virginia
141. Greenville, South Carolina
142. Princess Ann, Maryland
143. Gettysburg, Pennsylvania
144. Knoxville, Tennessee
145. Princeton, New. Jersey
146. Camden Term. 2, New Jersey
147. Des Moines, Iowa
148. San Antonio, Texas
149. New Brunswick, New Jersey
150. Crownsville, Maryland
151. Great Neck, New York
152. Danville, Virginia
153. Charleston, West Virginia
154. Fallston, Maryland
155. Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland
156. Street, Maryland
157. Battle Creek, Michigan
158. Carlisle, Pennsylvania
159. Phoenix, Maryland
160. New Orleans, Louisiana
161. Springfield, Mass.
162. Sparks, Maryland
.049
.047
.047
.047
.047
.047
.047
.047
.046
.046
.046
.045
.044
.044
.044
.044
.044
.043
.043
.043
.042
.042
.042
.042
.042
.041
.041
.041
.041
.041
.040

|  | Percent | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 181. Oakland, California | . 039 | 76.906 |
| 182. Berlin, Maryland | . 039 | 76.945 |
| 183. Elizabeth, New Jersey | . 039 | 76.984 |
| 184. Backbay (zones 15-16-17), Mass. | . 038 | 77.022 |
| 185. Worcester, Mass. | . 038 | 77.060 |
| 186. San Diego, California | . 038 | 77.098 |
| 187. Youngstown, Ohio | . 038 | 77.136 |
| 188. Taneytown, Maryland | . 038 | 77.174 |
| 189. Warren, Pennsylvania | . 037 | 77.211 |
| 190. Allentown, Pennsylvania | . 037 | 77.248 |
| 191. Poconoke City, Maryland | . 037 | 77.285 |
| 192. Fayetteville, North Carolina | . 036 | 77.321 |
| 193. Canton, Ohio | . 036 | 77.357 |
| 194. Paterson, New Jersey | . 036 | 77.393 |
| 195. Rockhall, Maryland | . 036 | 77.429 |
| 196. White Marsh, Maryland | . 036 | 77.465 |
| 197. Morgantown, West Virginia | . 036 | 77.501 |
| 198. Smithsburg, Maryland | . 035 | 77.536 |
| 199. Tucson, Arizona | . 035 | 77.571 |
| 200. Chattanooga, Tennessee | . 035 | 77.606 |


| Rank | No. in Group | Individual Percent | Group Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 201-202 | 2 | . 035 | . 070 | 77.676 |
| 203-205 | 3 | . 034 | . 102 | 77.778 |
| 206-212 | 7 | . 033 | . 231 | 78.009 |
| 213-221 | 9 | . 032 | . 288 | 78.297 |
| 222-230 | 9 | . 031 | . 279 | $78.576{ }^{\text {' }}$ |
| 231-234 | 4 | . 030 | . 120 | 78.696 |
| 235-242 | 8 | . 029 | . 232 | 78.928 |
| 243-245 | 3 | . 028 | . 084 | 79.012 |
| 246-252 | 7 | . 027 | . 189 | 79.201 |
| 253-260 | 8 | . 026 | . 208 | 79.409 |
| 261-269 | 9 | . 025 | . 225 | 79.634 |
| 270-280 | 11 | . 024 | . 264 | 79.898 |
| 281-287 | 7 | . 023 | . 161 | 80.059 |
| 288-302 | 15 | . 022 | . 330 | 80.389 |
| 303-316 | 14 | . 021 | . 294 | 80.683 |
| 317-331 | 15 | . 020 | . 300 | 80.983 |
| 332-345 | 14 | . 019 | . 266 | 81.249 |
| 346-357 | 12 | . 018 | . 216 | 81.465 |
| 358-373 | 16 | . 017 | . 272 | 81.737 |
| 374-399 | 26 | . 016 | . 416 | 82.153 |
| 400-415 | 16 | . 015 | . 240 | 82.393 |
| 416-445 | 30 | . 014 | . 420 | 82.813 |
| 446-477 | 32 | . 013 | . 416 | 83.229 |
| 478-515 | 38 | . 012 | . 456 | 83.685 |
| 516-544 | 29 | . 011 | . 319 | 84.004 |
| 545-587 | 43 | . 010 | . 430 | 84.434 |
| 588-642 | 55 | . 009 | . 495 | 84.929 |
| 643-699 | 57 | . 008 | . 456 | 85.385 |
| 700-767 | 68 | . 007 | . 476 | 85.861 |
| 768-859 | 92 | . 006 | . 552 | 86.413 |
| 860-982 | 123 | . 005 | . 615 | 87.028 |
| 983-1125 | 143 | . 004 | . 572 | 87.600 |
| 1126-1295 | 170 | . 003 | . 510 | 88.110 |
| 1296-1544 | 249 | . 002 | . 498 | 88.608 |
| 1545-1780 | 236 | . 001 | . 236 | 88.844 |
| 1781-1887 | 107 | less than . 001 | . 046 | 88.890 |
| Residue |  |  | 11.110 | 100.000 |

