

**OVERSIGHT OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE:
THE FINANCIAL FUTURE UNDER
POSTMASTER GENERAL STEINER**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
OPERATIONS**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
GOVERNMENT REFORM**

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

—————
MARCH 17, 2026
—————

Serial No. 119-60
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform



Available on: [govinfo.gov](https://www.govinfo.gov), [oversight.house.gov](https://www.oversight.house.gov) or [docs.house.gov](https://www.docs.house.gov)

—————
U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

63-306 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2026

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, *Chairman*

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	ROBERT GARCIA, California, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RO KHANNA, California
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
GARY PALMER, Alabama	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	GREG CASAR, Texas
PAT FALLON, Texas	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	EMILY RANDALL, Washington
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	WESLEY BELL, Missouri
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	LATEEFAH SIMON, California
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	DAVE MIN, California
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
ELIJAH CRANE, Arizona	
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	
<i>Vacancy</i>	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director
RYAN GIACHETTI, Chief Counsel
LUKE MOLL, Research Assistant
BILL WOMACK, Senior Advisor
MALLORY COGAR, Director of Operations and Chief Clerk
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

ROBERT EDMONSON, Minority Staff Director
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

PETE SESSIONS, Texas, *Chairman*

VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland, <i>Ranking Member</i>
GARY PALMER, Alabama	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	EMILY RANDALL, Washington
BRANDON GILL, Texas	

C O N T E N T S

OPENING STATEMENTS

	Page
Hon. Pete Sessions, U.S. Representative, Chairman	1
Hon. Kweisi Mfume, U.S. Representative, Ranking Member	2

WITNESSES

The Honorable David Steiner, Postmaster General, U.S. Postal Service Oral Statement	6
Mr. David Marroni, Director, Physical Infrastructure, U.S. Government Ac- countability Office Oral Statement	8

Written opening statements and bios are available on the U.S. House of Representatives Document Repository at: docs.house.gov.

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Letter from Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers; submitted by Rep. Mfume.
- * Letter from American Postal Workers Union; submitted by Rep. Mfume.
- * Article, *Reuters*, “US Postal Service to Ask Congress for Urgent Reforms To Survive ‘Beyond Next Year’”; submitted by Rep. Sessions.
- * Letter from Coalition to Protect America’s Small Sellers; submitted by Rep. Sessions.
- * Caucus Letter re Census; submitted by Rep. Walkinshaw.
- * Report, Commerce OIG, “Evaluation of Methodology Census Bureau Used to Select Test Sites for 2026 Census Test”; submitted by Rep. Walkinshaw.

The documents listed above are available at: docs.house.gov.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

- * Questions for the Record: Hon. David Steiner; submitted by Rep. Foxx.
- * Questions for the Record: Hon. David Steiner; submitted by Rep. Timmons.
- * Questions for the Record: Hon. David Steiner; submitted by Rep. Jack.
- * Questions for the Record: Hon. David Steiner; submitted by Rep. Mfume.
- * Questions for the Record: Hon. David Steiner; submitted by Rep. Frost.
- * Questions for the Record: Hon. David Steiner; submitted by Rep. Bell.
- * Questions for the Record: Hon. David Steiner; submitted by Rep. Walkinshaw.

These documents were submitted after the hearing, and may be available upon request.

**OVERSIGHT OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE:
THE FINANCIAL FUTURE UNDER
POSTMASTER GENERAL STEINER**

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 2026

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:02 p.m., in room HVC-210, U.S. Capitol Visitor Center, Hon. Pete Sessions [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Sessions, Foxx, Palmer, Burchett, Jack, Gill, Mfume, Norton, Frost, and Randall.

Also present: Representatives Walkinshaw, Tlaib, and Budzinski.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN PETE SESSIONS
REPRESENTATIVE FROM TEXAS**

Mr. SESSIONS. Good afternoon. The Subcommittee on Government Operations will come to order, and I would like to welcome everyone to this important hearing today.

Without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time.

And I recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement.

Welcome to today's hearing regarding the Postal Service's financial future.

The Postal Service is charged with delivering mail to every address in the Nation six days a week. This mandate is one that brings with it huge costs that no private company is required to deal with; it is on the Post Office.

For each year, the Postal Service loses billions of dollars, and now 12 months—and now we know that in 12 months they will run out of cash.

And so, we have been engaging, both Mr. Mfume and I and this Subcommittee, with the Postmaster General for quite some time about the meaning of that and how we might address those issues.

The Postmaster—the last Postmaster, Louis DeJoy, launched his “Delivering for America” (DFA) plan, which was designed to revive the Postal Service, and unfortunately those expectations were not reached.

Mr. Steiner now has taken that new role as our new Postmaster General—congratulations, and thank you for being here, Mr.

Steiner—a role that is very focused on taking full advantage of the last-mile capacity to grow revenue.

Raising revenue, cutting costs, and utilizing the capacities and capabilities of private industry, we believe, will be the path forward. Understanding which aspects of the “Delivering for America” plan remain and which have been stopped is a key path to that as we move forward.

Without proper transparency and overwrite, Congress will be unable to see whether further action is necessary, and that is why we are also here today.

And with the Postal Service’s request for an increase in borrowing authority from the Treasury, Congress needs to have confidence not only that they will be able to pay it back but that they are on the right road to achieve financial security.

For Congress to consider this request, the Postal Service must also prove that they have exhausted their options already. And this is a part of the regular interaction that takes place between this Subcommittee, as well as our staff, and the Postmaster General and his staff, as they work through the needs of understanding, the ideas, and where they meet with revenue objectives.

Like so many actions that are available to the Postal Service, they need to look at them and understand what those ramifications mean. And while we have been in dialog over those, some of those have taken place, and we look forward to today to hearing about those outcomes and answers.

So, I am delighted to be here today. I think Mr. Mfume and I both wake up, as Mr. Steiner does, at 3 o’clock some mornings with this on our mind. But I would also say that many of our other Members do that also; as well, the huge industry that surrounds this. It is a very important, competitive marketplace. It is a very important part of the American economy and the vibrancy of this country.

But we also come at this, as Members of Congress, from our opportunity to serve people back home who want and need the Postal Service to be viable but to be cost-effective also.

And so, all of these things come to a point today, another day where we are able to have the Postmaster General. And I am delighted that he is here.

I would like to yield now the time to the gentleman—the distinguished gentleman, my good friend, and a gentleman who, I think, he and I both share many of the same ideas not only about America’s bright future but about our responsibility and oversight.

The distinguished gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER KWEISI MFUME
REPRESENTATIVE FROM MARYLAND**

Mr. MFUME. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for those kind and gracious remarks. I am glad that we are here together one more time and here to discuss what we consider and many out there who are watching us consider to be a vital issue.

I want to welcome also the Postmaster General, Mr. Steiner—good to see you again—and Mr. Marroni. I hope that we can have

a productive conversation today on how to put the Postal Service back on the right track for delivering for the American people.

As we all know, for more than 250 years our Postal Service has performed an indispensable service to this country and its citizens. Through its Universal Service Obligation, the Postal Service knits together communities, it powers businesses, and bridges geographic and economic and cultural divides. Americans in every part of this country rely upon and really deserve prompt, reliable, and efficient mail services.

I have unfortunately been alarmed over the last 15 months to see, in many respects, efforts to politicize the process as we know it. President Trump unfortunately has threatened to do everything from merging the Postal Service with the Department of Commerce to firing an entire Board of Governors. And former Postmaster General DeJoy left his position prematurely last year under pressure from the White House after he refused to grant DOGE officials access to Postal Service systems.

So, moving forward, I would urge you, Mr. Postmaster General, to continue defending against any threat that is brought up that would in somehow or another undercut the independence of the Postal Service.

And many of my colleagues have also watched with a great concern in recent years as the financial condition has deteriorated and service standards, in the eyes of some people, have fallen.

The last thing that we want is a privatized system. And I would hope that every time we meet those efforts by those who argue that privatization is the way to go that we are steadfast and firm in resisting that.

Putting the Postal Service back on a financial and secure footing is key. And since July 2021, First-Class Mail costs have increased 41 percent, while delivery standards were lengthened from two to five days to, now, three—well, two to three days to, now, three to five days. So, that means that Americans have to pay higher prices for a service that is not as good as it was.

Last year, Postmaster General Steiner, you met with Members of this Subcommittee to share your plans for stabilizing the Postal Service's finances. We thank you for that. Since then, however, the Postal Service has continued, unfortunately, to lose money at an alarming rate while performance has continued to suffer.

In Fiscal Year 2025, the Postal Service suffered a net loss of \$9 billion—that has been well-reported; we are all familiar with that figure—with a further \$1.3-billion loss in the first quarter of this year alone.

The Postal Service is approaching a liquidity crisis. Indeed, without significant reforms, it will not have enough cash on hand to meet its required payments as early as 2027.

And so, for the good of all Americans who rely on the Postal Service for critical mail—medicine, ballots, et cetera—we cannot allow that to happen, and the Postal Service obviously needs to cut costs and increase revenue. I appreciate the Postmaster General's effort to do so over the last year or so, but this is not an easy matter at all. It is a hell of a juggling act, to say the very, very least.

So, I want to make sure that we, in this Committee, and those who are watching this who are concerned about the Postal Service find a way to realize a couple of things:

In addition to cutting cost and increasing revenue, there are, indeed, morale issues that have to be confronted also. Because some people grew up in the mail service believing it to be one way and look at it today and whether or not—figure out whether or not they have a role in it.

Most concerningly, the President has continued baseless attacks, I think, on the legitimacy of the democratic process, threatening to deprive—and I am going somewhere with this—millions of Americans by doing away with or eliminating mail-in ballots and punishing states that refuse to comply.

And that is why Chairman Sessions, myself, other Members of this Committee on both sides of the aisle introduced the bipartisan Vote by Mail Tracking Act, which would also standardize UPS tracking barcodes to every ballot that is mailed in, giving voters real-time visibility into whether or not their ballot has been received and/or processed.

And because we all agree, I believe, that the vote and the ability to vote is a sacred American right, any effort to abridge that right goes against virtually everything that we stand for as a Nation.

So, moving forward, I have every confidence, Mr. Postmaster General, that you and the workforce that you have assembled and the one that you have inherited will all work in this election year to ensure that every ballot is delivered and every vote is counted.

And I want to take the time to recognize the incredible work of the postal workforce that the Chairman alluded to earlier. They continue to do for the American people a great service, and they do it in a way that they do not complain.

We all remember what happened in the last election season, when they were faced with the insurmountable task, as some thought at the time, to be able to sort the mail and deliver the mail and guarantee the mail, and yet they did that—and, only weeks after that, ran into an avalanche of different challenges posed by the overwhelming load of holiday mail, and they did that back-to-back.

Regrettably, however, letter carriers across this country are increasingly the subjects of violence by criminals. We have spoken about this before. We all share this concern. Criminals target locked mailboxes that are only accessible to the United States Public [sic] Service. I have seen postal workers beaten and stabbed and left to fend for their own while help comes up. We have seen the videos all over YouTube on that.

So, no Postal Service worker should fear for their safety at work, and that is why I have pushed for the implementation of the Postal Service's joint Project Safe Delivery initiative. I know it sounds like a lot, but it does a lot, and it is designed to do that, as we try to provide a way to make sure that there is safety that goes with this job and all of the attendant positions and industries that are part of it.

Now, one final thing, and then I am going to yield back to the Chairman, who is very, very generous with his time.

We are in a situation where we cannot lose the Postal Service as we know it. We all agree on that, I think. The question becomes, how do we find a way to fight back against those efforts and those persons that do not necessarily believe it?

