

Before the
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20268-0001

Annual Compliance Report

Docket No. ACR2010

PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVE MOTION TO UNSEAL
RESPONSE TO CHAIRMAN'S INFORMATION
REQUEST NUMBER 4, QUESTION 27
(March 9, 2011)

On March 7, 2011, the Postal Service filed under seal a list of suspended post offices, stations, and branches. The list was provided in response to Chairman's Information Request No. 4, question 27. In the past, such lists have been public. The Public Representative moves to unseal FY10-NP34.

The Postal Service's reasons for filing the list of suspended post offices under seal do not bear scrutiny. None of the problems described by the Postal Service arose the last time such a list was made public. Accordingly, FY10-NP34 should be unsealed. The Postal Service recites a horror story about what happened when it released a list of stations and branches in Docket No. 2009-1. The Postal Service states, "Any facility on the list will draw the immediate attention of customers who may confuse the suspended retail facility with the Post Office they use regularly and fear, incorrectly, that the list foretells its discontinuance."¹ There is no basis for confusion. A suspended office, station, or branch is not open for service. It is thus not possible to confuse an office on the list with "the Post Office [customers] use regularly."

In Docket No. PI2010-1, the Postal Service provided a list of suspended offices to the Public Representative under seal. The Public Representative moved to have the

¹ Response of the United States Postal Service to Question 27 of Chairman's Information Request No. 4, March 7, 2011, at [unnumbered] 2 (Response).

list unsealed. The Postal Service did not oppose making the list public, provided that customer counts were redacted. The Commission ordered the redacted list unsealed.² The Postal Service does not mention this list in its response to question 27, nor does it cite any consequences that “were harmful from public relations and customer goodwill perspectives.” Response at 2-3. Rather the Postal Service refers to a list of *active* stations and branches that was released in Docket No. N2009-1. Given that the list in FY10-NP34 is of *inactive* (suspended) post offices, there appears to be no reason to keep the list under seal, even for a short time.

Respectfully submitted,

Emmett Rand Costich
Public Representative

901 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20268-0001
202-789-6833, FAX: 201-789-6861
email: emmett.costich@prc.gov

² Order on Motion to Show Cause, May 10, 2010 (Order No. 458).