

BEFORE THE  
 POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION  
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

REVISED 1-11-2011  
 RECEIVED

JAN 13 P 4:10  
 PRC Docket No. A2011-5

In the Matter of:

Penobscot Finance Station  
 (aka Penobscot Post Office,  
 Penobscot P.O., & Penobscot  
 Branch P.O., etc.)  
 645 Griswold Street, Suite 100  
 Detroit, MI 48226

Barbara K. Sherwood, Petitioner

PARTICIPANT STATEMENT  
 (January 10, 2011)

2 postings on the door to the Penobscot P.O., Suite 100, Penobscot Bldg., Detroit: on November 3, 2010, a Final Determination notice to close the Penobscot Post Office as of technically, Monday, January 3, 2011, but actually, at noon on the previous Friday, December 31, 2010, the day of New Year's Eve, at noon & on December 29, 2010, a SPECIAL NOTICE to extend the Penobscot branch retail window operations through Friday, January 14, 2011 at 5 p.m. I understand from one of the Detroit USPS executives involved in the closure (a closure she opposes and hates to implement because she knows all the people who will be hurt) that the extension of two weeks was to specifically benefit the staff of the Penobscot P.O. so they wouldn't have to suffer the closure at noon of their beautiful and safe workplace in a beautiful and safe neighborhood and then have to go home and pretend to participate in a Happy New Year's celebration, but EVERYONE (USPS staff at the Penobscot P.O., customers of the Penobscot Retail Store, the numerous tenants of the Penobscot skyscraper) felt relieved & could enter the New Year with a hope for a happy future.

A Federal Regulation governing the appeal process for petitioners has to be corrected so that as soon as the Postal Regulatory Commission (PRC) accepts an appeal from a petitioner to review a USPS Final Determination to close a post office (and that should include a finance station), the announced closure will AUTOMATICALLY be SUSPENDED until at least after the conclusion of the PRC Review. The Procedural Schedule for Docket A2011-5 as designed by the PRC is a 4 month appeal process (although I understand that the PRC can conclude it earlier). The scheduled closure of the retail window operations on Friday, January 14, 2011 will end all Penobscot P.O. operations because the 2 activities of the Penobscot P.O. have been the window service and the rental of P.O. boxes to members of the community who had from Nov. 3, 2010 to Dec. 31, 2010 to relocate their box to the Main Fort St. Post Office if they wanted to keep the same address or if they chose to change their address, could have a box at the Renaissance P.O. or any post office of their choice that offers P.O. boxes. To close a post office 1½ months into a 4 month appeal process to keep the post office OPEN is tantamount to evicting someone from their home 1½ months into a 4 month legal appeal to keep them in their home or executing a Death Row prisoner 1½ months into a 4 month appeal to keep the prisoner alive. To forestall a January 14, 2011 closure of the Penobscot P.O., it would seem to me that the PRC would have to remand the entire matter to the Postal Service for further consideration or affirm the decision to close the Penobscot P.O. totally. The tenants of the Penobscot P.O. will lose the window services (bulk mailing, purchasing stamps, weighing and mailing oversize envelopes and packages), but they will continue to have a carrier from the Main Post Office on Fort Street

deliver their mail addressed to them at the Penobscot Building which is diverted to the Main Fort street Post Office before being delivered by a Main P.O. carrier to the tenants' mailboxes in a room adjacent to the Penobscot P.O. The services of the Penobscot P.O. and the delivery of mail to tenants' mailboxes from the Main P.O. have always been totally separate operations. Without the perk of the in-house post office, it will be more difficult to retain and attract new tenants and to give the public a reason to visit the Penobscot Building which once had so many reasons: for 16 years, the Penobscot P.O., for almost 75 of their 76 year history: Gail's Office Supply, L&L Books, the travel agency, London Luggage (all on the 1st floor) and in the Concourse with a south entrance, the Cellars (as in wine cellar), the 2 most talented shoemakers I've ever known, a copy shop, and the cafeteria known as the Colonnade. It's a miracle the Caucus Club Restaurant & Evidence Express remain.

