

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

May 2, 2011

Marie Therese Dominguez
Vice President
Government Relations and Public Policy
United States Postal Service
475 L'Enfant Plaza SW, Rm 10804
Washington, DC 20260

Dear Vice President Dominguez,

We are in receipt of your April 22, 2011, response to our request for a copy of the draft 2011 Area Mail Processing (AMP) study regarding the possible consolidation of Sioux City, Iowa Processing and Distribution Facility mail processing operations into the Sioux Falls, South Dakota Processing and Distribution Center.

We appreciate your willingness to meet to discuss the AMP process and explain the mail processing, transportation, and other inputs that have been used to develop the \$2.8 million cost savings estimate that the Postal Service has used in recent weeks to describe the business case for consolidation of Sioux City's mail processing operations into Sioux Falls. However, we do not believe that such a meeting would accomplish the goal that we had in mind when we requested a copy of the draft AMP study.

On April 11th, when the Postal Service announced that a public meeting would be held in Sioux City on April 26th to receive public input and allow for the community to provide feedback on the proposed consolidation, it noted that the business case for the consolidation rested on the fact that the draft AMP feasibility study had identified approximately \$2.8 million in annual savings. We were concerned, as were our constituents, that with nothing more than a dollar amount provided by the Postal Service as to the rationale for the consolidation, Sioux City's residents and community and business leaders would not be able ask informed questions or provide reasoned feedback during the April 26th public meeting. As a result, we requested a copy of the study in order that we and our constituents might have a better understanding of the rationale for the proposed move.

We were disappointed when we received your response that a copy of the study would not be shared with us. Nevertheless, knowing that the public meeting was just days away, we decided to wait and see what we and our constituents might learn from it. Knowing that the Postal Service had not yet provided any detailed information to us or to our constituents about the rationale

behind the proposed consolidation or about the data used to compute the estimated \$2.8 million in annual savings, we assumed that it would take advantage of the public meeting to share more details with the community about the study and the data upon which its conclusions rest.

On Tuesday night, approximately 500 Siouxland residents, business and community leaders, and local elected officials arrived at the Sioux City Convention Center hoping to discover why the Postal Service was once again looking to move Sioux City's mail processing operations to Sioux Falls and how such a move could possibly save it \$2.8 million a year. While these Siouxlanders heard a great deal about the need to maximize efficiency and cut costs, they learned very little about how the study was conducted, where it had identified savings, and the extent to which mail service in the Siouxland region might be affected. During the question and answer phase of the public meeting, several members of the audience asked why the Postal Service had not made this information public. They also asked when it would be made public. Much to our dismay, however, throughout the evening the response they were given was: "If it happens, you will see it."

We understand that the study, in its current draft form, is subject to change as it is reviewed at the area and headquarters levels. However, it is our responsibility to represent the interests of our constituents. Tuesday night they were asked to attend a public meeting to ask questions and provide input on a proposal about which they have no information, and we are concerned that the circumstances under which the meeting was held have given our constituents the impression that the postal service is simply looking to check the box on seeking public input. With virtually no information given to the public before or during the meeting about the contents of the study itself, it is difficult to argue with this point of view.

Furthermore, we are disturbed by two recent reports. First, it was noted at the April 26 public meeting that clerks at Sioux City's downtown post office are being trained in bulk mail acceptance. This is a highly suspicious action to take considering the vast majority of bulk mail is currently accepted at the USPS P&DF in Sioux City. Second, USPS staff mentioned at that same meeting that work is currently being done at the Sioux Falls, SD P&DF to allow for additional internal space, including the removal of interior walls. These two actions indicate to us and our constituents in northwest Iowa that the Postal Service has already made a determination to move forward with consolidation without the completion of the AMP study, and regardless of the input provided by the participants at Tuesday's meeting.

As such, we respectfully request that the contents of the draft AMP feasibility study be provided to the community for review and consideration and that a second public meeting be scheduled so that Siouxland's residents and business and community leaders might have a chance to provide informed feedback about it. If your intention in offering to meet with us is to provide us with this information so that we may, in turn, provide it to our constituents, we will gladly oblige. However, merely meeting with us, behind closed doors, to discuss the generalities of the AMP process and of this proposed AMP study will not satisfy the desire of our constituents to review the facts of this proposal or our responsibility to advance their interests in this matter.

We thank you for your prompt attention to this request, and we look forward to your timely response.

Sincerely,



Steve King
Member of Congress



Chuck Grassley
United States Senator



Tom Harkin
United States Senator