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Transmittal Letter

August 31, 2022

MEMORANDUM FOR: EDDIE L. BANNER
MANAGER, KANSAS-MISSOURI DISTRICT

FROM: Sean Balduff
Director, Field Operations

SUBJECT: Audit Report – Mail Delivery, Customer Service, and Property Condition Reviews – Select Units, St. Louis, MO Region
(Report Number 22-115-R22)

This capping report presents the results of our audits of Mail Delivery, Customer Service, and Property Condition Reviews - Select Units, St. Louis, MO Region.

We appreciate the cooperation and courtesies provided by your staff. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Valeta Bradford, Operational Manager, or me at 703-248-2100.

Attachment

cc: Postmaster General
Corporate Audit and Response Management
Chief Retail & Delivery Officer and Executive Vice President
Vice President, Delivery Operations
Vice President, Retail & Post Office Operations
Vice President, Central Area Retail & Delivery Operations
Vice President, Processing & Maintenance Operations
Results

Background

This report presents a summary of the results of our self-initiated audits assessing mail delivery, customer service, and property conditions at four select delivery units in the St. Louis, MO region (Project Number 22-115). These delivery units were the Saint Peters Main Post Office (MPO) and the Maryville Gardens, Chouteau, and Marian Oldham Stations. We judgmentally selected these delivery units based on the number of customer inquiries per route each unit received and Stop-the-Clock (STC)\(^1\) scans occurring at each delivery unit. We previously issued interim reports\(^2\) to district management for each of these units regarding the conditions we identified. In addition, we issued a report on the efficiency of operations at the St. Louis Processing and Distribution Center (P&DC),\(^3\) which services these four delivery units.

All four delivery units are in the Kansas-Missouri District of the Central Area. These four delivery units have a combined total of 113 city routes and 40 rural routes. Staffing at the delivery units during our audit included 137 full-time city carriers, 28 city carrier assistants, 41 rural carriers, 14 rural replacement carriers, one assistant rural carrier, 26 full-time clerks, and eight postal support employees (see Table 1).

Table 1. Staffing and Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing and Route Types</th>
<th>Saint Peters MPO</th>
<th>Maryville Gardens Station</th>
<th>Chouteau Station</th>
<th>Marian Oldham Station</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time City Carriers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Carrier Assistants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Carriers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Replacement Carriers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Rural Carriers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Clerks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Support Employees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Routes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Routes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Postal Service Office of Inspector General (OIG) analysis of data from variance programs.

---

1 A scan event that indicates the Postal Service has completed its commitment to deliver or attempt to deliver the mailpiece. Examples of STC scans include “Delivered,” “Available for Pick-up,” and “No Access.”


The delivery units service about 187,395 people in several ZIP Codes, which are all considered to be urban communities\(^4\) (see Table 2).

### Table 2. Service Area and Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Units</th>
<th>Service Area ZIP</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint Peters MPO</td>
<td>63376</td>
<td>71,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryville Gardens Station</td>
<td>63104, 63111, 63118</td>
<td>65,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chouteau Station</td>
<td>63110</td>
<td>17,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Oldham Station</td>
<td>63106, 63108</td>
<td>32,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>187,395</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OIG analysis of Postal Service National Labeling List and Esri.

**Objective, Scope, and Methodology**

Our objective was to evaluate mail delivery, customer service, and property conditions at the Saint Peters MPO; and the Maryville Gardens, Chouteau, and Marian Oldham Stations in the St. Louis, MO region.

We reviewed delivery metrics, including the number of routes and carriers, mail arrival time, number of reported delayed mailpieces, package scanning, and distribution up-time.\(^5\) In addition, during our site visits the week of May 2, 2022, we reviewed mail conditions; and delivery unit safety, security, and maintenance conditions. We also analyzed the scan status of mailpieces at and around carrier cases and in the “Notice Left” area.\(^6\) Finally, we interviewed unit management and employees.