Do I have a sentimental attachment to the Penobscot Building? Yes! When I was a year old in 1933 during the Depression, my father, Harold Warner Sherwood, a downtown Detroit banker, had no interruption in employment when the bank he worked for closed because Edsel Ford with financial assistance from Henry Ford and their wealthy friends founded the Manufacturers National Bank with their 1st headquarters in the Penobscot Building, 1933-1943. When they needed more space, they moved next door to a splendid historic building on the SE corner of Fort and Shelby, 1944-1977, where Daddy worked until he retired in 1960. In the summer of probably 1952 when I was a student at Wayne State University, I worked as a Kelly Girl & was assigned to Manufacturers' Headquarters. Daddy always ate lunch at the Colonnade in the Penobscot Building Concourse so, of course, that's where we had lunch. Manufacturers and Ford Motor Co. partnered to build Detroit's tallest skyscraper, the Renaissance Center (RenCen), Manufacturers' headquarters from 1977-1992 when they merged with Comerica and in 1993, moved into their present location: Comerica Tower (One Detroit Center), Detroit's 2nd tallest skyscraper, the Penobscot Building, the third tallest. Comerica's operations are in Detroit and Dallas. In "The Detroit Almanac: 300 Years of Life in the Motor City" published by the newspaper: "The Detroit Free Press," the Penobscot Bldg. is referred to as "the sentimental tower" because throughout its history 1928-the present (2010), if you tell a Detroiter you have a business at the Penobscot, they know you're a business success or you couldn't be there. So sad the Penobscot P.O. can't stay.

As long ago as the summer of 2009, Julie, the Penobscot P.O. clerk who keeps me informed, told me with a worried look on her face that the Penobscot P.O. was being reviewed for closure, which inspired my letter writing campaign (see my Dec. 1, 2010 appeal letter to the PRC on the prc.gov website, Docket A2011-5). That, in retrospect, would have been the ideal time for the USPS to post on the door of Suite 100, a PROPOSAL TO CLOSE, inviting the customers of the Penobscot P.O. to respond in writing (by mail, fax, e-mail, clerk delivery) to one USPS executive designated as the contact person. But the clerks informed the customers and many customers, not just Barbara Sherwood, wrote letters and communicated with USPS officials in Detroit and Washington, D.C. and one tenant? circulated a petition throughout the building in an effort to keep the Penobscot P.O. OPEN. This concerted activity on the part of Penobscot P.O. patrons to keep their P.O. OPEN began in at least August of 2009 & was reported to the clerks.

I want to focus now on the Dec. 21, 2010 filing of the USPS in response to my appeal. But before I do, I want to mention that the first deadline for the USPS as determined by the PRC on the Procedural Schedule was Dec. 16, 2010 when a response to my request to SUSPEND CLOSURE, pending the outcome of

REVISED 1-11-2011

the PRC Review, was ordered to be filed by the USPS which never responded on December 16, 2010 or to my knowledge, any day since. On the 17th of December 2010, when the USPS had neither responded on the 16th nor asked for an extension to respond, did the PRC have the authority to contact the USPS and remind them of the Dec. 16th deadline? In any case, the solution is to correct the Federal Regulations governing PRC appeals so that upon acceptance by the PRC of a petitioner's appeal for review of a USPS Final Determination to Close a P.O., the CLOSURE is AUTOMATICALLY SUSPENDED, pending the outcome of the Review.

Now, let's take a look at the December 21, 2010 filing of the USPS which was filed on the date of the deadline. The USPS filing of Dec. 21, 2010 consists of a 3 page cover letter by USPS attorneys: Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr., Chief Counsel, Pricing and Product Support, Kenneth N. Hollies and James M. Mecone and a 4 page discontinuance study of the Penobscot P.O. signed by Dean Granholm, Vice-President, Delivery and Post Office Operations, and dated October 21, 2010 which is labeled Exhibit 1, with Exhibit 2 consisting of 2 pages of Post Office Locations in the Detroit, MI area. There are 5 entries. Naturally, I know the Penobscot Postal store (as it's called on the website producing the list), the Renaissance Center P.O., and the Main Fort St. P.O., but I've never heard of Fox Creek Station at 12711 E. Jefferson 48230 which I found out from the postal clerk who answered the phone for the other unknown facility (the Grand Shelby Carr Annex) is at the corner of Connor and E. Jefferson and that is a very long, long way from the Financial District or downtown Detroit. The Annex, of course, does not deal with walk-in customers and has no window services or P.O. boxes available.

