The Honorable Louis DeJoy  
Postmaster General  
United States Postal Service  
475 L’Enfant Plaza, SW, Room 10804  
Washington, DC 20260

U.S. Postal Service Board of Governors  
475 L’Enfant Plaza SW  
Washington DC 20260

Dear Postmaster General DeJoy,

I write to express my deepest concerns over the United States Postal Service’s (USPS) Mail Processing Facility Review (MPFR) proposal regarding a facility located in Medford, Oregon. This facility provides essential postal services to residents across many rural counties in my district. The changes outlined under the MPFR may have a hugely negative effect on jobs of postal employees in my district, timely delivery of mail in my district, and appear to violate USPS policies.

Chapter 4 of the USPS Handbook provides the method of communicating the fact that there was going to be an MPFR. Chapter 3.5, Public Input Meeting, directs the sharing of the MPFR findings and outlines the means of managing any concerns of stakeholders and the public including elected officials. Reports made to me indicate that neither of these requirements were met. For example, according to a petition signed by affected employees, at least 23 persons did not receive the required communication.

In highly rural communities across the United States, including Eastern and Southern Oregon, the USPS provides a vital lifeline because internet and telephone services are limited. Disruptions in mail delivery would severely impact these communities because deliveries of medications and other essential items would be affected. Consolidation would exacerbate those unacceptable delays.

The USPS plays an ever-growing role in the distribution of critical goods and services to the majority of Oregonians. In addition to the standard deliveries of paychecks, medical supplies, and letters, the USPS is crucial in providing support to small businesses and facilitating vote-by-mail processes. I assure you that Oregonians rely heavily on the quality and timely service that USPS provides. I recognize the extraordinarily challenging circumstances the USPS has experienced in recent years, and I am grateful for the services provided by the frontline postal
workers who have served our communities under such difficult circumstances. Consolidation of the Medford facility into the Portland facility would work an unacceptable disservice on those same workers who performed their jobs so well and so consistently during the Covid pandemic. Timely, secure, and responsive mail service is not optional. For that reason, and many others, consolidation such as that proposed in the MPFR is not acceptable.

The USPS’ workbook states that $390,000 is all that it is expected to cost to relocate equipment from the Medford Facility to Portland. Yet the MPE Inventory sheet of this workbook implies that might not be the case. This $390,000 is attributed on this page as “Mail Processing Equipment Relocation Costs from Losing to Gaining Facility” and is associated with the HSTS Equipment Type. However, there is no HSTS listed on the inventory of Medford – it is only being added to the Portland mail distribution center.

The MPFR Approval Signature page of the MPFR workbook reflects e-signatures from approving officials dated August 24, 2023, while the USPS’ website states that, “All comments must be received by August 24, 2023.” This means the proposal had been approved in advance of received comments.

USPS says that “there will be no career employee layoffs as part of this initiative”, and that “all career bargaining unit reassignments, as well as the reduction in the number of pre-career employees, will be made in accordance with the respective collective bargaining agreements”. It is difficult to believe that collective bargaining agreements will be honored since the MPFR process did not meet the policies outlined in the USPS MPFR Handbook. As mentioned earlier, apparently at least 23 employees did not receive communication about this process, which will most assuredly affect their employment.

It is essential that the USPS maintain the same quality of service in our rural communities as is normal in our urban areas. To that end, here are some questions the answers to which will help to understand the United States Post Office’s attempts to consolidate in Southern Oregon:

1. How is there to be any confidence that public comments were actually considered during the MPFR process when the plan was signed and approved before the public comment receipt date had closed?
2. How is there a relocation cost if there is no HSTS to relocate from Medford?
3. There are 6 items of equipment that are listed under the Medford facility as transferring to the Portland facility that have no relocation cost indicated. How can these 6 items of equipment not have a relocation cost?
4. How am I to ensure my constituents who are employees of the USPS that the USPS will recognize employee’s collective bargaining rights when 23 employees did not receive the required communication about the MPFR process?
I look forward to your response. Please contact my Washington D.C. office with a response at the earliest convenience.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Cliff Bentz
Member of Congress