We conducted this audit from April through August 2022 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and included such tests of internal controls as we considered necessary under the circumstances. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We discussed our observations and conclusions with management on August 17, 2022 and included their comments where appropriate.

We relied on computer-generated data from the Product Tracking and Reporting (PTR)\(^7\) system, Delivery Condition Visualization (DCV),\(^8\) the Surface Visibility (SV)\(^9\) database, and the electronic Facilities Management System (eFMS).\(^10\) Although we did not test the validity of the controls over these systems, we assessed the accuracy of the data by reviewing existing information, comparing data from other sources, observing operations, and interviewing Postal Service officials knowledgeable about the data. We determined the data were sufficiently reliable for the purposes of this report.

**Results Summary**

We identified issues affecting mail delivery, customer service, and property conditions at all four delivery units. Specifically, we found deficiencies with delayed mail, package scanning, truck arrival scanning, and property conditions (see Table 3).

---

\(^4\) We obtained ZIP Code information related to population and urban/rural classification from Esri.

\(^5\) Time of day when clerks have completed distributing mail to carrier routes.

\(^6\) Where letters or packages that carriers were unable to deliver are stored for customer pickup.

\(^7\) A system of record for all delivery status information for mail and packages with trackable services and barcodes.

\(^8\) A tool for unit management to manually self-report delayed mail, which provides a snapshot of daily mail conditions at the point in time when carriers have departed for the street.

\(^9\) SV collects end-to-end data by linking multiple scans of a single asset to create visibility data to support planning, management, and optimization of the surface network.

\(^10\) A custom-built Postal Service system used to manage work orders, contracts, and payments for facility construction, repairs, and alteration contracts, along with real estate contracts.
Table 3. Summary of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls Reviewed</th>
<th>Saint Peters MPO</th>
<th>Maryville Gardens Station</th>
<th>Chouteau Station</th>
<th>Marian Oldham Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Mail</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package Scanning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Arrival Scanning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Conditions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results of OIG reviews conducted during the week of May 2, 2022.

**Finding #1: Delayed Mail**

**What We Found**

At the Maryville Gardens Station, we identified about 5,145 pieces of delayed letter and flat mail. Although a portion of this mail volume was from an undelivered route, another portion was attributed to substantial amounts of letter mail that arrived from the St. Louis P&DC and was not sorted in Delivery Point Sequencing.\(^{11}\) In addition, management did not accurately report this delayed mail in DCV. While they reported 1,631 delayed letters and flats, this only represented about 31.70 percent of the delayed mailpieces we identified at the delivery unit (see Figures 1 and 2). We did not find any delayed mail issues at the Saint Peters MPO or the Chouteau and Marian Oldham Stations.

---

11 Mail that arrives at a unit in sequential order and is ready to be taken directly to the street for delivery.
12 We conducted an efficiency of operations review at the St. Louis Processing and Distribution Center (Efficiency of Operations at the St. Louis, MO, Processing and Distribution Center (Report Number 22-112-R22, dated July 13, 2022) during the same week we visited this unit. We identified and reported an issue related to unsorted machinable mail found at the plant.
Additionally, management stated that they did not accurately report the delayed mail in DCV because they believed the delayed mail was not committed for delivery.

What Should Have Happened
Postal Service policy\(^ {13}\) states that all types of First-Class Mail, Priority Mail, and Priority Express Mail are always committed for delivery on the day of receipt. In addition, managers are required\(^ {14}\) to report all mail in DCV that remains in a unit after the carriers have left for their street duties.

Effect on the Postal Service and Its Customers
When mail is delayed, there is an increased risk of customer dissatisfaction, which may adversely affect the Postal Service brand. In addition, inaccurate reporting of delayed mail in DCV provides management at the local, district, area, and headquarters levels with an inaccurate status of mail delays and can result in improper actions taken to address issues.

Recommendation # 1
We recommend the District Manager, Kansas-Missouri District, develop a plan to ensure that all committed mail at the Maryville Gardens Station is delivered daily, all delayed mail volume is entered into the proper system, and management systematically reviews the data and enforces reporting compliance.