My point with regard to the 3 attorneys (Foucheaux, Hollies, and Mecone), Dean Granholm, author of the discontinuance study of the Penobscot P.O., and the website print-out of Post Office Locations in the Detroit, MI area is lack of personal knowledge about the Penobscot P.O., the Financial District of Detroit, downtown Detroit, and what people who live here consider near and far, largely depending on their mode of transportation (chauffeur driven car, self-driven car, bus, cab, bike, if downtown: the elevated train (the People Mover), or their own 2 feet). The Post Offices left off the website finder are the Gratiot Branch (which delivers to me, but because it's an ugly, small stand-alone building in a bad neighborhood, I won't go there) and the P.O. in the magnificent 1929 Art Deco Fisher Building (the 1928 Penobscot Bldg. is also Art Deco; love that style!). The Fisher Building in the New Center area has a branch of my bank and The Detroit Gallery of Contemporary Crafts (owner, Judy Primak), the boutique: Vera Jane, and my jeweler, Todd Michael who is a jewelry designer and owner of Facets of Todd Michael, so even though it takes 4 buses round trip, the journey is pleasant and the destination, divine. The Fisher Building P.O. was/is? on the endangered P.O. list. But when all is said and done, the Penobscot P.O. is the perfect P.O. location for me because I can combine so many errands in one small lovely place and easiest to access. And this is true not only for me, but for countless others.

Pp. 1-2 of the 3 page cover letter by Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr., Chief Counsel, Pricing and Product Support et al with offices in Washington, D.C., states that the Penobscot P.O. doesn't require an official administrative record conforming to P.O. discontinuance standards because the Penobscot Station is NOT a P.O. and the discontinuance of Penobscot Station does NOT qualify as a closure! Definitions, please, Daniel, of the differences between a P.O. and Finance Station & closure & discontinuance. The discontinuance study of the Penobscot Post Office (Exhibit 1) by Dean Granholm makes the point that the reason he's decided to close the Penobscot P.O. (Finance Station) is to save money: \$242,815 in 2011 & thereafter, \$249,874, annually. If closing the Penobscot P.O. would solve the financial problems of the USPS, that would be one thing, but it won't. I have no knowledge

REVISED 1-11-2011

4

of steps the USPS is taking behind the scenes to solve its perpetual financial problems, but it's obvious that the USPS is attempting to improve its finances by a really terrific "mail it in a USPS box" campaign, contemplating or implementing closures of Post Offices, threatening to raise postage AGAIN, and threatening to reduce mail delivery from 6 days to 5.

On P. 1 of Dean Granholm's discontinuance report, he mentions that on Nov. 6, 2009, questionnaires were distributed to "delivery customers" of the Penobscot Finance Station and were available over the counter for retail customers. I imagine he means, the Penobscot P.O. boxholders and retail customers. My clerk informant in the Penobscot P.O. doesn't know if the Main P.O. postal carrier delivered these questionnaires to the mailboxes of the tenants, an activity which does not involve the Penobscot P.O. My clerk informant, Julie, told me when I asked her if she recalls these questionnaires and she does, but she said they received 100s and 100s of them and the fact that Dean Granholm states that only 150 were returned raises questions. By Nov. 6, 2009, I had reached out by letter to everyone appropriate I could think of, both in Detroit and Washington, D.C. and had had acknowledgments from the majority. By Dec. 22, 2009, Senator Carl Levin had written me twice, 1) to state that he is the senior member of the U.S. Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee with legislative jurisdiction over the USPS and 2) to inform me that at his request, the USPS had reviewed the 24 P.O.s on the possible closure list for MI & had reduced the number of possible closures from 24 to 6. However, he was not successful in saving the 1 in Detroit, the Penobscot P.O. I only vaguely recall a questionnaire at the Penobscot P.O. and I question the validity of the tabulation of responses. Dean Granholm is not assessing all the protests by letter and petition with signatures which the Penobscot clerks were aware of (Julie is, I believe, the only one who was there in 2009 and is still there) because they as I were always taking copies into the Penobscot P.O. or otherwise reporting our efforts to keep the Penobscot P.O. OPEN.