And it is an all-hands-on-deck kind of an issue, where, whether you are in the field, whether you are in the building, whether you are at headquarters, or whether you are doing something else related to the mail, this means all of us sort of—and, by the way, whether it means you are sitting on one of these committees of oversight—it means that all of us have to find a way to put aside any differences and to recognize that, if we do not all go forward, we will all go backwards.

So, it has been a pleasure working with this Chairman, who shares many of my ideas and I share many of his on this. We have tried to approach this as a bipartisan effort and have left out, to the extent we can, anything that sometimes creeps in as partisan. Because, at the end of the day, it is the service and the people who deserve the service, more than anything else, that we are all assembled here for.

So, I thank you again for your generosity of time, Mr. Chairman, and for working together on this issue, as we have for years now—I never thought I would say we have been doing it for years, but we have been—and I yield back my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Mfume, for his conversation.

I believe that I will take it succinctly down to the point that he and I overwhelmingly agree with, and that is: we have to keep the issues directly in front of us. We have to work on them, we have to understand them, we have to deal with them.

And I could not have a better partner to do that with than you, sir.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Although, I will say, over time, you look better and I look older.

So, without objection, we are going to welcome our young Chairman, James Comer, who is here, the Chairman of the full Committee.

We also welcome Congressman Timmons from South Carolina, Congresswoman Boebert from Colorado, Congressman Walkinshaw of Virginia, Congresswoman Tlaib of Michigan, Congresswoman Budzinski of Illinois, and Congressman Bell of Missouri, all—I am sorry, I am supposed to say “Missour-ee.” I used to live in “Missour-ah,” but they like to call it “Missour-ee.” They are all waived on the Subcommittee for the purpose of questioning the witnesses at today’s Subcommittee hearing.

So, thank you very much.

We now would move to the reason why we are here, and I am pleased to welcome our witnesses for today.

Mr. Steiner is the Postmaster General and Chief Executive Officer of the United States Postal Service, having held this position since July 2025. Prior to this, he was the CEO of Waste Management and on the Board of Directors of FedEx.

Our second witness today is Mr. Marroni. He is Director of Physical Infrastructure at the Government Accounting [sic] Office, the

GAO, and is expert in many areas, and he will soon prove his worthiness today. He is an expert in the Postal Service and Federal real property management.

So, I look forward to both of you not only being here for your testimony but answering the questions.

I would ask that both of you now stand for you to be sworn in before this Subcommittee.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses will please raise their hand, which they have done. And their right hand is raised, and I will ask the question.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Mr. SESSIONS. Let the record reflect that both witnesses have answered in the affirmative.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

I would now like for you to know that we normally follow this 5-minute rule, but what I am interested today—and I have informed the gentlewoman, the Chairman [sic] of the Rules Committee; she will take the time that she needs. You have drawn a lot of people who will come today. Not everybody is here right now, but you have drawn this. And I am interested that us, Members and you, are given an opportunity to fully vet your answer and to be given that time, and if you exceed that, I will let you know.

So, I now would recognize the gentleman, the Postmaster General of the United States Postal Service, the gentleman, Mr. Steiner, for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID STEINER
POSTMASTER GENERAL, U.S. POSTAL SERVICE**

Mr. STEINER. Thank you so much. Good afternoon, Chairman Sessions, Ranking Member Mfume, Chairman Comer, and Members. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss how the Postal Service is at a critical juncture.

At our current rate, we will be out of cash in less than 12 months. So, in about a year from now the Postal Service would be unable to deliver the mail if we continue the status quo.

So, how did we get here, and how do we solve the problem?

We got here because of the drastic reduction in the use of the mail. From historic peak volume of 213 billion pieces per year to today, at 109 billion pieces per year, we have lost over 104 billion pieces per year in our system.

For perspective, if all of that lost volume was paid at the current price of a stamp, which is 78 cents, that is about \$81 billion of lost revenue. No company could weather that much revenue loss.

So, it is not hard to see how we got here. I like to say that we got thrown overboard and into the water, but instead of tossing us a life jacket, we were thrown an anchor.

So, what does that anchor look like, and why is it weighing us down?

First, we pay an unfair share of Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) benefits, which cost us about \$3 billion a year.

Second, we cannot borrow more than \$15 billion. The \$15-billion limit was established decades ago. If you applied inflation or based it on revenue, that limit should be \$30 billion to \$40 billion.

Third, we can only invest our retirement in Treasury notes. If we were able to invest conservatively, we would have an additional \$800 billion in retirement benefits.

Fourth, we are mandated by law to deliver to every address, more than 170 million of them, six days a week. This leads to 71 percent of our delivery routes being financially underwater. If we are expected to deliver six days a week to every location, someone needs to pay for that.

Fifth, we are not allowed to manage our own workers' compensation claims. That costs us anywhere from \$400 million to \$800 million per year.

Next, we are regulated like a monopoly but we no longer exist as one. In fact, we are regulated worse than a monopoly, because even a monopoly is allowed to make money. Our regulator causes us to lose billions annually.

Just recently, they passed an order that, by their own estimate, could lose us nearly a billion dollars a year. Clearly, they are not following their mandate to make the Postal Service financially viable.

And there are other parts to the anchor. Transporting cargo to remote parts of the United States costs us about \$150 million. Keeping post offices open and not being allowed to consider losses as a reason to replace them with alternative means is another \$840 million. And the list goes on.

All those costly inequities amass to an incredibly burdensome anchor that plagues our trajectory, and we should have a discussion about all of them. But in order to survive beyond the next year, we need to increase our borrowing capacity so that we do not run out of cash.

Despite all of this, we are proud of our universal service mission, and we do everything possible to work through the restrictions to deliver mail and packages that are so depended upon by Americans.

And we are also not standing by as we sink under the weight of the anchor. We are taking steps to fight our way back above water.

On pricing, we need higher prices on both our package and mail products. At 78 cents, the U.S. first-class stamp is the lowest in the industrialized world. Compare it to France, at almost \$3, and England, at \$2.50.

And the longest distance those letters have to travel is about 600 miles—smaller than the State of Texas. We deliver from the tip of Puerto Rico to the tip of Alaska for 78 cents. That is a distance of 5,000 miles. So, we sell the stamp at less than half the cost to travel eight times farther.

If we were to change the stamp price to 90 to 95 cents, which is still less than half of the cost of foreign posts, that would largely solve our controllable loss, and the stamp would still be the lowest in the industrialized world by a lot.

And on the cost side, the Postal Service has undertaken a transformation of our network and operating practices to reduce costs. We know that our execution should have been much better and

that we have not achieved all the savings that we initially projected, but we can do more. We will continue to reduce costs wherever we can, and I have asked our team to develop a plan to further reduce costs.

So, I am here to tell America that we can do anything you want. We have been doing exactly that for over 250 years. If you want the same number of delivery days and post offices, we can do that—but someone has to pay for it. If you want to have a discussion about reducing services, we can do that too. But there is one thing we cannot do, and that is the status quo.

And we do not have a lot of time. One easy action, increasing our borrowing authority, buys us time—time that we can use to best determine what the Postal Service should do to best serve the American public.

We stand ready to continue serving all Americans. We just ask that you take away the anchors and let us operate like a truly independent agency, free from requirements that weigh us down, or that you compensate us for the cost of those anchors. If we can do either of those, I can promise unparalleled service for the next 250 years.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much, General.

Mr. Marroni, welcome. We are delighted that you are here. You are recognized for your opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF MR. DAVID MARRONI
DIRECTOR, PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE
U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE**

Mr. MARRONI. Thank you, Chairman Sessions, Ranking Member Mfume, and Members of the Subcommittee. I am pleased to be here today to discuss the future of the United States Postal Service.

GAO has been making the case for more than 15 years that USPS' finances are a high-risk issue in need of substantial transformation. Rising costs and declining mail volumes have made USPS' existing business model unsustainable. As a result, it has accumulated billions of dollars in net losses, as its debt and unfunded liabilities have continued to grow.

We are now at a critical moment, with the Postmaster General stating that USPS could run out of cash as early as next year. Urgent action is needed to get ahead of any near-term cash crisis while also putting USPS on a sustainable, long-term path. Without action, there could be substantial consequences for American households and businesses that rely on USPS' services.

In short, it is time for Congress to fix USPS' outdated business model. This will require making difficult choices with significant trade-offs. There are no easy solutions. However, it is better to make those choices now rather than wait until crisis hits.

To be clear, USPS and Congress have taken significant actions in the past five years. USPS has implemented a wide-ranging ten year plan with the aim of fixing its finances, and Congress has passed major postal legislation to provide financial relief.

However, those actions have not been enough. While USPS has been able to increase its revenue and cut some costs, its overall ex-

penses have grown at a faster rate while its service performance has declined.

This pattern is not sustainable. There is a fundamental tension between the level of services that Congress expects USPS to provide and the revenue that USPS can reasonably be expected to generate. Something has to change.

For its part, USPS needs to take additional actions within its own authority to try and improve its financial situation. This includes considering changes to its current ten year plan and identifying ways to increase its revenues while tackling cost growth.

As it does so, USPS should develop long-term financial projections that will help communicate its outlook and progress to Congress and identify actions to help put it on a financially viable path.

That said, it is highly unlikely that USPS will be able to fix its poor financial condition on its own. Congress will need to act.

Indeed, Congress may need to provide some short-term financial relief to help USPS avoid running out of cash. At the same time, it is essential that Congress also address the long-term issues with USPS' business model.

If those underlying issues are not addressed now, USPS will likely continue to struggle financially and its service performance may decline further. Indeed, within five years, USPS will be responsible for an additional \$6 billion a year in retiree healthcare costs on top of other expenses that are likely to continue to grow.

To fix USPS' business model for the long term, Congress will need to decide on the level of Postal Service the Nation requires and determine a balanced approach to funding those services.

In conclusion, USPS has been struggling financially for years and is now approaching a crisis point. It is imperative that USPS and Congress act with urgency to both address the near-term cash crisis as well as fix USPS' business model for the long term.

There are difficult choices ahead, but those choices need to be made now to put USPS on a sustainable financial path. A financially viable USPS will best be able to provide high-quality service to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my opening statement. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much.

Obviously, your insight from both of you will be available to this Subcommittee, and I appreciate that.

I would move first, does the distinguished gentleman, the Chairman of the Committee, wish time?

The gentleman, Mr. Comer.

Mr. COMER. I am just going to ask questions whenever—

Mr. SESSIONS. Okay. Then it sounds like the gentleman is going to be here for a little bit. I would move to the distinguished gentleman—oh, you do want to go now?

Mr. COMER. Well, I thought you meant a statement.

Mr. SESSIONS. No.

Mr. COMER. I am sorry. I apologize.

Mr. SESSIONS. For time.

Mr. COMER. And, Mr. Chairman, thank you and the Ranking Member for always having quality meetings.

Mr. Postmaster General, welcome. I have three questions I am going to try to get in, in my 5 minutes.

I want to start with a report of the Office of Inspector General regarding waste in the Postal Service USPS Ship program, a topic that is of significant concern to this Committee.

The OIG found that the Postal Service has spent over \$1.5 billion developing this Ship program, and it is something that the private sector already has, the private sector already offers.

The program wasted billions. The OIG recommended ending it. Your Chief Financial Officer agreed to end it. But it has not ended.

First, do you agree that the USPS should not spend billions recreating programs that the private sector already offers at a fraction of the cost?

Mr. STEINER. Yes, I mean, that is a great question. You know, from our perspective, we want to give the customer the best experience, and, generally, I would say, giving the customer the best experience is dealing directly with our customers. But we have looked at situations where we would have others between us and our customers to do that type of technology work.

We are actually looking at it right now—

Mr. COMER. But—and I apologize for interrupting, but I have limited time.