Finding #2: Package Scanning
What We Found
Employees improperly scanned packages at all four delivery units. Specifically, employees scanned 1,584 packages at the delivery units between January and March 2022 (see Table 4). Further analysis of the scan data for these packages showed that about 48 percent were scanned “Delivered.” This data excludes scans that could properly be made at a delivery unit, such as “Delivered - PO Box” and “Customer (Vacation) Hold” but, rather, represent scans performed at the delivery unit that should routinely be made at the point of delivery. In addition, we only included “Delivery Attempted – No Access to Delivery Location” scans performed Monday through Friday to avoid legitimate scans for businesses that are closed on weekends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STC Scan Type</th>
<th>Saint Peters MPO</th>
<th>Maryville Gardens Station</th>
<th>Chouteau Station</th>
<th>Marian Oldham Station</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>48.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Exception/Animal Interference</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Attempted &amp; No Access to Delivery Location(^ {15})</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>43.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Authorized Recipient Available</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptacle Full / Item Oversized</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Secure Location Available</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>282</strong></td>
<td><strong>563</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>566</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OIG analysis of the Postal Service’s PTR System.

\(^ {13}\) Committed Mail & Color Code Policy for Marketing Mail stand-up talk, February 2019.
\(^ {15}\) This scan type includes both “No Access” and “Business Closed” scans and does not differentiate between the two. “Business Closed” scans are often legitimately made at the unit; therefore, some of these scans may have been correct.
In addition, on the morning of May 3, 2022, we selected 157 packages\(^{16}\) to review and analyze scanning and tracking data. Of the 157 sampled packages, 32 had missing or improper scans, including:

- Twelve were scanned “Delivered” (eight from the carrier cases and four from the “Notice Left” area), which should only occur when the package is successfully left at the customer’s delivery address.

- Sixteen had scans (other than “Delivered”) that were performed at a location other than the delivery point. All packages are required to be scanned at the point of the delivery attempt.

- Four were missing STC scans to let the customer know the reason for non-delivery.

Further, at the Saint Peters MPO, 11 packages in the “Notice Left” area were not returned to the sender, as required.\(^ {17}\) These packages ranged from two to 32 days past their return dates. At the Chouteau Station, four packages in the “Notice Left” area were not returned to the sender, as required. These packages ranged from nine to 94 days past their return dates. In addition, at the Chouteau Station we identified nine postage due packages on the shelves in the Post Office Box area dating back to March 8, 2021. After we brought this to management’s attention, the unit manager started returning packages to the senders.

Why Did it Occur

These scanning issues occurred because management did not adequately monitor and enforce proper package scanning and handling procedures. Specifically:

- At the Saint Peters MPO, management stated that they are required to clear all packages daily, ensuring that there is an STC scan on each package. However, they stated that they did not review the type of scan performed on packages brought back to the delivery unit because of time constraints.

- At the Maryville Gardens Station, management provided documentation of disciplinary discussions with carriers regarding the scanning issues. In addition, unit management submitted discipline requests for higher level approval. However, formal corrective action was not issued to the carriers because unit management did not adequately follow up on the discipline requests.

- At the Chouteau Station, management stated that they instructed employees to scan packages at the point of delivery. However, management was more focused on ensuring carriers delivered mail than on monitoring and enforcing scanning and handling procedures. In addition, some carriers thought that packages for caller service\(^ {18}\) customers should be scanned as “Delivered” at the delivery unit and held for customer pickup rather than taking them to the customer’s street address.

- At the Marian Oldham Station, the manager stated that he monitored a scan integrity report provided by the district but did not adequately monitor other reports, such as those in the Delivery Management System, to ensure scanning accuracy. Some carriers also thought they should scan packages for caller service customers as “Delivered” and place them aside for the customer to pick up, even though the packages had the customer’s street address on them.

