

AUG 31 2011

RECEIVED

BEFORE THE
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION 2011 SEP -1 P 12: 37
WASHINGTON, DC 20268

In the Matter of:

Masonville, Iowa 50654
Post Office State ZIP Code

POSTAL REGULATORY
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Docket No: A2011-38

Nellie Marting et al, Petitioner(s)

PARTICIPANT STATEMENT

1. Petitioner(s) are appealing the Postal Service's Final Determination concerning the Masonville post office. The Final Determination was posted July 5, 2011.
(date)

2. In accordance with applicable law, 39 U.S.C. § 404(b)(5), the Petitioner(s) request the Postal Regulatory Commission to review the Postal Service's determination on the basis of the record before the Postal Service in the making of the determination.

3. Petitioners: Please set out below the reasons why you believe the Postal Service's Final Determination should be reversed and returned to the Postal Service for further consideration. (See pages 1-2 of the Instructions for an outline of the kinds of reasons the law requires us to consider.) Please be as specific as possible. Please continue on additional paper if you need more space and attach the additional paper(s) to this form.

We, the Petitioners, believe the Postal Service's Final Determination should be reversed and returned to the Postal Service for further consideration due to the following facts:

1. A low quality and inaccurate study was done regarding the services and sales that are handled at the Masonville Post Office. That study was relied on by the Postal Service to deem that the Masonville Post Office closure would result in an economic savings. The study should take into account the save of the town and the hours of operation. It of course cannot be expected to do the same volume of services and sales as a larger office.

2. The Postmaster left and the position was not filled by another postmaster. There was and has been no effort made by the Postal Service to put a Postmaster in the office at Masonville. That is what they use as a main factor in determining the closure of the Masonville office. The residents of Masonville feel that if the Postal Service would have filled the position as it is required to do, we would not be facing closure of our post office.

3. For the size of our community the post office is well patronized and it is my understanding that the lease on the post office building is for another ten (10) years. Therefore, the Postal Service would have to continue to pay rent on an empty building that is not generating income rather than pay rent on a building that if the post office was still functional, would generate revenue to pay the rent and the salary of the postal employee that was assigned there.

We, the Petitioners, feel that the Postal Service relied on facts that have not been established and that the Masonville Post Office should be reevaluated and an accurate and complete study should be done taking into consideration all of the above mentioned facts.

Respectfully submitted,

Nellie Marting, Petitioner