So, will you or will you not commit to ending this program immediately? I mean, that is part of what we are all concerned about, at least on this side of the aisle, is the losses. We want to protect—

Mr. STEINER. Of course.

Mr. COMER [continuing]. The Postal Service, but we have got to make some business decisions.

Mr. STEINER. No doubt about it. And I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, that we have not made a final decision on that. But I appreciate the question, and we will make sure to get you a final decision on that posthaste.

Mr. COMER. Well, let us talk about the Postal Service Reform Act. I worked very closely when I was Ranking Member with then-Chairman [sic] Maloney, and that was a true bipartisan bill, because there is bipartisan support for the Postal Service.

One of the things that we expected when we gave the Postal Service some money to stabilize the books—everything that you are talking about today we did five years ago. What cost-cutting measures has the USPS implemented since the Postal Service Reform Act passed and became law?

Mr. STEINER. Sure. As you are well aware, you know, we transformed the network. We basically went to a typical hub-and-spoke network, something that has been around for hundreds of years, been used by every logistics company since 1955.

Going to that network—so we reduced transportation costs, we reduced number of times that we move boxes—that has—

Mr. COMER. Did that reduce costs?

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. That has reduced costs by about \$2.1 billion, \$2.2 billion.

Mr. COMER. Well, according to—

Mr. STEINER. Now, remember, our original projection was \$3.6, so we are not there yet.

Mr. COMER. Based on the numbers, it looks to me like nearly 80 percent of the U.S. Postal Service's costs are labor, which is the case with just about every government agency. The biggest expense in your entire budget is personnel.

And most Federal agencies today have hiring freezes. Why would that not be something you would be looking at to reduce costs instead of asking Congress for a bailout?

Mr. STEINER. Oh, we are absolutely looking at that.

Now, remember, there are two pieces to our network. There are folks that actually deliver the mail. And, you know, you do not want to do a hiring freeze there, because if we do that, then we will not deliver mail.

From a management perspective, you know, we have not increased the number of our employees dramatically, but, as you know, we have brought in the—

Mr. COMER. But they have increased, and every other government agency is decreasing the—

Mr. STEINER. Well, actually—

Mr. COMER [continuing]. Number of employees—

Mr. STEINER. Actually—

Mr. COMER [continuing]. Just like at most private-sector roles.

Mr. STEINER. Yes, actually, in the last four years, we have about 30,000, 35,000 fewer employees. And we are moving toward more of those employees being pre-career rather than career.

There are two ways we can really save money here. That is changing our mix of career and non-career more toward non-career.

Mr. COMER. You are talking about part-time and full-time, right?

Mr. STEINER. Correct. Basically.

And the other is overtime, both regular overtime, penalty overtime. You know, those are \$100 million to \$150 million for every percentage point you move them. So that is where we are focused at.

Mr. COMER. What about—

Mr. STEINER. But you are absolutely right, we have to look at everything. We cannot look at just one piece.

Mr. COMER. And, look, we support the postal workers. My grandmother delivered the mail. She spent 27 years as a mail carrier in Red Boiling Springs, Tennessee. I support the Post Office. It is very popular in my district. But people are frustrated with the Post Office. We all have horror stories from the Postal Service.

But what is frustrating to me and, I think, many Members on this Committee is that it seems like we are trying to do more in the Postal Service in-house instead of privatizing. Even before the Postal Reform Act passed a few years ago, you privatized a lot of the logistics and things like that that it appears now the Postal Service is trying to do itself.

And it is hard for me to believe, as much trouble as the Postal Service has at delivering the mail on time efficiently, that anyone would believe the Postal Service, run by the government, can operate cheaper than private companies that have been contracted with the Postal Service for years.

And we are—or, I will speak for myself—I am frustrated that a lot of private companies that have been doing business with the Postal Service for years have been cut out in the last year or two.

Mr. STEINER. Yes, I mean, I am not sure which part of the network you are referring to. We did—the only thing that we have really in-sourced in the last year is our local transportation network, and we have started to in-source that.

I will tell you, anytime I can do something better, cheaper, we are going to do it. And that is one area—

Mr. COMER. It is hard for me to believe you are doing it cheaper from the Postal Service. You have done that, and you are asking for more money. It is just hard to believe. Maybe it is true, but it is hard for me to believe, being in Congress 9-1/2 years.

Mr. STEINER. Well, if you believe our accountants, it is true. There is about—

Mr. COMER. I do not know. If they work for the government, I will have to think about that, but.

Mr. STEINER. There is about \$44 million that we have saved by in-sourcing that.

But, even more importantly, it helps service. So, when we use third parties, we have to call them, it takes them time to get there. You know, sometimes they will show, sometimes they will not. When we have our own folks onsite with the trucks, they can move immediately. So, what we get is better service at a cheaper cost.

Now, that is not to say that there is not plenty that we do not do well. But that is one thing we are doing pretty well.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chairman, my time has expired. I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman yields back his time.

The gentleman, Mr. Mfume, is recognized.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, again.

Mr. Postmaster General, I took some notes on what you were saying, and I have a couple of observations, and maybe you can kind of point me in the direction where you think you should be going.

Aside from that, there is an old saying that says, “The hurrier I go, the behinder I get.” And we have been rushing, through this Committee, for the last several years, emphatically trying to find a way to avoid the crisis that is in front of us now. And we look up, and behinder we are.

So, your points, if I have them correctly, was that you do not have the ability to manage your worker compensation plans. Is that correct?

Mr. STEINER. That is one of them, yes.

Mr. MFUME. That you have lost \$81 billion in real-time over an accumulated number of years as a result of a reduction in the volume of mail in the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. STEINER. Well, we lost 104 billion pieces. I was just using the 78-cent stamp for illustrative purposes.

Mr. MFUME. Okay. And—

Mr. STEINER. But, yes, that would be—

Mr. MFUME [continuing]. The other point you were making is that, unlike other places, you are required to transport to remote places across the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. STEINER. That is correct.

Mr. MFUME. And you said that the 78-cent stamp is the lowest out of all industrialized countries and that it travels with fewer

miles for it to be taken advantage of or deliver, I should say, the mail. Is that correct?

Mr. STEINER. That is correct.

Mr. MFUME. This is a situation that Mr. Marroni mentioned earlier, about the GAO strongly recommending, aside from congressional assistance in terms of money, that the Postal Service do everything that it can within its power to drive back the costs and to get out of the situation we are in.

Mr. Marroni, is that correct?

Mr. MARRONI. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. MFUME. And what would some of those things be?

Mr. MARRONI. So, there are ways to get compensation under control. That is the major area of cost growth. There would be continue to find ways to get costs out of transportation, out of the network process.

There are steps that USPS has been taking to get those costs under control, but you have the fundamental issue of volume is declining while the amount of places the USPS has to deliver are increasing. So, there is a fundamental disconnect there that is driving up costs.

Mr. MFUME. And I am sure Benjamin—well, we will not call his name here today, because I am sure he is probably spinning in his grave looking at this. But the first Postmaster General could not anticipate FedEx, Amazon, UPS, but you are faced with those as a competing force.

Can you take a quick minute and tell us whether or not you have any ability to control those costs—or losses, I should say?

Mr. STEINER. In what regard?

Mr. MFUME. Well, what are you doing with your competition, who clearly wants to do all that it can to take away your business?

Mr. STEINER. Yes. A great question.

Look, the reality is, until the recent changes to the network, we did not have a network that could even compete with FedEx and UPS and Amazon. It just could not compete. And so, what we have designed now is a network that can compete, but it competes at the lower level.

So, just to give you an example, our average weight of our package is about 1 to 1.2 pounds. FedEx, UPS, they are closer five pounds. And as you move up in weight, you move up in value, and so you move up in profitability.

So, our network was designed for lower-weight packages. We need to move that up. We need to go after those higher-value packages. But we also need to continue to get those lower-value packages.

And, then, in that lower-value package market, what you have seen is a dramatic change in how that market is being served. What do I mean by that? The gig economy. So, you have got very-low-cost providers, coming from foreign countries, being subsidized by foreign governments—

Mr. MFUME. Okay.

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. Coming in and selling transportation at below cost so that they can—

Mr. MFUME. I got it. I am going to have to reclaim my time. It is very limited. And maybe you will get a chance to respond to an-

other Member's question on that subject. But let me just go back to the point I initially made that Mr. Marroni said.

Short of everything that is being proposed as stopgap measures, that UPS should be doing everything it can under its authority to reduce costs. Can you tell us what that is? I want to follow up on the Chairman's question on that. And, specifically, tell us how those costs have been reduced.

Mr. Postmaster?

Mr. STEINER. Oh, I am sorry. I thought you were talking to the other David.

So, you know, obviously, we put together a network that reduces number of trips, reduces transportation costs, reduces fuel costs. I mean, as I said, it is a hub-and-spoke network. It has been proven to work since it was invented in 1955 by Delta Airlines. Every major logistics company uses it.

But there is a difference between building a network and operating a network. And we have built the network. We are close to done building the network. We have yet to fully really learn how to operate the network. And that is where the savings start to come, is when you learn how to operate the network.

What you have seen is that the pace of savings has increased and the pace of service has—

Mr. MFUME. Okay.

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. Gotten better.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you, sir. My time has expired, though.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman yields back his time.

The distinguished gentlewoman, Chairwoman of the Rules Committee, Ms. Foxx, is recognized.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I thank our witnesses for being here.

And I want to say that I particularly join Mr. Mfume and you, Mr. Chairman, in thanking the local postal workers for their work.

I am a lifelong letter-writer and always use the Post Office, but I am very concerned with the caliber of service that we are getting and with the fact that the Post Office continues to come to us for more money.

I mailed my husband a valentine a week before Valentine's Day; he still has not received it. People in my office know people who have sent out wedding invitations, mailed in plenty of time; people have not received them a month later.

This is unacceptable, Mr. Postmaster General—absolutely unacceptable. If you want people to stop not using the Post Office, you want them to continue to use the Post Office, then they have to get the kind of service that they deserve and have had in the past.

Now, we were told the "Delivering for America" plan was a long-time strategy to steady Postal Service finances, improve operations, and protect the future of the mail system, but the USPS losses continue, productivity has declined, Americans get repeated rate increases, slower services.

I was a big part of the Postal Service Reform Act, also, in 2022.

So, given what is going on, the very negative things that are happening, what evidence suggests the current plan is working—I

heard what you just said—and why should Congress expect different results if the DFA plan continues?

Mr. STEINER. Yes, I could not agree with you more on the service issue. We absolutely have to do a better job with what we call the “tail of the mail”—the wedding invitation that shows up late, the Valentine’s Day card that does not get there on time.

You know, this is an unbelievably complicated network. Just to give you perspective, FedEx and UPS both deliver well under ten billion packages a year—well under ten billion. We deliver 110 billion pieces per year. And so, this network is so much more sophisticated than those networks because of mail, and so there are hundreds of pinch points where there can be problems.

It goes back to what I said earlier. You can build a network, but you have got to learn how to operate the network. And I will tell you, we are not great at operating the network.

We have put Doug Tulino in charge of that, making sure that all three of our pieces that do delivery are joined together and working together, and you have started to see progress. You have started to see some very good progress in service. I am——

Ms. FOXX. So——

Mr. STEINER. I am not going to sit here and tell you that we are there yet.

Ms. FOXX. So, can we expect modifications to the plan and better service?

Mr. Marroni said that you have controllable costs, but you did not give us any specifics. We know that if you could reduce controllable costs by roughly two percent per year, you would put the Postal Service on a path to break even.

Given that possibility, what specific steps is USPS taking to reduce controllable costs?

Mr. STEINER. Well, we have got to look at controllable costs everywhere.

So, we have talked about it in the network.