Furthermore, packages in the “Notice Left” area were not returned timely due to inadequate management oversight. At the Saint Peters MPO, management stated that they did not ensure proper coverage when the clerk who was designated to oversee the “Notice Left” area went on leave. At the Chouteau Station, the backup clerk who managed the “Notice Left” area did not have this responsibility as part of her normal duties and was not adequately trained in “Notice Left” procedures.

---

\(^{16}\) We selected all 59 packages from the carrier cases and judgmentally selected 98 packages from the Notice Left area.

\(^{17}\) Notice Left and Return Guidelines, dated July 2007, state that domestic packages should be returned to the sender on the 15th calendar day after a notice is left and international packages should be returned to the sender on the 30th calendar day after a notice is left.

\(^{18}\) A premium service available for a fee to customers who receive more mail than can be delivered to the largest Post Office Box offered by the postal facility where the caller’s (customer) mail is addressed.
**What Should Have Happened**

Management should have monitored scan performance daily and enforced scan compliance. Caller service mail without a box number should have been delivered to the street address on the mailpiece. The Postal Service’s goal is to ensure proper delivery attempts for mailpieces to the correct address with proper service, which includes scanning packages at the time and location of delivery.

In addition, packages in the “Notice Left” area should have been reviewed timely for second notices and returned to sender if they remained after the prescribed number of days.

**Effect on the Postal Service and its Customer**

Customers rely on accurate scan data to track their packages in real time. When employees do not scan mailpieces correctly or properly handle packages, customers are unable to determine the actual status of their packages. By improving scanning and handling operations, management could potentially improve mail visibility, increase customer satisfaction, and enhance the customer experience and Postal Service brand.

**Finding #3: Truck Arrival Scanning**

**What We Found**

Employees at the Saint Peters MPO and the Maryville Gardens and Chouteau Stations did not always scan incoming trailer/truck barcodes as required. We reviewed data related to morning truck arrival scans from January 1, 2022, to March 31, 2022, and found that employees did not perform a scan for 283 of the 607 trips (46.62 percent) arriving from the St. Louis P&DC (see Table 5).

**Table 5. Truck Arrival Scans on Incoming AM Trips**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Units</th>
<th>Count of Inbound Trips</th>
<th>Count of Missed Scans</th>
<th>Percentage Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint Peters MPO</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryville Gardens Station</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chouteau Station</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>66.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>607</strong></td>
<td><strong>283</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.62%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OIG analysis of the Postal Service’s SV data.

**Why Did it Occur**

Management at the Saint Peters MPO and the Maryville Gardens and Chouteau Stations did not monitor scan performance data to ensure that all trucks received an arrival scan. Management at the Saint Peters MPO stated that they were not aware that they should be monitoring truck arrival scans, nor did they know where to get the reports to be reviewed. Employees at the Maryville Gardens Station were aware of the process to properly scan the truck/trailer barcode; however, management was not overseeing employee scan performance because they were unaware of the report providing this data. A supervisor at the Chouteau Station stated that he was not aware of the requirement to scan the trailer/truck barcodes. The acting manager stated that she was aware of the requirement, but prioritized mail delivery over monitoring scans.
What Should Have Happened
Management should have reviewed and monitored trailer/truck scanning data to ensure that all expected truck scans were being performed. According to Postal Service policy, employees must scan the trailer barcode on Postal Service trailer/trucks and Highway Contract Route trailer/trucks arriving at the delivery unit during local operating hours.

Effect on the Postal Service and its Customer
When employees do not scan the trailer/truck barcodes consistently, the Postal Service does not receive timely transportation information and is unable to address issues that may be causing mail delays, which could affect customer service.

**Recommendation # 4**
We recommend the District Manager, Kansas-Missouri District, develop and implement a plan to ensure management at the Saint Peters Main Post Office, Maryville Gardens Station, and Chouteau Station reviews truck/trailer arrival scanning performance daily and enforces compliance.

