

BEFORE THE
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20268

RECEIVED

2011 NOV -1 P 4:45

In the Matter of:

Lorraine, NY 13659
Post Office State ZIP Code

POSTAL REGULATORY
COMMISSION
Docket No: A 2011-101

Bill Key Moore, Petitioner(s)

Postal Regulatory Commission
Office of the Chief Admin. Officer

NOV 1 2011

PARTICIPANT STATEMENT

1. Petitioner(s) are appealing the Postal Service's Final Determination concerning the Lorraine post office. The Final Determination was posted 8/23/2011.
NY (date)

2. In accordance with applicable law, 39 U.S.C. § 404(d)(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 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 page(s) to this form.

- Please See Attached pages -

PARTICIPANT STATEMENT
ATTACHED TO PRC FORM 61

Docket No. A2011 – 101

1. PROCEDURAL INFORMATION WAS MISLEADING AND MISMANAGED

On 4/15/2011 postal customers of the Lorraine, NY 13659 Post Office received notification of a public meeting to answer questions regarding the possible closure of the Lorraine, NY Post Office. Said letter was from Jeffrey Sands, Manager of Post Office Operations. The letter stated that the Post Office was being considered for closure due to an article in the Watertown Daily Times concerning its condition and problems with the lessor regarding utilities.

On 4/27/2011 at the public meeting moderated by Jeffrey Sands, Manager of Post Office Operations, he opened the meeting with the statement that the building condition or lessor issues had nothing to do with consideration for closing and it would not be considered in the evaluation and decision. This was completely the opposite of the 4/15/2011 letter to customers. He was very clear and precise in this statement/announcement. It undoubtedly had an influence on the questions and general discussion by those in attendance that evening—intended or not intended (?).

On August 23, 2011 The Final Determination to Close the Lorraine, NY Post Office was posted. Paragraph two (2) on the first page of said posting states word for word what Mr. Sands, Manager of Post Office Operations said would NOT be considered in a closing study and states that it was a reason for the consideration of closing.

This situation is clearly an example of misleading and mismanaged information that has disadvantaged the Lorraine Customers in the procedural process required by law. For that reason and the appropriateness of the USPS re-establishing a degree of credibility, the matter of closure of the Lorraine, NY P.O. should be returned for additional review.

2. THE FINAL DETERMINATION SMACKS OF SERVICE DISCRIMINATION
AND ABUSE OF DISCRETION & FAILURE TO FOLLOW GOVERNMENT
POLICY

Of the cost cutting measures indicated and taken to date the rural customer appears to be carrying the only burden in terms of impact on service availability. There has been no indication of any service impact on urban/suburban customers in the mentioned measures to resolve postal service financial problems. The suggestions to reduce and restructure service in Lorraine rather than eliminate it were basically ignored in the Final Determination. The Lorraine Customers have petitioned to have a service reduction rather than elimination working toward a break even status with revenue.

This approach is appropriate and in keeping with the Policy of providing a maximum degree of effective and regular service to rural areas where a post office is not self-sustaining. To eliminate service when a self-sustaining service could be secured is not consistent with stated policy.

It is worth noting that the 75 postal box holders currently have carrier service available to them and choose to use P.O. boxes rather than carrier delivery. It is obvious from its current actions that the Postal Service is more willing to eliminate window service to rural customers than to consider reducing and restructuring the same. It seems ironic and discriminatory that the revenues from the rural area will flow to support a stronger USPS while they are in fact seeing a service eliminated while having a travel burden added.

3. INACCURATE INFORMATION

One response in the Final Determination with respect to why no postmaster was appointed for a period of five years after a 2006 states that "All management positions were frozen in anticipation of reorganization efforts." In fact other postmaster positions have been filled and this statement is not an accurate or truthful response.