You have got fuel costs. Of course, you are going to see those disappear as we have seen the price of fuel go up.

You have got labor costs. You have seen our work-hours come down by over 50 million work-hours. Now we need to make sure that those work-hours are straight-time hours, not overtime hours.

And we need to make sure that our complement moves more toward pre-career than career. We still have a lot of room to grow there. So, there is a lot of dollars to be saved right there.

Ms. FOXX. I want to——

Mr. STEINER. The rest of the money is going to come by us learning how to operate the network better.

But let me make it very, very, very, very clear: we are not going to save our way out of the hole that we are in. There is—you know, I know that the prior plan said break even in 2023. Not gonna happen. Did not happen, and I do not expect to see it happen anytime soon on the current path that we are on.

Ms. FOXX. I want——

Mr. STEINER. Why is that? Because——

Ms. FOXX. I would like——

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. Inflation keeps eating up our savings.

Ms. FOXX. I would like to follow up on a question from Chairman Comer also about duplicative in-sourcing done.

I think many of us share the concern that there is a way to contract out a lot of services but you keep bringing those things back inside, and it is costing more because of the overtime and the number of people that you have there working.

So, please say a little bit more about what you can do not to have this in-sourcing going on.

Mr. STEINER. Yes. As far as I know, there is only one thing we in-sourced, and, again, that is local transportation. And those costs, I said, down \$44 million. That is 17 percent. There is a 17-percent savings in that cost of local transportation. Not only is there 17-percent savings, but we get better service. I think that is a win-win.

I am not going to tell you that is going to solve the problem. Forty-four million dollars does not get you there. But that is one instance where I would tell you we made the right business decision.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your indulgence. I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentlewoman taking time. I know that these are important issues to her, and she catches me on a regular basis, and I appreciate her taking time here.

The gentlewoman, Ms. Norton, is recognized.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to begin by thanking Postal Service employees for their dedication and hard work.

Postal General, disgruntled residents have brought to my attention that their local post offices are often closed during normal business hours. That is unacceptable. I request that you examine this matter and report back to me within 30 days on how you will fix it.

At a time when more and more Americans are struggling to cover the costs of basic goods and services, increased Postal Service prices are especially hard to accept.

Millions of people across the country rely on the Postal Service to pay their bills, file their taxes, run their businesses, and fully participate in our society.

Since July 2021, First-Class Mail rates have increased by nearly 42 percent. At the same time, the delivery standards have been lengthened from two to three days to three to five days.

Postal General, can you comment—can you commit that the costs of the Postal Service's financial situation will not be disproportionately borne by customers via increased prices and lower delivery standards?

Mr. STEINER. Yes, you know, look, we are still by far the lowest-priced stamp in the industrialized world. Every industrialized country has dealt with this issue, and they have had to triple, quadruple prices.

You talked about the 42-percent price increase. That is because we were at such a low base relative to the rest of the world. Six of the last 12 price increases have been under two percent.

And so, you know, I am a firm believer that the market should set the rate, and the market is not setting the rate right now.

And the other thing I would say is, look, we are all users of the Postal Service. If we raise the stamp by a price of 15 cents, someone that uses 100 stamps a year, that costs them a dollar and a half. If you are a super-user and you used 1,000 stamps a year, it costs you \$150. Is that worth saving the Postal Service?

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Marroni, what changes can be made to Postal Service operations to put the Postal Service back to a secure financial footing without continuing to see higher prices and lower service levels?

Mr. MARRONI. So, in terms of that model, I do not think it is possible that USPS, on its own, without some sort of revenue increases and cost growth, can get to a sustainable path.

I do think that congressional action is going to be needed, based on our work, to address either: first, what is the level of service that the American people need? Is it the same? Less? More? And then figuring out, how is that going to be funded? You could reduce services and USPS could take actions—cut costs, increase revenues—to try and meet that level of service, or you could reduce service levels, or something in between.

But I do not think, based on where things are right now, USPS, on its own, could—it can take actions to reduce costs, it can take actions to increase revenue, but I do not think it can get there on its own.

Ms. NORTON. The Postal Service must not only be accessible and reliable, its services must be also affordable. The American people need an affordable Postal Service.

And I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentlewoman yields back her time.

I would also like to take just a second and thank you for your service. This is not a point that we will be at as we will be later in the year, but I want to thank you—both Mr. Mfume—appreciate your not only insistence to come to every one of our Subcommittee hearings but to genuinely participate in that. And I appreciate you very much, and I want to thank you.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. The distinguished gentleman, Mr. Palmer from Alabama, you are recognized, sir.

Mr. PALMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thanks, Mr. Postmaster General, Mr. Marroni, for being here.

There is a report published by the Envelope Manufacturers Association. It is an economic study. And what they find is that your revenues have remained relatively stable at roughly \$78 billion to \$79 billion annually, but the controllable costs have continued to rise, increasing by billions of dollars over the past several years.

And I am just—they make a point that if you could produce controllable costs by just two percent annually, you would eliminate your operating losses and reach a break-even by 2030. That basically, when this report was done, would have been about five years.

How do you respond to that?

Mr. STEINER. I will tell you, I have been a part of two of the largest logistics companies in the world for the last 20-some-odd years,

Waste Management and FedEx. Neither of them have been able to do that.

You know, everyone thinks, "Oh, it is easy. It is very easy. Just get productivity." The problem is, you have got expenses rising. You have got to give employees pay increases. Fuel goes up—

Mr. PALMER. I am going to interrupt you right there, because part of your increase in expenses has to do with the mandate to purchase next-generation delivery vehicles, which is a euphemism for electric vehicles. And the ones that you are—the Post Office is buying from Oshkosh were, like, \$20,000 more than your conventional vehicles. The ones you purchased from Ford were \$10,000.

And then you have got—I know the Federal Government has allocated \$3 billion in the so-called Inflation Reduction Act for this, but your overall cost is going to be close to \$10 billion.

So how do you—when you are doing things like this that—I cannot make an economic case for this.

Mr. STEINER. Well, look, you are going to hear me say this repeatedly and over and over again. If I am in the private sector, I have got options. If I have 71 percent of my routes that are losing money, guess what I can do? Cut routes. If I have 80 percent of my stores that are losing money, you know what I can do? I can cut routes. I can raise prices. I can do all the things that I can do in the public [sic] sector.

We do not have options. We have mandates.

Mr. PALMER. Well, here is where you could help us out to help you. I would like for you to provide to the Committee—the Subcommittee, and we will provide it to the full Committee—a breakdown of where your revenues come from. Is it personal mail? Business mail? You know, package delivery?

Mr. STEINER. Sure.

Mr. PALMER. Advertising? Junk mail? You know, business/political—

Mr. STEINER. "Marketing mail," please.

Mr. PALMER. Well—

Mr. STEINER. I used to make that same mistake. I do not make it anymore. I call it "revenue."

Mr. PALMER. Okay. Well, but, also, where is your cost, tied into this? You know, you have got a revenue stream from different types of delivery, but you have also got a cost.

So, I think that would be helpful, and I think the GAO—

Mr. STEINER. Of course. Of course.

Mr. PALMER [continuing]. Might be able to help—

Mr. STEINER. But let us—

Mr. PALMER [continuing]. Come up with that as well.

But, getting back to this, I know there is a lot of angst or anger about delivery. I mean, my wife ordered a necklace, and it went to—we live in Birmingham—it went to Birmingham, then it went to someplace in Florida, and then it went to Orlando, and then it came back to—what should have been three days was ten days. And then she did not like the necklace, which is another issue.

But what we are trying to do is get you where you can operate but—and I am going to talk with the Chairman of the full Committee about what legislation we might be able to introduce that will help deal with some of these mandates. For instance, the elec-

tric vehicle issues, but also the management of the pension funds, these other things.

Rather than come in and give us these things, give us some ideas on, legislatively, how we can fix this. Because I am not interested in beating up the Post Office; I am interested in fixing it. And if it cannot be fixed, then we need to, Mr. Chairman, we need to look at other options.

Mr. STEINER. Yes. Would love to have that conversation.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to raise these questions. I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the gentleman.

I know we are all pressed on votes and a lot of things going on here, but, in fact, that when I consume my time, you will hear where we think we have been doing this and have committed ourselves to some other things. But the success of that rain dance has not been achieved because the Postmaster General has embarked on some things that he was hoping would alleviate some of these things or give him a longer-term answer, and they—that is still part of this discussion—

Mr. PALMER. May—

Mr. SESSIONS [continuing]. And part of why we are here today. Yes, sir?

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I would like for the Postmaster General's office to provide that breakdown of the revenues so that we can juxtapose those against where the costs are.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes, sir. And I would respond back to the distinguished gentleman and tell him: We agree. Our working group is to get there. And last month we sat down with the Postmaster General and his financial team and did agree to do exactly that. And this was going to be the first breakout session since that time.

And I appreciate the gentleman, and we will be glad to share those with you.

Mr. PALMER. Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes, sir. Thank you very much.

Let us see. We now go to the—Mr. Frost.

Mr. FROST. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. You are recognized.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Marroni and Postmaster General, for being here.

And, also, Postmaster General, thank you for taking the time to sit with us in that briefing a few months ago.

A couple topics I want to ask about. The first one is something I am a bit concerned about.

So, President Trump has announced his plans to require postal workers to question residents on their citizenship status as part of a summer pilot test for the 2030 census.

An accurate census is the only way we can ensure fair and equal representation. It helps determine how congressional districts are drawn and makes sure that Federal funds reach communities.

Postmaster General, how does the Postal Service plan to address the gap in expertise if postal workers are expected to perform the duties of census workers?

Mr. STEINER. Yes. It is—as you probably read, that is why we are doing two pilots, very small pilots. I think the total cost is around \$200,000, probably a little less than that. In one of the pilots, our folks will actually take the oath and be—and do the census. In the other, they will do it as part of their postal duties.

And it comes from the fact that everything that, in my conversations with the Secretary of Commerce, everything that he has talked about with respect to the census is, how do we do it better, cheaper?

And he said, the best way to do it better, cheaper, is to get people to go that they trust, that are there every day, that, you know, they probably know, so they are going to open the door, so they do not have to go back five and six times.

And so, it is strictly a pilot to see if we can do it faster, better, cheaper. And if so, that will be a service to the American public.

Again, it is a big, big, big undertaking, and so that is why we are doing the two pilots, to see if we can make it work.

Mr. FROST. And how will you ensure service delivery is not impacted if Postal Service—if postal workers have to balance their mail delivery duties with the administration of the census?

Mr. STEINER. Yes, I mean, look, that is why we are doing the pilots. You know, actually, it would be good for the carriers, because they can make a little bit of overtime. A lot of our carriers like to earn the overtime. But that is why we are doing it, so that we can figure out how do we best make it work for our employees and for the census.

Again, a long way before we actually get it done. That is why we are doing the pilots. Hopefully we will be able to do it faster, better, cheaper.

Mr. FROST. Thank you.

Also, the Postal Service is implementing a new transportation plan—this is the RTO, Regional Transportation Optimization initiative—which may impact 72 percent of postal offices.

The Postal Service Office of the Inspector General has projected that this plan may slow mail delivery. People rely on USPS to get mail quickly—medications, their ballots, bills, et cetera.

Are you confident that you can ensure that the RTO initiative will not slow mail delivery?

Mr. STEINER. Absolutely certain, because, actually, RTO does not affect delivery. It only affects collection. So, on delivery, there has been absolutely no change. The only changes that RTO brings is on collection.

Mr. FROST. Okay. And then—okay. Gotcha.

And then the last thing I want to talk about is the fact that the USPS is not a business opportunity. It provides essential services, like helping rural Americans get their prescriptions. Private carriers charge extra to deliver to rural areas, even if they deliver there at all.