Finding #4: Property Conditions
What We Found
We found safety, security, and maintenance issues at all four delivery units. At the Saint Peters MPO, we identified a missing ceiling tile in the customer lobby (see Figure 3); a dirty ceiling fan over the retail window; a ceiling fan with exposed wires on the workroom floor (see Figure 4); and a dirty/rusted air vent and stained ceiling tiles in the men’s restroom (see Figure 5). In addition, we identified a broken toilet, dirty walls, and a faucet with no cold water in the women’s restroom (see Figure 6). We also observed a gate in front of the building that was pulling the brick wall apart toward the customer sidewalk (see Figure 7); and a handrail on the dock that was rusted at the base with its concrete chipping away (see Figure 8).
At Maryville Gardens Station, we identified peeling paint along parts of the air vents in the workroom floor area (see Figure 9); two ceiling tiles in the customer lobby with signs of water damage and another tile that was missing (see Figure 10); dirty air vents (see Figure 11); and an inoperable urinal in the men’s restroom (see Figure 12). In addition, 40 percent of the lights in the workroom floor area and in the customer lobby needed to be repaired or replaced.
We also identified a blocked internal Postal Inspection Service door (see Figure 14), portable fire extinguishers with outdated monthly and annual inspections (see Figure 15), and a newly installed drinking fountain in the employee breakroom that was leaking. During our audit, unit staff completed repairs on the drinking fountain (see Figure 16).

Figure 9. Peeling Paint Above Workroom Floor

Figure 10. Damaged and Missing Ceiling Tiles

Figure 11. Dirty Air Vents

Figure 12. Inoperable Urinal

24 Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), 29 CFR 1910.157(e)(2) and 29 CFR 1910.157(e)(3) requires that fire extinguishers be inspected monthly and annually.
Figure 13. Insufficient Lighting in Employee Work Area and Customer Lobby


Figure 14. Blocked Inspection Service Door


Figure 15. Examples of Expired Fire Extinguisher Inspections


Figure 16. Leaking Water Fountain in Break Room and Repaired Water Fountain

At the Chouteau Station, we identified fire extinguishers with outdated monthly and annual inspections (see Figure 17). We also found walls with possible water damage (see Figure 18) and dusty air vents (see Figure 19) throughout the facility. In addition, there was no signage posted around the facility stating that vehicles may be subject to search.

**Figure 17. Fire Extinguishers Missing Inspections**


**Figure 18. Walls With Water Damage**

Source: OIG photo taken May 4, 2022.

At the Marian Oldham Station, seven fire extinguishers were missing annual and monthly inspections (see Figure 20), a space heater was plugged into a surge protector rather than directly into the wall (see Figure 21), there were dirty vents in the customer lobby (see Figure 22), and one large pothole in the employee parking lot (see Figure 23).

**Figure 19. Dusty Vents**


**Figure 20. Example of Fire Extinguisher Missing Inspections**

Source: OIG photo taken May 4, 2022.

**Figure 21. Space Heater Plugged into Surge Protector**

Source: OIG photo taken May 4, 2022.

**Figure 22. Dirty Vents in Customer Lobby**

Source: OIG photo taken May 4, 2022.

**Figure 23. Large Pothole in Employee Parking Lot**

Source: OIG photo taken May 4, 2022.
Why Did it Occur

Management did not provide adequate oversight to ensure that they corrected property condition issues. Specifically, management at the Saint Peters MPO stated that they reported the issue with the gate to Facilities management; however, as of May 17, 2022, the issue had not been reported in the eFMS. Management stated that they were not aware of the other issues that we reported.

At the Maryville Gardens Station, management did not take necessary actions to ensure that facility condition issues were corrected because they were not aware of an electronic system that allows them to determine the status of submitted work orders and repair requests. In addition, local management was not aware of the process to request fire extinguisher inspections because this process was managed by the safety department in the past.
At the Chouteau Station, management was focused on other duties, such as addressing customer inquiries and getting the mail delivered each day. At the Marian Oldham Station, management was not aware of any of the issues we identified. For the annual fire extinguisher inspections, the station manager stated that he usually receives an alert from the company that conducts the inspections when they are due, but he had not received one this year.