Percent

| Uncanceled | 2.879 | 91.769 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Special Delivery | .011 | 91.780 |
| APO Foreign | .148 | 91.928 |
| Star Route | .507 | 92.435 |
| Nixies | .216 | 92.651 |
| Go Backs | .030 | 92.681 |
| Air Mail | .172 | 92.853 |
| Misfiles | .073 | 92.926 |
| Residues | 7.074 | 100.000 |
| TOTAL | 11.110 |  |

## Breakdown on Residue

| Alaska | .004 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Idaho | .023 |
| Montana | .030 |
| New Mexico | .082 |
| Nebraska | .070 |
| Oregon | .046 |
| Nevada | .011 |
| Arizona | .022 |
| Utah | .024 |
| Arkansas | .059 |
| Colorado | .046 |
| Kansas | .080 |
| Minnesota | .069 |
| Oklahoma | .044 |
| Washington State | .062 |
| Wyoming | .005 |
| New Jersey | .509 |

Virginia RPO ..... 414
Wash. D.C., Mtr. Route ..... 004
Maryland ..... 107
Wash. D.C., Mtr. Route ..... 001
Wash. D.C., Mtr. Route ..... 015
Maryland RPO ..... 029
Louisiana .....  058
Tennessee ..... 178
Mississippi ..... 093
New York .....  395
Maine .....  081
Vermont ..... 042
Connecticut ..... 176
Rhode Island ..... 074
North Carolina RPO ..... 427
California RPO ..... 531
Delaware RPO ..... 010
Iowa ..... 085
Alabama ..... 175
Illinois $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{K} \mathrm{L}-\mathrm{Z}$ ..... 274
Wisconsin ..... 113
Ohio RPO ..... 370
Indiana RPO ..... 034
Kentucky RPO ..... 063
N. Y. and Pitts., Ind. ..... 046
Wash. and Grafton, Kentucky ..... 057
Wash. and Cinn., Kentucky ..... 023
Georgia RPO ..... 028
South Carolina RPO ..... 068
Wash. and Bristol, Georgia ..... 039
Wash. and Hamlet, South Carolina ..... 036
Wash. and Flor, Georgia ..... 012
Wash. and Flor., South Carolina ..... 056
Wash. and Charl., Georgia ..... 045
Wash. and Charl., South Carolina .....  068
West Virginia ..... 048
Texas RPO .....  178
N.Y. and Pitts., Texas ..... 078
Massachusetts .....  229
Florida 1 and 2 .....  282
Michigan A-K L-Z ..... 207
Missouri .....  082
Pennsylvania ..... 494
New Hampshire ..... 058
'TOTAL ..... 7.074
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## 

## APPENDIX A

## San Francisco Special Primary Study

The question of ten arises as to just how much difference, if any at all, exists among the distributions (by Destinations) of various types of mail, namely: metered long, metered short, stamped long, and stamped short letters. Special data were taken in San Francisco in an effort to help answer this question and these are included in Figure A.1. Figure A. 2 gives summary percentages of the raw data. Judging from a rough comparison of these percentages there are apparently very little differences among these different types of mail for the given separations (with the possible exception of Nixies and San Francisco which seem to be different for metered and stamped mail).