You were kind of talking about this, the options that private corporations may have that we do not have. And it is a good thing we do not have those options, because, no matter what, our postal workers are going to deliver the mail no matter where you live. And that is part of what separates this service that we all believe in from a business.

Rural areas are already losing their hospitals and pharmacies, and it is more important than ever that rural Americans can get their medication from the USPS.

Mr. Marroni, if the Postal Service was privatized, how would this impact people in my district or across the country? How could that impact their day-to-day experience with the USPS?

Mr. MARRONI. So, there are definitely tradeoffs with privatization. It is possible they might be able to reduce costs and increase revenues faster, but then it also means they might not serve certain routes that are unprofitable, they might close postal locations that are not profitable either, to get to profitability.

Mr. FROST. What are the kind of—what type of Americans, what type of people could expect maybe a loss in service if it was privatized?

Mr. MARRONI. So, there is a higher percentage of rural and small community locations that are unprofitable. So, there are some urban areas as well that have unprofitable locations, but the bulk is going to be rural and small, so that is where it would disproportionately fall.

Mr. FROST. Okay.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much.

The gentleman yields back his time.

We are now on votes. There are four votes that are being called. I have advised the gentleman, Mr. Gill, he will be first one when we come back.

And there will be these four votes that will take probably a good bit of time. We have figured this one out before. Do not know if a rule is in the mix. But let us advise the Members that we will come back 10 minutes after the last vote.

I would like to have Members come back. This is a very important hearing. We have distinguished Members who have taken their time to be here this afternoon.

Mr. Gill, you will be the first one when we return.

And I would say to the witnesses and the people here, thank you for taking time. I am sorry, this is the part of our business that we just have to go through.

So, the Committee will now be in recess.

[Recess.]

Mr. SESSIONS. The Subcommittee will come to order.

And thank you very much. I apologize for the delay.

We now will go back with Members' opportunities for their questions.

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Gill, is recognized.

Mr. GILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing.

And thank you to Postmaster General Steiner and to Mr. Marroni for taking the time to be here. We certainly really appreciate it.

Mr. Steiner, I want to begin with a few questions for you.

Do you know how many of the drivers who haul mail for USPS are using non-domiciled Commercial Driver's License (CDL)s?

Mr. STEINER. To my knowledge, at this point, none.

Mr. GILL. Do you know if it is a lot or just a few?

Mr. STEINER. None.

Mr. GILL. So, what I am—from what I am hearing from mail processing centers, there have been quite a few. In fact, I have heard from several large ones who have said something to the extent about half of the drivers who are coming to pick up mail are—appear to be non-domiciled, that they typically do not even speak English. I have heard that over half of them do not speak English. There have been suggestions that many of them are perhaps illegal aliens.

Are you familiar with that?

Mr. STEINER. I am not sure where that information comes from, but with our—

Mr. GILL. It is coming from major mail—

Mr. STEINER. Yes, I—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Processing facilities.

Mr. STEINER. That probably would not surprise me. But my guess is that—

Mr. GILL. So, it would not surprise you that there are a lot of drivers who are non-domiciled?

Mr. STEINER. No, it would not surprise me that that is where the information is coming from. Because, if you look at the information from our United States Postal Inspection Service, which everybody that hauls for us has to go through a check with them, I think they have probably got better information.

Mr. GILL. And what is that information?

Mr. STEINER. That every driver that drives for us, whether they are an employee or whether they are part of a third-party contractor, has to go through and make sure that they are a domiciled CDL holder.

Mr. GILL. Is that being enforced? Because I have been told by multiple different parties that that rule is not, in fact, being enforced in any meaningful way.

Mr. STEINER. I have been told by our Postal Service that it is.

Mr. GILL. Okay. Well, I have got—this is from a whistleblower, Postal whistleblower. “Here are [multiple] non-domicile licenses from one hour of check-ins at one USPS facility!” This was from March 2026 that has been recorded.

Mr. STEINER. Yes. If you would send that on to us, I will have our Postal Inspection Service look at that and find out what happened.

Mr. GILL. We have also got recording from Pete Routsolias, who is the VP of Transportation Strategy at USPS, who has said, quote, “We did not understand the magnitude of how many people are using non-domiciled CDLs,” suggesting that they attempted to stop this practice but realized that there are too many drivers who are using these non-domiciled CDLs, so, it was not, I guess, practicable to enforce that particular ruling.

Are you familiar with that at all?

Mr. STEINER. Not familiar at all, no.

Mr. GILL. So, it is your testimony that there are no CDL drivers—or, no mail carriers, excuse me, who are non-domiciled CDL drivers?

Mr. STEINER. No, my testimony is that I am not aware of the conversation that you are referencing.

Mr. GILL. Okay.

What are you guys doing to ensure that there are no non-domiciled CDL drivers carrying our mail?

Mr. STEINER. Our Postal Inspection Service looks at everybody that drives—

Mr. GILL. How is—can you explain how that is being enforced?

Mr. STEINER. How do you mean, “how is it being enforced”?

Mr. GILL. How are you ensuring that—

Mr. STEINER. We are requiring—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. None of the drivers are, in fact, non-domiciled CDLs?

Mr. STEINER. We require our third-party contractors—

Mr. GILL. But by what mechanism are you enforcing that, other than a, you know, theoretical requirement?

Mr. STEINER. You know, I do not know how you can do anything other than in-person, right? I mean, our folks are—

Mr. GILL. Are drivers required to use a Post badge?

Mr. STEINER. As far as I know, they are, yes.

Mr. GILL. I have heard from multiple, multiple, again, mail processing facilities who are telling me that none of that is being enforced in any meaningful way. And it seems, based on—

Mr. STEINER. If you will bring me that information, we will make sure—

Mr. GILL. I would be happy—

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. We will make sure it stops.

Mr. GILL. I would be happy to do that. Because I do not think that that makes our roads any safer.

Mr. STEINER. No, you are absolutely right. And, look, we all agree that safety is number one. But let us put it in perspective. You have 2,000 deaths every year from gig drivers driving.

Mr. GILL. Uh-huh.

Mr. STEINER. You have got other companies using them to deliver packages.

Mr. GILL. Uh-huh.

Mr. STEINER. Those folks are—

Mr. GILL. And USPS is outsourcing that as well.

Mr. STEINER. Not—we do not have any gig drivers for the United States Postal Service.

Mr. GILL. But the mail deliver—or, mail carriers, excuse me, are not necessarily USPS employees. Is that correct?

Mr. STEINER. That is not correct. They are.

Mr. GILL. They are all employees? You do not outsource any of that?

Mr. STEINER. We do not.

Mr. GILL. You do not outsource—so every single delivery truck that is carrying mail in the United States is an employee of USPS?

Mr. STEINER. That delivers to our customers? Absolutely.

Mr. GILL. Or that is transporting mail?

Mr. STEINER. Oh, no. Transporting mail is a whole different animal.

Mr. GILL. That is what I am talking about—

Mr. STEINER. We are talking about delivery.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Here. I am talking about—

Mr. STEINER. I do not think—

Mr. GILL [continuing]. Transporting mail.

Mr. STEINER. I do not think gig drivers are transporting mail; they are transporting individual packages to customers. And there are 2,000 people dying every year—

Mr. GILL. That is what we are—

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. Because they are going through the neighborhoods.

Mr. GILL. That is what we are concerned about.

Mr. STEINER. And so, look, put it in perspective. You are absolutely right, so let us put it in perspective. Two thousand people died because we had gig drivers that are probably unlicensed—

Mr. GILL. Uh-huh.

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. They are probably uninsured, they are untrained, and they are killing people—not on the highways; they are killing people in neighborhoods.

Go talk to homeowner associations and ask about the people that are driving through the neighborhood, speeding through the neighborhood, when their kids are playing, to deliver a small package that should be delivered by the United States Postal Service.

And so, I completely agree with you on the CDL issue.

Mr. GILL. Uh-huh.

Mr. STEINER. We have taken care of that. I would like to see us look at taking care of the—

Mr. GILL. Okay. Well, we will talk about that.

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. Gig drivers that are driving through our neighborhoods.

Mr. GILL. Thank you, Mr. General. Appreciate it.

Mr. STEINER. Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Does the gentleman choose to yield back his time?

Mr. GILL. Yes.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman yields back his time.

Thank you very much.

We will now move to the gentlewoman, Ms. Randall.

You are recognized.

Ms. RANDALL. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

I represent the Olympic Peninsula in Washington State, and in my district, like, I am sure, many across the country, we have seen how the closure of a single post office can disrupt an entire community. Folks rely on USPS for service, for connection, for medication, for so much more.

Last summer, the Martin Luther King Jr. Post Office in Tacoma closed suddenly due to reported water damage. Since then, residents and small businesses that rely on dependable mail service have been concerned, left without clear answers about when it will reopen.

When the Tacoma City Council raised this issue with our office, we followed up with USPS and were told that the Postal Service was working with the landlord to assess the damage.

My understanding now, based on updates from the city and the property owner, is that the roof repairs have been completed, and the next step is mold mitigation, to be carried out by USPS. But, still, like, confusion, no clear timelines for reopening the facility.

For people who rely on the post office every day, it is more than just an inconvenience; it is an erosion of trust in a service that they rely on.

Now, to be clear, like, I want mold mitigation to happen in the building. I do not want employees to be working in a water-damaged and moldy space.

But, Mr. Steiner, when a postal facility closes due to damage, what timeline does USPS follow for assessing damage, initiating repair contracts, and completing repairs?

Mr. STEINER. Sure. You know, obviously, we will look into that specific situation.

But you will hear me say this a lot. We are not proud that some of our post offices look like third world stores. We are not proud that we have 40-year-old trucks going through neighborhoods. We are not proud that we cannot give every single one of our wonderful carriers a brand-new uniform. But we have to make tradeoffs. You know, we are running out of cash, and we have to make tradeoffs.

And so, every day, we need to make the determination, are we going to keep the cash to keep the mail being delivered, or are we going to go fix a post office or buy a new truck? It is why I am here today.

We would absolutely love to have pristine post offices throughout the United States. It is our face to our customers. We do not have the cash to do it. We would love to have brand-new trucks driving through the neighborhoods safely. We do not have the cash to do it.

And so, you know, we will look into that specific instance, obviously, and we will get you some timelines on it, but I think we do have to have that conversation of, where are the tradeoffs? Right? Where can we make those tradeoffs, at a time when we will be out of cash in less than 12 months?

Ms. RANDALL. Absolutely.

And I wonder—this might be one of the tradeoffs that you are contemplating—what percentage of USPS facilities are leased versus owned? And does a reliance on leased facilities make it harder to complete some of the maintenance and repairs that facilities may be facing?

Mr. STEINER. Yes. I think the number is, about 60 percent, a good portion, are leased rather than owned.

And it is—you know, as we look at—you know, I keep saying that everything is on the table. We have to look at those leases and see which ones we can keep, which ones we cannot.

You know, and when we talk about tradeoffs, I like to look for cost-free tradeoffs. So, to take the example of your post office, our rural communities and our smaller communities, some of them might not have an urgent-care facility or they might not have a bank. Can we co-locate with them and bring more than just the Postal Service to that community, bring an urgent care, bring a bank, bring the other needed things, so that we can get lower cost of rent and we can also bring other things to the community?

Those are the type of—you know, I love cost-free tradeoffs. Those are the kind of great cost-free tradeoffs that we can get. Would love to look at doing one in your community.

Ms. RANDALL. Absolutely. And I am really proud that our district office shares a building with a post office. It is a great way for folks to get all their business done when they come to visit us.

Now, the last thing I want to raise is the politicization of the Postal Service in the way that it is being used to attack the ability for our neighbors to vote by mail.