What Should Have Happened
Management should have provided sufficient oversight to personnel responsible for maintaining facilities; reported safety, security, and maintenance issues as they arose; and followed up on completion. The Postal Service is required to maintain a safe environment for employees and customers. In addition, OSHA requires employers to provide a safe and healthy workplace free of recognized hazards.

Effect on the Postal Service and its Customer
Management’s attention to safety, security, and maintenance deficiencies can reduce the risk of injuries to employees and customers; reduce related costs, such as workers’ compensation claims, lawsuits, and OSHA penalties; and enhance the customer experience and Postal Service brand.

Recommendation # 5
We recommend the District Manager, Kansas-Missouri District, address all building safety, security, and maintenance issues identified at the Saint Peters Main Post Office and the Maryville Gardens, Chouteau, and Marian Oldham Stations.

Management’s Comments
Management agreed with the findings and recommendations in the report.

See Appendix A for management’s comments in their entirety.

Regarding recommendation 1, management stated that they will provide direct oversight and ensure available resources are sent to units with potential delayed volume to eliminate delays. Management also stated mail conditions will be entered into the Facilities Database (FDB) and DCV websites and reviewed daily by management for accuracy. Additionally, district management has created a Compliance Close-Out telecom held daily for local management to report units that have not accurately reported in FDB and DCV. Management’s target implementation date is September 30, 2022.

Regarding recommendation 2, management stated that the St. Louis Postmaster and Managers of Customer Services Operations will provide direct oversight and ensure that administrative action is taken for those employees who do not comply with procedures and directives. Management’s target implementation date is September 30, 2022.

Regarding recommendation 3, management stated that the Delivering with Accuracy and Integrity service talk will be given to employees within the units for seven consecutive days to ensure proper scanning is done at the correct location and at the correct time. Thereafter, management will give this service talk once per week. Additionally, the scanning integrity data will be reviewed daily down to the employee level. Management will use this data to address employees concerning any scanning anomalies found. Management’s target implementation date is September 30, 2022.

Regarding recommendation 4, management stated that the Bundle Visibility Procedures service talk will be given to units for a consecutive week to ensure proper scanning is completed upon truck/trailer arrival. Local management will also monitor truck/trailer arrival data to ensure the correct scans are completed and reported to the Managers, Customer Service Operations. Management’s target implementation date is September 30, 2022.
Regarding recommendation 5, management stated that they have abated all safety issues at the Saint Peters Main Post Office and the Maryville Gardens, Chouteau, and Marian Oldham Stations. Additionally, management provided documentation to support some abatement work and stated that they have placed work orders for all issues that have not already been remedied. Management’s target implementation date is September 30, 2022.

**Evaluation of Management’s Comments**

The OIG considers management’s comments responsive to the recommendations in the report.

All recommendations require OIG concurrence before closure. The OIG requests written confirmation when corrective actions are completed. Recommendations should not be closed in the Postal Service’s follow-up tracking system until the OIG provides written confirmation that all recommendations can be closed.
Appendix A: Management’s Comments

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
August 25, 2022

JOHN CIHOTA
DIRECTOR, AUDIT SERVICES

SUBJECT: Mail Delivery, Customer Service, and Property Conditions Review – Select Units, St. Louis, MO Region (22-115)

Thank you for providing the Postal Service with an opportunity to review and comment on the findings and recommendations contained in the draft report, Mail Delivery, Customer Service, and Property Conditions Review – Select Units, St. Louis, MO Region.

Management agrees with all the findings and recommendations.

Management agrees with Finding #1: Delayed Mail
Management agrees with Finding #2: Package Scanning
Management agrees with Finding #3: Truck Arrival Scanning
Management agrees with Finding #4: Property Conditions

Following are our comments for each of the four recommendations:

Recommendation 1: We recommend the District Manager, Kansas-Missouri District, develop a plan to ensure that all committed mail at the Maryville Gardens Station is delivered daily, all delayed mail volume is entered into the proper system, and management systematically reviews the data and enforces reporting compliance.