The questionnaire about all matters concerning the USPS which was mailed to my house (and I thought a terrible waste of money in my case since I had expressed myself in my letters of August 2009) is the one I recall vividly in Spring 2010.

At the bottom of P. 1 Dean Granholm discontinuance report after "Response": Dean Granholm refers to the option of carrier delivery which would eliminate trips to the post office for their mail. He can only be referring in the case of the Penobscot P.O. to P.O. box holders who open P.O. boxes precisely because they don't want carrier delivery and don't want the world to know their home or business address. As for purchasing stamps by mail (or on the internet), I'm on the mailing list of the USPS catalog of commemoratives (the only type of stamp I use): the USA Philatelic (I was a stamp collector as a young girl and others in my family were as well since commemoratives are works of art), but I only buy commemoratives by phone when I can't buy the ones I want at the Penobscot, my P.O. for the 12 years I've lived at my present address. And I much prefer the social experience of going to the P.O. rather than ordering stamps over the phone. On P. 3 of Dean Granholm's discontinuance report, he concludes in the last paragraph of the section EFFECT ON COMMUNITY that closing the Penobscot P.O. will not adversely affect the community. I totally disagree. Closing the Penobscot P.O. will hurt the staff of the Penobscot P.O., the customers of window operations, the P.O. boxholders, the tenants who while not dependent on the Penobscot P.O. for the delivery of the mail are dependent on their in-house Post Office for bulk mailing, stamps, mailing supplies, etc. If the Penobscot P.O. closes, remember those

REVISED 1-11-2011

Detroit USPS executives involved in the closing, but who were opposed to it, the staff of the Penobscot P.O. who wanted to stay on the job in the Penobscot P.O. and not have to be transferred to another location (very likely, less desirable than the Penobscot P.O.), the customers from near and far residential neighborhoods who can no longer avail themselves of the friendly Penobscot P.O. window services, the tenants in the Penobscot Bldg. who have lost an in-house P.O. and now (as is true for those who work in nearby office and government buildings and retail establishments and cannot take a short walk to the Penobscot P.O.) will have to leave work and by cab or car travel to another P.O. or stop at a P.O. on their way to work for bulk mailing, package and oversize/overweight envelopes, and stamps, and the Penobscot P.O. boxholders who had to find another location to have a P.O. box.

A friend of mine who lives in West Bloomfield drove to Detroit in her car for a visit with a trunkful of wrapped-for-mailing Hanukkah and Christmas gifts and asked me what Post Office I would recommend and I said the Penobscot P.O. I told her my plan. We'd go together in her car to the South entrance of the Penobscot Bldg. on W. Congress, the entrance I use when I go by bus because it's easy access. I'd hop out of the car and ask the friendly security guard on the Concourse (street) level if he would ask a building maintenance man to bring a dolly to the trunk of my friend's car, load it up with her ready-to-mail packages and take it on the elevator up to the 1st floor Post Office; if the guard would let my friend park where she was for a few minutes, I would stay in the car, and she could go on the elevator to the P.O. and take care of mailing her packages. The plan worked perfectly just as I visualized it would. I was delighted and so was my friend with the staff of the Penobscot Building and the Penobscot Post Office, adding to the great reputation over the years of both. There is no other post office in Detroit or the suburbs where this plan could so pleasantly and easily be implemented. Not to my knowledge.

If the Penobscot P.O. closes, remember the visitors who can't avail themselves of their window services when there's ice & snow and holiday packages to mail.

The discontinuance study by Dean Granholm focused on the financial savings of closing the Penobscot P.O. by minimizing the negative human consequences and ignoring what could also be negative financial consequences. The USPS could close every Post Office and Finance Station in the nation and that would save money at the expense of no national mail and package delivery service. UPS, FedEx, DHL, and all the private delivery services, and the internet can supplement, but never replace the USPS. There's a cost to saving money by reducing services and that cost is unhappy customers. The public needs the services and goods of the USPS and the USPS needs the support of the public (intellectual, emotional, and financial support).