You know, my constituents have long relied on mail-in voting—you know, nearly two decades in Washington State. And with the continued attacks on mail-in voting, I think one of the things that is being undermined is the trust in the Postal Service.

And I am out of time, but I just wanted to raise that I am—our constituents are so grateful for the work of USPS to ensure that you get our ballots to us and then back to the auditor's office so that they can be counted. And preserving the ability for USPS to do that work is so important to the people of Washington State and Americans across the country.

So, thank you.

Mr. STEINER. Absolutely. Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Does the gentlewoman yield back her time?

Ms. RANDALL. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentlewoman yields back her time.

Thank you very much.

The gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Burchett, you are recognized.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURCHETT. It is good to be here with you and the Ranking Member, who were both, I guess, around when they had the Pony Express. So, I guess y'all are bringing some real-world experience here.

Mr. STEINER. Both he and I knew Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. BURCHETT. That is good.

Well, Mr. Postmaster General, what is the most up-to-date assessment of when Postal Service will run out of money?

Mr. STEINER. Yes. A lot of it depends—you know, we have a lot of obligations that we fulfill to the U.S. Government, you know, for retirement and things like that, so a lot of it depends on those.

As you probably know, we have been defaulting on a number of those for a number of years. If we continue to make those payments, we are looking at probably October, November. If we stretch those out, we are looking at more like February.

Mr. BURCHETT. I agree with my colleagues about reducing controlled costs. What are you doing to raise revenue?

Mr. STEINER. Yes. You know, again, we need to—you have got two different types of revenue, right? You have got what we call the market-dominant side, what you would call mail and marketing mail, and then you have got the competitive side, which would be packages.

You know, on the market-dominant side, I think, you know, that has been going down five to seven percent compounded every year since probably we were born because of the internet and things like that.

But I keep saying, we cannot think that that is a given. We have got to try to reimagine the mail. I have started to talk to our customers about how we can reimagine it to stop that decline on the market-dominant side. That is something that we have to work with our customers through.

On the package side, there are only three things that matter when you are in the package business: speed, reliability, and cost. Speed, reliability, and cost.

We have always been competitive on cost. We have not been competitive on speed and reliability. This past peak, we actually became very competitive on speed and reliability. So, now we have something we can go to the market with, right? We can go to our customers, or potential customers, and say, "We can do it just as well and cheaper than other companies can do it."

And then the other thing I would say: oddly enough, this was shocking to me, we do not deliver all the packages for all the agencies of the U.S. Government. We are part of the U.S. Government. It is basically taking money from one pocket into the other pocket. Yet, we do not do business for most of the U.S. Government.

So, I want to talk about how we can get into all the various agencies in the Federal Government—

Mr. BURCHETT. I would like to talk to you about that at some point.

I do not want to run out of time, but I did want to—one quick thing.

With the rising postage rates, slower service standard, declining productivity, and request for additional congressional support, how do you justify the claim that the Postal Regulatory Commission oversight is the problem, given its role as the primary check on postal pricing and performance?

Mr. STEINER. Yes, it is one of the problems. I mean, you know, you heard me talk about, we have a lot of different mandates. But I will not show you any further than their last order. Their last order, by their own admission, transfers anywhere from \$700 million to a billion dollars from us to mailers by not allowing us to raise prices.

Mr. BURCHETT. How much was that figure again?

Mr. STEINER. Seven hundred million to a billion.

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay.

Mr. STEINER. There are two pieces to it: they will not allow us to raise prices more than once, and they have basically changed the work-share rules, which are too complicated for here. But it is basically taking money from us, by their own admission, taking money from us and transferring it to mailers.

They say they do it to balance. You know what I asked them? "If we are balancing things, answer me one question: of all the companies that do business with us, how many of them are losing money?"

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay.

Mr. STEINER. The answer? Zero. They are all making money. We are the only one losing money. I am not sure how I see that as a balance.

Mr. BURCHETT. All right. I appreciate that. Could you have somebody come by my office, maybe, and talk to me about it? I do not want you to talk to the staff; I want you to come talk to me?

Mr. STEINER. I will come.

Mr. BURCHETT. All right?

Mr. STEINER. I will come talk to you personally.

Mr. BURCHETT. Well, that would be fine.

Mr. STEINER. I would love to do it.

Mr. BURCHETT. I appreciate that.

Also, I just wanted to pay a compliment. Those folks out there—we moved out to off, you would not know it—off Emery Road, but Maynardville Highway. Those folks out there, this little country-type area, they are wonderful. They are just wonderful. And they always—they take care of folks, and they holler at them, and they talk to them, and it is good. “Holler at them,” that is a positive thing in—

Mr. STEINER. Yes.

Mr. BURCHETT [continuing]. The South.

And I used to have a burgeoning eBay business and would go to the one on Weisgarber, and I can—some of the fondest memories I have with my daddy were, he was an old World War II veteran, and when Daddy would come in there, they would always pull him out a chair. And I would say, “Daddy, you just watch my packages. I have got to run back out to the truck.” Because sometimes I would—somebody would park a car in front of my house and I would sell it on eBay, the parts off of it, but—and Daddy would just sit there, and sometimes he would go to sleep. And they were—but the people there were just wonderful.

And I hope we do not lose that with the Post Office, because if you lost that, you lost me, brother, because—

Mr. STEINER. You are absolutely right.

Mr. BURCHETT [continuing]. Those folks are wonderful people.

Mr. STEINER. And, look, we could use an entrepreneur like you in the Post Office, if you are selling those used parts.

Mr. BURCHETT. You what? Say that again.

Mr. STEINER. We could use an entrepreneur like you in the Post Office—

Mr. BURCHETT. Well, I cannot—

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. From selling those used parts.

Mr. BURCHETT [continuing]. I cannot really do it much, as these ethics people get in my way, you know. If you want to do insider stock trading, go to Congress. If you want to sell something on eBay, you better get you an attorney if you are in Congress.

So, thank you, brother.

And thank you—

Mr. STEINER. Thank you.

Mr. BURCHETT [continuing]. Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ranking Member, for always being a class act.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman yields back his time.

Thank you very much.

By the way, Mr. Steiner, I think you will enjoy the 2-1/2 or 3 hours you spend with Mr. Burchett. He is a lot of fun and covers a lot of ground very quickly. So, I wholeheartedly encourage this endeavor between the two of you.

Thank you very much.

If you need help making that happen, Tim, let me know.

We now move to Ms. Budzinski.

Ms. Budzinski, you are recognized.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Thank you very much.

Mr. SESSIONS. Excuse me. I am sorry.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Oh. Yes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Ms. Tlaib. I am sorry. I——

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS [continuing]. Scratched through this. Wait till you turn 50.

Excuse me, Ms. Tlaib. You are on the Subcommittee, and you are recognized.

Ms. TLAIB. Yes. Thank you so much, Chairman.

Thank you to the Postmaster for being here.

I want to show you a picture. This is Nicholas John Acker. On November 8th, he was found dead at the USPS Detroit Network Distribution Center in Allen Park, Michigan. As you know, he was a postal worker. His body was found—it was trapped, actually, in a mail handling machine, and he had been dead for about six to eight hours before he was found. He checked into work at 11 a.m., and his body was not discovered until the following day at 12:30 p.m.

His death is an unspeakable tragedy for his family, including his fiancée—he had just recently got engaged—for his colleagues and fellow postal workers, and for the entire southeastern Michigan community.

His death is heartbreaking, and it was preventable, Postmaster General. Nicholas had previously voiced concerns about the facility's operations and safety practices to his fiancée.

What you should know is, those concerns were raised about safety measures and procedures at the facility and then how management there was pressuring staff to look for letters while the handling machine was still operating.

Are you aware of that?

Mr. STEINER. I am aware of the incident, yes.

Ms. TLAIB. Are you aware that they are asking workers to look for letters while the machine is operating?

Mr. STEINER. We are still waiting on the final report from Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to understand what happened.

Ms. TLAIB. Since the death, a number of Nicholas's coworkers at the distribution center—it has gotten worse. The toxic work environment, dangerous culture there has created—USPS management at the facility has just—you know, just increased and gotten worse, prioritizing speed over safety.

It has, you know, been over four months since Nicholas's death, and Representative Dingell and I had written a letter directly to you on two occasions, demanding answers to get to the bottom of what happened to him and what USPS leadership is doing to prevent this from ever happening again.

You understand, he served our country. He did not die at war, he did not die—he literally died in his community, working for the Postal Service.

Now that you are here in person, perhaps you can give us some answers to it. Can you give me some information to tell his mom—by the way, both his parents, you do not understand how devastated they are. They did not expect to get that call, again, of him just showing up to work, and, again, even the circumstances around his death were pretty horrifying for his mother.

Would you at least be willing to come to Allen Park, Michigan, come tour this place, come visit it, come down, talk to the coworkers, tell his coworkers that you are working on making it much more safe for them to work in that space? Will you at least acknowledge you would be able to do that? Again, they deserve some acknowledgment from the Post General about what happened at their facility.

Mr. STEINER. Yes. Look, obviously, obviously, a horrific incident that, you know, my heart, the heart of the whole postal family goes out to him and his family.

But, you know, to me, safety is the most important thing we do. One incident is one incident too many. Anytime you lose someone, you have got to take it personal, and you have got to take it as a teachable moment, right?

I ran a company where we went—our safety numbers for, just for—went from 60 to 1, which is world-class. And it was not because one person took it; it is because everybody took it.

And I will be at that facility.

Ms. TLAIB. Please come down.

Mr. STEINER. Because we need to show that it starts at the top, right?

Ms. TLAIB. Absolutely.

Mr. STEINER. And any incident is too much of an incident. And if there is anything that we can do to make that a teachable moment to save someone else—

Ms. TLAIB. Listen, we have got to save—

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. In the Postal Service, we will absolutely do it.

Ms. TLAIB. I mean, to be trapped in the machine, you know?

Look, I know that nobody wanted this to happen to Nicholas, but I just feel like, you know, OSHA has not responded to any of our requests. It has been months, and I—you know, Chairman, please work with me in trying to get answers for his parents. It should not take this long to get answers to this investigation of what happened to Nicholas Acker, especially serving almost a decade in the military service. And for him to die, again, in a Postal Service machine, a sorting machine, of all things.

Again, his parents deserve answers, they deserve justice. And they do not want talking points, Postmaster General. They want to, one, make sure there is justice and accountability and make sure it does not happen to anyone else.

And, look, I am here to tell you, I hear a lot of the financial crisis that is facing the Postmaster. I have been talking about public banking in Postal Service, doing more in Postal Service. I am a big advocate for it, trust me. But this is what I have been focused on right now. Because when you hug a mother that lost her child like that, as a Member of Congress, I cannot give her answers until you do your job.

I yield.

Mr. STEINER. Understood.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentlewoman yields back.

I want to say to the gentlewoman that I have talked to our staff and they were aware of it. It, as the General has stated, is under OSHA investigation. And Mr. Mfume and I will deal with this im-

mediately and speed up not just a response but an answer from them. And I want to thank you for bringing that forward.

And, General, thank you for your care and concern.

There are a number of facts and factors about this which I am not able to speak about, nor you, to offer any insight into this, and I respect that. But I believe that his family is entitled to that answer, and Mr. Mfume and I will be involved in that.

And, General, you will see that we are working with you to encourage that, properly and professionally.

Mr. STEINER. Absolutely.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much.

The gentleman from Georgia is now recognized, Mr. Jack.

Mr. JACK. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to thank the Postmaster General for testifying before us. Another LSU graduate. It seems like you guys are taking over the U.S. Congress, but—

Mr. STEINER. I never thought I would get the chance to say “Geaux, Tigers” in front of Congress.