4. INCOMPLETE INFORMATION

Paragraph two of the Final Determination indicates that the office service hours are determined by a workload analysis which includes deliveries and revenue. Paragraph five indicates an eight minute workload and ignores delivery time (sorting and casing mail for the P.O. boxes and rural route) and preparing mail for dispatch which averages approximately two hours per day. By not acknowledging this and including it in the report customers have an incomplete and less than accurate assessment of the workload. By taking all aspects into account a clerk could operate the office for 2 to 3 hours per day and considering the revenue in the equation have a service as per government policy. The suggestion made at the public meeting to consider a postal station on a part-time basis was dismissed with the response that stations are being closed. That may be appropriate in some areas, however it may be just as appropriate to downscale to a station status to maintain some level of service in others.

5. EXCEPTIONS TO LISTED ADVANTAGES IN FINAL DETERMINATION

#2. Savings to the Postal Service should not be at the expense of or discriminate against one segment of the customer base.

#5. Savings from P.O. Box fees are replaced with costs for rural mailboxes and maintenance and costs of keeping them open in winter months. That is no small challenge in the snowy Tug Hill Country of Lorraine, NY.

PARTICIPANT STATEMENT
PRC FORM 61

Docket No. A2011-101

6. ADDITIONAL EFFECTS ON THE COMMUNITY

The Final Determination fails to mention the aspect of travel distance for window service the elimination of this postal facility would have on the community. A trip to the Post Office for the average customer would go from a 0 to 12 mile roundtrip, to a 10 to 22 mile roundtrip, with the average being a round trip of approximately 14 miles. Just six such trips in a year by each customer would add 14,000 miles of additional travel over and above current travel to the present location. By current IRS standards that would amount to an expense burden to local customers of approximately \$8,000.

The additional travel burden means this is not a wise GREEN decision.

There is no mention of the economic effect or the GREEN effect on the community in the Final Determination

7. COMMUNITY BUSINESS IMPACT

The anticipated loss of the post office has already caused one local citizen considering a mail order business upon retirement to scrap those plans. The availability of postal service is a significant factor in community development.

SUMMARY CONSIDERATION:

This Final Determination should be returned for further review for the following reasons:

1. There was misleading and mismanaged information in the procedure that corrupted the process.
2. Information was managed with a bias so as to support the findings
3. The action is discriminatory against one class of customers (rural). There is no indication of a plan to impact other classes of customers.
4. Not all effects on the community were considered (travel, business)
5. The only consideration was maximum economic savings. Effects on the community and alternative means of service and savings were dismissed without discussion/consideration/or attention.

Office of the Secretary
Postal Regulatory Commission
901 NY Avenue, NW, Suite 200
Washington D.C. 20268

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I was a petitioner for appeal in the matter of the Final Determination recommending closure of the Lorraine, NY Post Office (Docket No. A2011-101). My intentions were to file on line as an intervener prior to the 4:30 10/31/11 deadline. I was able to secure a temporary account, but was not able to successfully file. I could not secure a PRC form 61 to attach to, I could not find explanations of what the "attributes" were and in general ran into blocks and hurdles at every turn and consequently was unable to file on line as required even after investing several hours attempting to do so and soliciting the assistance of a computer expert.

I have therefore forwarded this by the USPS mail system in which I have far more confidence. Although I expect this packet is on the way to the re-cycle bin I respectfully ask that it be considered in the above matter as many hours were involved in its preparation. I have made my best effort to accommodate the process on behalf of the postal customers in Lorraine, NY and they should not be denied their due process and their voice silenced by my inability to successfully file by electronic means.

I would appreciate your sincere consideration.

Sincerely,
Bilkey Moore
20692 Co. Rt. 93
P.O. Box 66
Lorraine, NY 13659
315-232-2707
bmoore46@twcny.rr.com

JUST A NOTE ON THE PROCESS---

As a retired public sector administrator I found the experience of attempting to participate in this appeal process a humbling, frustrating and completely discouraging experience. What should have been a simple task of registering concerns and information was elevated to a level that the common person without legal and technical assistance could not participate in. It is no wonder that the population has developed such a negative attitude with respect to the government. I have submitted many items on line but have never been confronted with the difficulties I found in my failed attempt here.