If the Penobscot P.O. closes, many will also remember that once a branch of the Federal Reserve graced the north side of Fort Street across from the Penobscot Building on the south side of Fort. Years ago when someone tried to rip a \$10. bill out of my hand and tore it in half because I hung on to the bill, I went to the Federal Reserve and they gave me a new \$10. bill. Now, the Federal Reserve is on E. Warren surrounded by barren land, really invisible from the street, with a high fence, probably electrified. I'm sure the employees of the Detroit branch of the Federal Reserve didn't want to move either, any more than the staff of the Penobscot P.O., and leave the beautiful and safe Financial District of Detroit behind.

REVISED 1-11-2011

6

The only real solution I can see to the financial problems of the USPS is legislation which amends the Postal Reorganization Act of August, 12, 1970, implemented on July 1, 1971, which "privatized" the USPS and created the Postal Regulatory Commission which I first became aware of by watching Ruth Goldway, Chairwoman of the Postal Regulatory Commission, twice a guest in 2010 on C-SPAN's Washington Journal. I wrote to Ruth Goldway in April, 2010, but sent it to the wrong address, the headquarters of the USPS. My letter was returned, I did further research and found the correct address, but did not mail the letter. However, as soon as I read the Nov. 3, 2010 Final Determination to Close notice on the door to the Penobscot P.O., I wrote a combination letter to U.S. Senator Carl Levin (with whom I'd been in correspondence) and Ruth Goldway. On Nov. 24, 2010, the day before Thanksgiving, Annie Kennedy, Consumer Relations Specialist with the PRC, phoned me and offered me the opportunity to appeal the Nov. 3rd, 2010 Final Determination to Close the Penobscot P.O., explained her role as my contact person, detailed what I needed to do, and mailed me material that day. When I asked legal questions, Annie could quickly consult with attorneys and answer me. On Dec. 10, 2010, the PRC issued a "Notice and Order Accepting Appeal and Establishing Procedural Schedule" and my new contact person became Cassandra Hicks who is an attorney, but NOT MY attorney; she's the attorney for "the Public," I'm the petitioner.

The Federal legislation I visualize could solve the financial dilemma of the USPS would return it to the status of a Federal Government Department like the Homeland Security Department or the Department of State (as the USPS once was for years before August 12, 1970 & July 1, 1971) in view of its mission to function as our national mail and package delivery system and part of a global network of national postal systems OR an agreement could be made between the USPS and the U.S. Congress that the Federal Govt. would underwrite the operations of the USPS by filling the financial gap between the financial needs of the USPS and income from customers (on whom it has been solely dependent). It's never been fair to expect the USPS with Federal Govt. Dept. responsibilities to have to function as a corporation with Federal Govt. and PRC oversight and make a profit (for whom?). Ruth Goldway on C-SPAN's Washington Journal had some excellent ideas for dealing with the financial problems of the USPS and I hope they pay attention to her.

Before I conclude today, 1) I thought that perhaps in order to post a Nov. 3, 2010 closure notice, 60 days prior or Sept. 3rd, a Proposal to Close should have been posted, but the USPS has said THAT policy does not apply to the Penobscot P.O. because it's a Postal STATION, 2) See Federal Regs 3001.111 Initiation of review proceedings (a) Petition for review. With regard to the reference to 30 days, the PRC attorneys Annie Kennedy consulted counted Nov. 3, 2010 as day one and counted day after day until reaching day 30, Thurs., Dec. 2, 2010. I, on the other hand, looked at Wed., Nov. 3 on the calendar, skipped down 4 Wednesdays to Wed., Dec. 1; then, since  $4 \times 7 = 28$ , I added 2 days making 30 on Fri., Dec. 3, 2010, so instructions on how to count 30 days by counting as day one, the day on which action A was taken rather than doing as I did and counting as day one, the day AFTER action A was taken, need to be given. What Annie, the attorneys, and I were doing is trying to figure out the correct deadline for me to postmark my appeal which had to be 30 days after the Nov. 3, 2010 Notice to Close was posted, 3) See 3001.111 (b) Intervention. The reference to the deadline for interveners as within 25 days of the date on which the notice for review is filed (in my case on Docket A2011-5, Procedural Schedule, my review request is Dec. 6, 2010) is contradicted by the Procedural Schedule which lists Jan. 4, 2011 as the deadline for interveners. Therefore, instead of a reference to 25 days, it might be better to direct attention to the Procedural Schedule for the relevant Docket.