Mr. JACK. But I wanted to just, first, thank you for your service and ask, broadly speaking, as one of the last questioners today: You outlined in your opening testimony the challenges you face as Postmaster General. Is there a version of USPS’ future that does not require some form of congressional intervention in the coming years? And if so, what would that look like?

Mr. STEINER. You know, I do not think there is.

You know, I have done tons of strategic plans across a number of businesses, and I have never had a strategic plan where they say so many options are not available to you, right? You have losing routes; cannot cut them. You have losing post offices; cannot cut them. You have retirement benefits that only earn T-bill rates; you cannot invest it in stocks. You know, there are just so many, so many strings.

I tell people that this is like “Gulliver’s Travels.” You know, Gulliver was the giant in the land of the small, and one small person could not take him down, but they put so many strings on him that they were able to hold down the giant Gulliver.

And that is what is happening here. It is not one string; it is the accumulation of all the strings. I think David spoke about them. It is the discussion we have to have—I keep coming back to: We can do whatever you want. We can absolutely do whatever you want. You want six days a week? You want all the post offices open? We can do it, but someone has got to pay for it, right?

When the Postal Service split in 1971, they actually put something in place that they called the postal service cost. And they said, we understand it is going to cost a lot of money for you to serve rural communities, so we are going to pay you for that. And that number then was \$460 million. If you translate that to today’s dollars, that is anywhere from \$13 billion to \$20 billion.

So, Congress in 1971 understood that they are going to have to pay for the rural—for taking care of all the rural places that lose money and the routes that lose money. They totally understood it.

You know, I would say that either we reduce the mandates that we have upon us on delivery days, all the different things that I have talked about in my remarks, or we acknowledge that there is

a cost to, you know, back what they called then the public service cost, there is a cost to that that Congress is going to fund. You know, to me, it is six of one, half a dozen of another. We can do it either way.

But recognize that all the mandates that we have cost money. And that money precludes us—the business model precludes us from being profitable. And so, either we have to get it through rate-payers paying it or through an appropriation from Congress. We can do it either way. And glad to have those conversations.

Mr. JACK. Well, thank you for that.

I have got two local issues in my district I want to highlight. I know we have been working diligently with your team. I am curious, and if it necessitates further commentary or correspondence after this hearing, I welcome that.

But in Tyrone, Georgia, Fayette County, my home county, there was a post office that burned down in March 2023, well before your time. I want to congratulate you; in recent months, you were able to reopen at least the post-office-box element of that facility. But retail is still not operable.

Curious what y'all's protocols are if you have a natural disaster that affects a post office, and can we work together to try to reopen the retail as quickly as possible.

Mr. STEINER. Yes. We will certainly, certainly follow up with you on that.

Mr. JACK. And, last, Thomaston, Georgia, also in my district—you mentioned rural. You know, this is interesting, and I think it does affect some more rural post offices that were built before the 1960s, before Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) came into effect. And we do have a lot of reports—and I want to commend the postal employees there. They are trying to help folks that are, you know, in need of getting up stairs, and they do not have ramps, to—they are trying to help them get into the post office. But we just—we hear recurring problems there.

Because the facility was built in the 30s—1930s, I should say—there has not been a lot of, I guess, you know, legal requirements for them to update their facilities. I am curious what y'all do with some those more rural post offices that do not have the ADA requirements but still service people that have ADA needs.

Mr. STEINER. Yes. Again, you know, we have to go back to that tradeoff. Do not know the specific details, but we will get back to you on it.

But, you know, it is interesting that you say that, when you talk about them helping people to get into the post office. For every time we have someone that did not get their birthday card on time, we have that great employee that gives that unbelievable customer service. It really is the face of the Postal Service.

That is what we can bring back if we figure out this business model. That is what we can bring back, I think, everywhere, is that unbelievable customer service that your folks experience, when they go out of their way to go out and help them into a post office where it might be hard to get into it.

Mr. JACK. Well, I appreciate you working with us on both of those.

Mr. Chairman, I may have some questions to submit for the record hereafter, but I deeply appreciate you convening this hearing. It is a very, very important hearing, and it is a big deal for us to be part of it. So, thank you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much. We will look forward to not only getting your questions but also hearing back from them. And thank you very much.

The gentleman, Mr. Walkinshaw.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for suffering my presence again on this Subcommittee.

I have a couple of UC requests, if that is all right.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, that—please, feel free to move for them.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a March 5, 2026, letter signed by 66 Members of Congress, including 15 Senators and 51 Members of the House, urging the Department of Commerce to reverse course on a flawed 2026 census test.

Mr. SESSIONS. Without objection.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a report released by the Department of Commerce Inspector General (IG) on March 16, 2026, evaluating the methodology employed by the Bureau for the upcoming 2026 test involving Postal Service workers.

It outlines the IG's concerns that the proposed approach could compromise readiness for the 2030 census.

Mr. SESSIONS. Without objection.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Steiner, thank you for being with us today, and thank you for the conversation that we had and your open engagement with this Subcommittee.

For Congress to make informed decisions about how we can ensure the Postal Service's long-term stability, we need clear data on the proposals you put forward, where the Postal Service stands, and where it is headed.

Frankly, your predecessor, in my view, was sometimes hostile toward our role in congressional oversight, did not want to provide information we needed to be able to help the Postal Service.

Will you agree to provide Members of this Committee with five year financial projections showing how the reforms and changes you have outlined, including the continued implementation of "Delivering for America," like including the Regional Transportation Optimization initiative, would affect the Service's financial position and service performance over five years?

Mr. STEINER. Yes. In fact, during the break, I was speaking with David about that, that—

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Okay.

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. What I think we can put together. Because, you know, it is all the mandates that I talked about. We can put together multiple scenarios where you have different outcomes, right?

And so, if you assume, you know, the six or seven mandates that I have talked about—there are probably five or six other ones—we will make assumptions on which ones happen and which ones do not. And so, we will have multiple budgets for you, to say, "If you

want this one, we can go this direction. If you still want this mandate, we can go this direction.”

We can actually put it together for you that it will show the effect of all the different mandates that I have talked about and how that would affect the five year plan.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Because if we are going to build support for any of the proposals, including maybe the lower-hanging fruit like investing the retirement funds, we have got to be able to go to our colleagues and say, this is where we are headed in a positive—

Mr. STEINER. Exactly.

Mr. WALKINSHAW [continuing]. Direction. Okay.

Mr. STEINER. Absolutely.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. According to a recent IG report, the Postal Service spent roughly \$860 million in remedies due to failing to comply with respective Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)s.

So, given the challenge the Postal Service has had in complying with its own CBAs that you all agreed to, you maybe will forgive my skepticism that you would be able to successfully take over and run the Federal Employees’ Compensation Act and workers’ comp programs, as you provided.

I am a little bit skeptical of that, given the challenging track record.

Mr. STEINER. Yes, I do not blame you for the skepticism. But the workers’ comp would actually be managed by a third party. You know, we manage, obviously, the claims you are talking about; the workers’ comp would actually be managed by a third party.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. So, you would outsource that.

Mr. STEINER. Yes. I mean, basically every company in America outsources that.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Okay.

I want to go to one of the maybe low-hanging-fruit reforms. And you and I had a good conversation about the investment, and I had an ounce of skepticism, and you relieved me of my skepticism, I think, in our conversation.

Can you talk through, though—because, obviously, it is not as simple as saying you can invest the funds, right? There would have to be a structure in place to guide that, so especially the workers and retirees have a voice in how their money’s being invested.

Mr. STEINER. Right.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. What kind of structure do you envision to accomplish that?

Mr. STEINER. Yes, I think you would want to put—obviously, you would want to put a board of directors, if you will, in charge of that, really an investment committee. I think—I love the idea of having representatives, the employees, be part of that. I think that is a great idea. You know, the proposals I have seen would have, for example, the Secretary of the Treasury. You know, so you would have a broad-based, representative group to make those ultimate investment differences.

But then you could also have parameters to say, you know, you are not going to go out and invest in crypto. I mean, you could set parameters and say, here are your allowed investments, and make those rather conservative, right—because we do not want to be there out there gambling with our retirees’ money—and then you

get an oversight board with broad-based experience to manage that.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman yields back his time.

Mr. Walkinshaw, thank you very much.

I would now yield myself—oh, excuse me. We did promise you would move forward. So, Ms. Budzinski, you are now recognized. And thank you for taking time to be waived on to this.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, and to Ranking Member Mfume, for this chance.

I do want to say, it is also great to meet and be with Postmaster General Steiner and Mr. Marroni.

Thank you both for being here.

In Fiscal Year 2025, the Postal Service lost about \$9 billion. In the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2026, USPS lost an additional \$1.4 billion.

Postmaster General Steiner, you have stated that you believe that the Postal Service is headed toward a financial crisis, and I do agree with you on that point. But you have also said that you want to continue to move forward with the “Delivering for America” plan, which has really only worsened delivery for the past six years.

As we enter year six of the “Delivering for America” plan, I do remain concerned that the Postal Service seems committed to pushing forward with the plan despite the steep declines in on-time delivery and slowed outgoing mail in rural areas, like the district that I represent in central and southern Illinois.

Just for example, in Fiscal Year 2019, the on-time delivery for 2-day First-Class Mail was 92 percent. Six years later—and this is in my district—it is down now to just 83 percent, with areas like downstate Illinois consistently seeing on-time delivery fall below 80 percent and even 70 percent at various points in 2024 and 2025.

I will argue, I think that is why I do believe that it is really important that we continue to have a strong Postal Regulatory Commission and an Inspector General, to ensure that we have oversight over the Postal Service and its implementation for “Delivering for America.”

And I know, you know, yes, it is true that the Postal Service, as you have stated, must act in accordance with the Postal Regulatory Commission, but it ultimately does have much more flexibility for its competitive products or packages. And I do worry, just in talking about the Postal Regulatory Commission (PRC), is watering it down or eliminating it, given the fiscal situation of the USPS, that maybe perhaps it actually should have more authority, not less.

But with all of this in mind, I just want to say, I am very excited; we have started a bipartisan Postal Service Caucus. And we do look forward to working with you on all of these challenges.

One of my first questions for you, Postmaster General, is: in recent months, you have continued, as I stated, that you believe in continuing to move forward with the “Delivering for America” plan despite these declining delivery rates.

My question would be, are there indicators that you are looking at that would give you pause in the continued implementation of the “Delivering for America” plan or decide to perhaps suspend it?

Mr. STEINER. Yes, and, you know, I do want to clarify that, when I think of the “Delivering for America” plan, I am talking just about the network transformation piece—

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Uh-huh.

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. Right, which I said before, you know, is sort of the Logistics 101 hub-and-spoke system.

You know, what I do see is, you see service numbers improving. You see us pulling work-hours out—not fast enough, but you see us pulling work-hours out. So, you can see it. It moves slow, because the network is so big. You can absolutely see it. You see it in the service numbers. You saw it during peak. We were the most improved company—

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Uh-huh.

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. In performance in peak of all the major competitive package companies.

But you can also see it when you look—you are right dead in the center of the heart of where our biggest problem is, right down the center of America, from Chicago to St. Louis to Memphis.

And I will tell you, I do not believe that that is a network problem. My understanding is it is a staffing problem, that it is hard to get employees to work in the plants where we need them to work. And, you know, we do not have a lot of flexibility to give bonuses to hire people or retention bonuses because of the way our union contracts work.

But that area, I can promise you—

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Uh-huh.

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. Is looked at by us, not just every week, every single day.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Okay.

Mr. STEINER. And the numbers are getting better.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Yes.

Mr. STEINER. They absolutely are not there yet.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Just since I can squeeze in one more question.