Management Response/Action Plan:

Management agrees with this recommendation. To ensure mail is delivered timely, the St. Louis Postmaster and Managers of Customer Services Operations will provide direct oversight and ensure available resources are sent to units with potential delayed volume to eliminate the delays. Mail conditions for delivery units will be entered into the Facilities Database (FDB) and Delivery Conditions Visualization (DCV) websites and reviewed by management daily for accuracy. In addition, the district has created a
Compliance Close-Out telecom held daily. Local management will report if they have units within their scope that has not accurately reported in FDB and DCV.

Target Implementation Date: 09/30/2022

Responsible Official:
St. Louis Postmaster, Managers, Customer Service Operations St. Louis

Recommendation 2: We recommend the District Manager, Kansas-Missouri District, develop and implement a plan to ensure that management at the Maryville Gardens Station follows up on proposed administrative actions.

Management Response/Action Plan:
Management agrees with this recommendation. To ensure employees are following procedures and directives, the St. Louis Postmaster and Managers of Customer Services Operations will provide direct oversight and ensure that those employees that do not comply may be followed with administrative action.

Target Implementation Date: 09/30/2022

Responsible Official:
St. Louis Postmaster, Managers, Customer Service Operations St. Louis

Recommendation 3: We recommend the District Manager, Kansas-Missouri District, develop and implement a plan to ensure that all employees at the Saint Peters Main Post Office and the Chouteau and Marian Oldham Stations are trained on standard operating procedures for package scanning and handling and that unit management systematically reviews scan data and enforces compliance.

Management Response/Action Plan:
Management agrees with this recommendation. Management has made it mandatory that the Delivering with Accuracy and Integrity Service Talk be given to employees within the units seven consecutive days to ensure proper scanning is done at the correct location and at the correct time. Thereafter, management will give this service talk once per week. The scanning integrity data is reviewed daily down to the
employee level through Informed Visibility. Management will use this data to address employees concerning any scanning anomalies found.

Target Implementation Date: 09/30/2022

Responsible Official:
St. Louis Postmaster, Managers, Customer Service Operations St. Louis

Recommendation 4: We recommend the District Manager, Kansas-Missouri District, develop and implement a plan to ensure management at the Saint Peters MPO, Maryville Gardens Station, and Chouteau Station reviews truck/trailer arrival scanning performance daily and enforces compliance.

Management Response/Action Plan:
Management agrees with this recommendation. The Bundle Visibility Procedures Service talk will be given to units for a consecutive week to ensure proper scanning is completed upon truck/trailer arrival. Local management will monitor truck/trailer arrival through RIMS to ensure the correct scans are completed and will report to Managers, Customer Service Operations.

Target Implementation Date: 09/30/2022

Responsible Official:
St. Louis Postmaster, Managers, Customer Service Operations St. Louis and OIC St. Peters

Recommendation 5: We recommend the District Manager, Kansas-Missouri District, address all building safety, security and maintenance issues identified at the Saint Peters Main Post Office and the Maryville Gardens, Chouteau, Marian Oldham Stations.

Management Response/Action Plan:
Management agrees with this recommendation. Management abated all safety issues at the Saint Peters Main Post Office and the Maryville Gardens, Chouteau, Marian
Oldham Stations. Management has placed work orders for all issues that have not already been remedied.

**Target Implementation Date:** 10/21/2022 see attachments 2 and 3

**Responsible Official:**
St. Louis Postmaster, Managers, Customer Service Operations St. Louis and OIC St. Peters

Eddie L. Banner
District Manager
KS-MO District

Cc: Vice President, Area Retail and Delivery Operations, Central Corporate Audit Response Management
Contact Information

Contact us via our Hotline and FOIA forms.
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