## $=$

|  |  |  |  | T |  |  | T | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \％．9 |  |  |  |  | is |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | O－3 | O－ |  | 15 |  | लm | \％ |  | －－ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Hom | W＇0＇9 | ${ }^{-1}$ |  | 81：000000 | \％olu | जैंज | ç | जन | केत |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | －mo． | Cig |  | $\bigcirc \bigcirc 0^{\circ}$ |  |  | citic | $7 \pi$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cos ${ }^{-1}$ | －10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $90 \%$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | वरत | － |  |  | （1） |  |  |  |  | $0$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \％ | － |  |  | 꾸굴 |  | mep | न－ |  | 9 ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  |  | 5 |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | －0 | 4 min |  | ¢0\％ | Nom | n ${ }^{\circ}$ | no | －$=1$ | \％ | क్ర్ర | 훙 |  |  | 60\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \％ | $\cdots$ |  | 0 | rem | $\cdots$ |  |  |  | mmo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \％ | O－ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 유웅 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{c}^{2}$ | त्वंक्तो | mo | mop |  | フ10 |  |  |  | \％in | No웅 | 尔 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | r－ris |  |  |  |  | rer | $\cdots$ |  | grim | N0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | oob | 以入c | ço | M m |  |  |  |  | NO | $\infty$ |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | － |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \％ | －${ }^{\text {g che }}$ | cics |  |  |  | Tris |  | Oon | mo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 号い | 8）． | －${ }^{\circ}$ | Mrี\％ |  |  |  |  | जैM゙心 | 认ై |  | $0^{60}{ }^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＞m3 |  | mom |  | স্তm |  |  | \％ |  |  | mox | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | क力 जैं | c |  |  |  | $1{ }^{\circ}$ |  | Tr |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | $\mathfrak{g l}$ | － | －${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | n以 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\sim}^{\infty} \sim$ | इलत | पनic | a | mN0 |  |  |  |  | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | जिले | बें ${ }^{3}$ | 3 คें | ina |  | －ro | Find |  | 0\％ | ช8\％ |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ＋ | r |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Vै |  | 认ँ | －${ }^{2}$ |  | mi | 勺ै |  | m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | 30 | 100 | ？ | m |  |  | ， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 | 00 |  | 7 ？ |  |  | $0 \times$ |  | － | m |  | rom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | 00 | 雨 | 3 m |  | शore | 000 | \％ | గ\％ | ，${ }^{2}$ |  | －m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1\％ |  | Nন্ন | ${ }^{2}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0}{ }^{\circ}$ | ¢ 정 | $0 \times 0$ |  |  | 3－ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | न－बत्व | a－ |  | a 0 | － | M | M | $\bigcirc$ | रतें |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | त्वç | 00 |  |  | －${ }^{\text {OH }}$ | ब्बुज | $0^{2}$ |  |  | m |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | लेने० | 0 O | Cु? | N＊ | तom | min | फ1／ |  | पे |  |  | 0 | 6mix |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $18$ | ～20 |  | O | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | त－ |  | द $\sqrt{ }$ | To | 0 |  |  | T 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | （ | cigm | 00 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 入¢ | $\cdots$ | त्र० |  | $\pm \sim$ | लें |  | －तु0 | －2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | व | －${ }^{\circ}$ | $\sim$ |  |  |  |  | त्य |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | conm | $\cdots=-1$ | －1 | $\checkmark$ | $\cdots 3$ | जल． |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | $\mathrm{St}^{\text {a }}$ | 『 | 87 | $\dot{\lambda}^{\text {－}}$ | ช0． | $-2$ |  | $00^{\circ}$ |  | in | 100 श | ंiर |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^6]
## TIE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The scope of activities of the National Bureau of Standards at its headquarters in Washington, D. C., and its major field laboratories in Boulder, Colorado, is suggested in the following listing of the divisions and sections engaged in technical work. In general, each eection carries out specialized research, development, and engineering in the field indicated by its title. A brief description of the activities, and of the resultant reports and publications, appears on the inside front cover of this report.