Mr. STEINER. Sure.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. I would love to keep working with you on that. And I do have concerns around the consolidations and the RTO plan, and those are things that we can continue that conversation.

But my last question, Postmaster General: in regarding the Postal Service’s recent hiring and the restructuring firm—hiring the restructuring firm Alvarez & Marsal, the Postal Service has said that they are going to use Alvarez & Marsal to identify ways to transform the Postal Service and address the fiscal shortfalls.

So, my question: should we be anticipating future reductions in force or more network changes if Alvarez & Marsal were to recommend that to your team?

Mr. STEINER. Yes, you know, look, what I have said is that we are in a crisis, and when you are in a crisis, everything has to be on the table.

Alvarez & Marsal is, you know, the leading restructuring firm in the world. And so, we wanted to bring in the best to show us what was possible.

We have not gotten that report, but once we get that report, we need to look at it and say, okay, what is it that we need to do in order to, you know, right the ship, in order to extend the period of time?

When you have less than 12 months of cash available, you have got to look at everything. And I wanted to bring in the best to help us look at it.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Okay. I look forward to working with you. Thank you.

Mr. STEINER. Thank you. And——

Ms. BUDZINSKI. I yield back.

Mr. STEINER [continuing]. Glad to come meet with you in person to have discussion about those issues, because they are important.

Ms. BUDZINSKI. Thank you.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thanks very much.

The gentlewoman yields back her time.

I would now yield myself such time as I may consume.

I first wanted to ask unanimous consent to address and add into the record the Coalition to Protect America's Small Sellers' letter that has been provided to me; and, second, a letter dated March 16, "U.S. Postal Service to Ask Congress for Urgent Reforms to Survive 'Beyond Next Year.'"

Without objection, we will enter those into the record.

The opportunity for us to be here together, publicly, with vendors, people who work for the Post Office, people who have oversight over the Post Office, people who want an opportunity for the Post Office to work and work well, Members of Congress—almost every single one of us have people that sing your praises and some that think otherwise. It is a hard business. You are everywhere.

I, too, have had a post office that burned down. I knew well the neighborhood that felt like it took a little bit longer than it should have, but it was accomplished. There were accommodations made.

Every single Member of Congress somehow does hear something about the Post Office. Sometimes—and I learned this in my prior life—sometimes when things are going so great you do not hear a lot.

The Post Office, however, is at a point that we all agree with—Mr. Mfume, you and I agree with, GAO agrees with—we are at a crucial point, not critical, we are at a crucial point where we now know more decisions need to be made with agreement—agreement between us, agreement between you. I think that certainly this article that I provided says exactly that, that there has to be not just consent given but agreement.

I would like to say that, during much of this period of time over the last year and some, that we have been given an opportunity to know each other, work with each other. I find you refreshing, I find you honest, and I think we can do business with you.

But it is going to take more than that. It is going to take Mr. Mfume and I to stand behind an organization that is going to have to make some decisions also. We are going to have to make decisions because this represents a huge part of not just enterprises across the United States but the best interests of people who are normal American citizens, who want, need, and expect a good Post

Office—sound service, good price—to where we will continue to use it.

A few months ago, when you and I met, I told you that I had several goals. You told me pretty plainly, “Congressman Sessions, we will do whatever you want to pay for.” And I told you I did not want to raise the price of a stamp further. I told you that I believe that we have to look at this organization as something that we need to get close on, keep in front of us, and to have an idea about where we are going to go and how we are going to get there.

I met with our friends at the White House to find out what instructions they really provided you also, because that is important. When you go to offer a job to someone, you, generally speaking, would want to get some understanding of that—a commitment to that. I think it is easier when you get elected—when you take over a job than it is to serve in that job. And, certainly, a few months later you learn some things that you may not have known.

But the buck stops here now. And Mr. Mfume, Mr. Mfume and I are very open with each other. And I will say—I am not trying to be a tough guy—we are going to do this together, but I will do this.

And from our last meeting that we had over at your office, we had a determination that we were going to get closer. I told you at that time that I had a commitment from James Comer, who is the Chairman of the Committee, that he felt like that this is something that could not be passed on, that it does us no good to simply give you more money or agree to something that we know does not work.

I will fully admit to you that Mr. Womack, who is sitting beside me, our staff guru on the Post Office, has admitted to me and I have admitted to him that we need to dig in further. We need to dig in. We need to do this. I think that your team openly agreed to do this a month ago. No excuses, we need to do this. We need to do it rapidly, and we need to get right to the issues.

I think that it will require some give-and-take. We have generally been asking questions. We have generally been allowing you that opportunity to move forward with your plan. I think the newest indications that I have of knowing where we are, I think we are past that point now, and we will get to where we agree and disagree.

I am not responsible, I am not your boss; I am your oversight. But Mr. Mfume and I carry the torch about the result of what we are going to do from Congress to help. And I think that Mr. Mfume and I both have great confidence in the workers, the supervisors, the postmasters, the management of the organization, but we have to—we are going to have to make tough decisions.

So, in great fairness to you and your team, who I do have confidence in and who have been very gracious to not only Mr. Mfume and I, we are going to get to where we then say, “Oh, yeah? Prove it.” “Oh, yeah? You think that? Well, then we think differently.” And it is a position that you find yourself in and I find myself in. And I have never been one to play tiddlywinks; I will go right to it.

So, I want you to know that, today, I am not going to put us through some of the bigger questions. Because, as I told the staff,

I am not going to do that because you are under an obligation to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God. And that means that I could ask you questions about some things that may be in transit, some things that may be being worked on now. But when we are not with you under oath, you and I are going to engage in that with Mr. Mfume.

And we need to understand more about the same types of questions that have been brought up by our Members, about the hopes and expectations that come from both sides about the Postal Service, about its delivery system. And you have given us back enough impediments, the things which you do believe are in the way of you not only making a profit but being successful.

And so, we are going to have to have more than just time with each other in an open mic like this. And so, Mr. Mfume has informed me that he will be pleased to participate in this effort. And I think that we owe it to the American people, but I know we owe it to Members of Congress to address these issues.

And it will not be about what we are doing with a burned-down post office. It will not be about what we are doing on a route or two. It will be the financial integrity, the things that would allow you to serve people and to make changes that would be necessary to you.

And so, I want you to know that I have received the best wishes from a good number of people leading up to this, including people who work for the Post Office, including people who were in the industries that surround this that have placed billions of dollars in all of our hands. It is in our best interest to make sure this works.

And I have a commitment to this. I served on the last postal subcommittee that we had in Congress. I came to that subcommittee because I had an interest in it. I had a great big rural district. I still have a great big rural district, and I care about everybody.

So, I do care about the Service. I do care about your commitment. And I think I have sized you up as a person who is able to effectively work professionally through these issues. And you did not cause them, and I did not cause them, but it is going to come down to the three or four of us are going to have to make some tough decisions, that we can look at other people and say: That was a problem, the Postmaster General laid it on our doorstep, and we are not going to kick the can down the road. We are going to put these directly in front of us. And then we are going to have to figure out how we are going to go to our colleagues and pull it off.

But it does us no good to find that in one year from now the Postal Service failed. It does us no good, in my opinion, to go to a dollar stamp, even though there might be some in this room that think that is the right answer.

But we are going to have to make tough decisions. We will help you through that. And I will know that I know you enough professionally where you have the moxie and the stuff about yourself of what you are made of that you will stick with us.

I want to thank you and Mr. Marroni for being here today. I want to thank your friends and allies who have gathered together to not only cheer you on but also others who have come here with a hope that the entire system works. And we are going to do that.

So, Mr. Mfume, would you like to defend yourself in this effort?

Mr. MFUME. Well, thank you, first of all, Mr. Chairman.

As many of you know, we work well together because we put a goal in front of us and try to put politics to the side so that we are concerned about people and not politics.

And the other "P" in all this is "Postal," the Postal Service, and why it gives us the kind of pride that we have had growing up in this country and the kind of personal relationships that we have all had with the Post Office. We all think it is "our" Post Office. And I think that is the way it was meant and intentioned and that is the way it has been throughout the years.

And so, when you consider something as yours, you have an obligation, at least inherently, to want to always try to protect it. And that has overcome the differences that we may have had on different things so that we are able to move forward together.

I have got a couple of UCs, Mr. Chairman, and then just a final statement.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MFUME. I would ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a statement from the president of the American Postal Workers Union regarding today's hearing.

Mr. SESSIONS. Without objection.

Mr. MFUME. And I would ask unanimous consent to enter into the record a statement from the national president of the National Postal Mail Handlers Union regarding today's hearing.

Mr. SESSIONS. Without objection.

Mr. MFUME. Thank you, Mr. Sessions.

It was 1991 when the Congress really stepped up to the plate and put in place a debt limit and an authority for the Postal Service. That was 35 years ago, and they set it at \$15 billion. I have to tell you, I am amazed it has not been revisited since then. That is a long, long time—35 years.

And so, one thing that is clear about all of this is that we cannot let United States Postal Service die, that we are going to have to find a way, as we all know, inevitably, to look at restructuring that debt limit. How we do it and what the new limit becomes is going to be a matter of a lot of conversations and discussions. It may be hard to sell, but I think most people feel like I do, that, rather than do nothing and watch the Titanic sink, that we need to do something.

And I think, without a doubt, that many Members of the Congress are going to be particularly watching what Mr. Sessions and what I advocate, because they would recognize that there is no daylight between the two positions. And hopefully that will get us to the point where we are able to deal with this debt crisis and debt limitation.

However, having said that, all other Members of this House, all 433, are going to have a comment or question and, clearly, are going to have some say in this, because people just do not want to give their votes even though they recognize that something is necessary.

And so, what comes out of that in terms of the concessions, if I could use that term, or the guarantees, which I feel better about, will be done collaboratively.

And, Mr. Postmaster General, I hope that you and your people are willing to be a part of that.

Mr. Marroni, I am going to ask that the GSA [sic] also weigh in on all of this so that we feel like we are on stable grounds to be able to answer the tough questions.

And then I am going to ask for something that none of you came to this hearing for, and that is vision. What becomes, then, after all that, the vision of the United States Postal Service that the American people who are watching this hearing and the Members of Congress who ultimately will have to grapple with the question of debt extension—what is the vision that you want to put before them?

And I do not want you to try to answer that now, but I just want you to think about it. Because that is what we need here—some clear vision that everybody in this country can get behind and to embrace and have signature on and to clearly feel like they are part of the solution going forward. So, I would ask you to think about that.

Again, I want to thank Chairman Sessions for his work and for our working relationship and would hope, as I have said earlier—we have gone through this for a lot of years. We would hope that this is the beginning of the ultimate end of the ongoing crises that we have all witnessed far too long.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman yields back his time.

Thank you.

And I will very succinctly tell the gentleman—and he has heard me say this many times—I believe us working together can accomplish this. And I am talking about the Postal Service, I am talking about their vendors, and people back and forth. I think the system is better when it works together. I think the system is better when it views each other as complementary to that system.

I think that there are people that do certain things out of their own either best interest or that is the way their route, so to speak, went, that there are things that you have as an advantage with the Postal Service that seemingly could be a disadvantage but that we can turn into an advantage. But I think that when we try and move that needle too far one way or another, I think it works adversely against the best interest of the whole.

So, those are my comments. The gentleman has a philosophy also. And I will tell you that if you have viewed us as trying to be a part of the solution, then you may go home tonight and know that Mr. Mfume and I, and I believe the General, is deeply committed to that also.

We now—I am going to close the hearing.

And so, with that, and without objection, all Members have five legislative days within which to submit materials and additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded first to us and then to the witnesses.

If there is no further business, without objection, this Subcommittee stands adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 5:02 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