REVISED 1-11-2011

7

I am sorry that no interveners filed their objections to the closure of the Penobscot P.O. (their deadline was Jan. 4, 2011), but I can understand why they didn't. U.S. Senator Carl Levin can't become involved in legal challenges (as an aide in his Detroit office explained), but Sen. Levin has pursued other avenues. Jim Joyce, the Property Manager of the Penobscot Bldg., was so enthusiastic when we spoke on the phone on Dec. 2, 2010, a day after I met him (Dec. 1) in the Penobscot elevator on my way to mail my appeal to the PRC to review the closure and ask the USPS to SUSPEND CLOSURE, pending the outcome of the review. Three other passengers entered the elevator and when I mentioned my destination and goal, to try to keep the P.O. open, the 2 women (tenants) said that if I had a petition, they'd sign it. The man said I should contact "them," and when I asked "How?" he gave me his business card (James Joyce (same name as the author of "Ulysses"), Property Manager of the Penobscot; management company, Finsilver/Friedman) and told me to contact him, which I did the next day. He wanted to know how they could participate in my appeal to the PRC (I assumed he meant, although he didn't say, Finsilver/Friedman, he as Property Manager of the Penobscot, & the tenants) and I told him "By being interveners," to which he responded by saying that that's what they would be. He added that he'd have all the tenants write letters insisting that the Penobscot P.O. remain open. I knew, however, that the attorneys for Finsilver/Friedman would have to approve, which they obviously didn't. I'm sure they realized (as I have reminded myself, always with angst) that to enact the PRC appeal process in a courtroom, I would be the plaintiff per se with no attorney to represent me (to advise me, yes, but not be MY attorney), challenging a destructive decision affecting me and the public by a top USPS executive (backed up by the USPS administration), the defendant, represented by 3 attorneys, specialists in USPS & PRC law, a scenario designed to have the plaintiff (most probably) lose and the defendant (most probably) win. However, the PRC appeal process DOES give me an opportunity to express my objections to the scheduled closure of a much loved Post Office, the Penobscot. I know I speak for not only myself but so many others. I wonder if it might be better if the PRC were a public-interest law firm without the restrictions imposed on them by the same Congressional legislation that "privatized" the USPS, the Postal Reorganization Act of Aug. 1970 which went into effect on July 1, 1971. In the case of the opposition to the closure of the Penobscot P.O., all the letters, petition with signatures, faxes, and e-mails have been originated by unorganized individuals and scattered to many offices, which the PRC cannot investigate, but the USPS COULD. I learned from the discontinuance study by Dean Granholm (see the Dec. 21 filing on Docket A2011-5, prc.gov by the USPS) that even before Oct. 21, 2010, the USPS and (I assume) management co. of the Penobscot reached agreement that the USPS would buy out the lease and pay for the reconstruction of Suite 100 to make it suitable for another tenant.

On Jan. 12, 2010, I received a letter dated Jan. 11 from Lloyd Wesley, Jr., Postmaster, Detroit District, in which for the first time I read, not about the closure or discontinuance of the Penobscot P.O., but rather the CONSOLIDATION of the Penobscot P.O. WITH THE MAIN DETROIT P.O. ON FORT STREET, in other words, a merger, which however, means a loss of the Penobscot P.O. in the perfectly located Penobscot Building in downtown Detroit's Financial District.

*Barbara K. Sherwood*

Barbara K. Sherwood 1-11-11

3 attachments as of 1-12-11: the 2 notices posted by the USPS with closure dates of Jan. 3, 2011 and for window operations, Jan. 14, 2011 and letter from the Detroit District Postmaster, Lloyd E. Wesley, Jr.