WASHINGTON, D. C.
Electricity and Electronics. Resistance and Reactance. Electron Tubes. Electrical Instruments. Magnetic Measurements. Dielectrics. Engineering Electronics. Electronic Instrumentation. Electrochemistry.
Optics and Metrology. Photometry and Colorimetry. Optical Instruments. Photographic Technology. Length. Engineering Metrology.
Heat and Power. Temperature Physics. Thermodynamics. Cryogenic Physics. Rheology and Lubrication. Engine Fuels.
Atomic and Radiation Physics. Spectroscopy. Radiometry. Mass Spectrometry. Solid State Physics. Electron Physics. Atomic Physics. Nuclear Physics. Radioactivity. X-rays. Betatron. Nucleonic Instrumentation. Radiological Equipment. AEC Radiation Instruments.
Chemistry. Organic Coatings. Surface Chenistry. Organic Chemistry, Analytical Chemistry. Inorganic Chemistry. Electrodeposition. Gas Chemistry. Physical Chemistry. Thermochemistry. Spectrochemistry. Pure Substances.
Mechanics. Sound. Mechanical Instruments." Fluid Mechanics. Engineering Mechanics. Mass and Scale. Capacity, Density, and Fluid Meters. Combustion Controls.
Organic and Fibrous Materials. Rubber. Textiles. Paper. Leather. Testing and Specifications. Polymer Structure. Organic Plastics. Dental Research.
Metallurgy. Thermal Metallurgy. Chemical Metaliurgy. Mechanical Metallurgy. Corrosion. Metal Physics.
Mineral Products. Engineering Ceramics. Glass. Reiractories. Enameled Metals, Concreting Materials. Constitution and Microstructure.
Building Technology. Structurai Engineering. Fire Protection. Heating and Air Conditioning. Floor, Roof, and Wall Coverings. Codes and Specifications.
Applied Mathematics. Numerical Analysis. Computation. Statisticai Engineering. Mathematical Physics.
Data Processing Systems. SEAC Engineering Group. Components and Techniques. Digital Circuitry. Digital Systems. Aralogue Systems. Application Engineering.

- Office of Basic Instramentation Office of Weights and Measures


## BOULDER, COLORADO

Cryogenic Engineering. Cryagenic Equipment. Eryogonic Processes. Properties of Materials. Gas Liquefaction.
Radio Propaquion Physics. Upper Atmosphere Rescarcf:. Ionospheric Research. Regular Propagation Services. Suri-Earth Relationships.
Radio Propagation Engineering. Data Reduction Irsirumentation. Modulation Systems. Navigation Systems. Radio Noise. Tropospheric Measurements. Tropospheric Analysis. Radio Systems Application Engineering,
Radio Standards, Radio Frequencies. Microwave Frequencies. High Frequency Electrical Standards. Radin Broaricast Service. High Freotency Impedance Standards. Calibration Center. Microwave Whysics. Minowave Circuit Siendards.


[^0]:    1 Figures in brackets refer to the list of references given at the end of the report.

[^1]:    1/ No proofs are given in this report. A forthcoming report by the first author will discuss the derivations and statistical properties of these estimates.

[^2]:    1/ Regular first class mail carried by air.

[^3]:    Figure 4 - Sample Data for San Francisco Primary (Worksheet)

[^4]:    - $m$

[^5]:    1/ Appropriate conversion factor is used.

[^6]:    Figure A． 2 －Summary of Sample Data for San Francisco Special Primary Study