ATTACHMENT 1 of 3  
TO REVISED DOCUMENT  
OF 1-11-2011  
DOCKET A2011-5

**Detroit District  
PO Closing Coordinator**



# ***PENOBSCOT FINANCE STATION***

November 3, 2010

## **Penobscot Branch will be closed as of January 3, 2011**

As a result of a study conducted last year, the Postal Service has made the decision to close the Penobscot Finance Station located at 645 Griswold St. Ste 100, Detroit MI. However, the office will be open and operational for at least 60 days from the date above.

Career employees will be reassigned in accordance with applicable collective bargaining agreements and established repositioning processes. No dates have been set for personnel moves at this time.

This was a difficult decision but a necessary one. Because of the drastic decline in mail volume, the Postal Service is in a fiscal crisis and must take action to reduce the size of its retail and delivery network. By consolidating, streamlining and adjusting our operations, the Postal Service becomes a more efficient and effective organization.

Local mail delivery will not be affected by this move. Full retail services will be available in neighboring offices and our customers will continue to receive the same excellent service they always have.

Nearby Station or Branch:  
George W Young (GWY) Main located at 1401 W Fort Street  
Renaissance Center located at 100 Renaissance Center Ste 1014

If you have questions, or need additional information, please call at 313 226-8723,  
Carol Zarek, Review Coordinator, Detroit District

**Detroit District  
Relocation Coordinator**

9

**ATTACHMENT 2 of 3  
TO REVISED DOCUMENT  
OF 1-11-2011  
DOCKET A2011-5**



## ***SPECIAL NOTICE***

# ***PENOBSCOT FINANCE STATION***

December 29, 2010

### **Penobscot Branch Retail Window Operations Will remain open until January 14, 2011**

The Penobscot Finance Station located at 645 Griswold St. Ste 100, Detroit MI will extend their Retail Service window operation until Friday, January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

**The relocation of the Penobscot 48231 PO Box customers will remain on schedule. Last day for PO Box access in the Penobscot is December 31, 2010.** As of Monday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>, our 48231 box customers will collect their mail at the George W Young Main Post Office at 1401 W Fort Street.

Full retail services at our neighboring offices will begin January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011, where you will continue to receive the same excellent service you are accustomed to.

**Nearby Retail Stations:**

George W Young (GWY) Main located at 1401 W Fort Street  
Renaissance Center located at 100 Renaissance Center Ste 1014  
Gratiot Station located at 3434 Chene Street

If you have questions, or need additional information, please call at 313 226-8723, Carol Zarek, or Pat Shell, 313 226-8013, Coordinators, Detroit District.

We Appreciate Your Cooperation and Thank You for Choosing  
The United States Postal Service™.

POSTMASTER  
DETROIT DISTRICT

10

Attachment 3 of 3 Revised Document  
of 1-11-11, Docket A2011-5  
Letter Received by Barbara Sherwood  
on Wednesday, 1-12-2011



January 11, 2011

Barbara Sherwood  
1325 Chene St Apt 617  
Detroit MI 48207-3853

Dear Ms. Sherwood:

This is in response to your letter concerning your displeasure with the consolidation of the Penobscot Finance Unit at 645 Griswold to the George W. Young Main Post Office at 1401 W Fort St.

The continuing decline in mail volume has reduced postal revenues so much that the Postal Service™ was required to review all postal operations for opportunities to streamline processes. The consolidation process for the Penobscot had been initiated in November of 2009. After a review of business activities at the finance unit; analysis revealed the office workload and revenue for the past three years had been declining.

Your diligence in contacting many of the administrative offices is heartfelt, but the necessity to follow through on the consolidation enables the Postal Service™ to provide service more efficiently.

We truly value you as a customer and appreciate your passion to keep the Penobscot unit on Griswold, but in these times of high unemployment and decreasing customer visits to our post offices, we too, have to make sacrifices to ensure the longevity of the United States Postal Service™ as a whole.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lloyd E Wesley, Jr.", written in dark ink over a light background.

Lloyd E Wesley, Jr., Postmaster  
Detroit District

LEW: cz

cc: Charles Howe, District Manager, Detroit  
cc: Carleton Mitchell, Customer Service Operations Manager, Area 1  
cc: April James, Consumer Affairs, Detroit District