

TO DESIGNATE FACILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES
 POSTAL SERVICE, TO ESTABLISH NEW ZIP CODES, AND
 FOR OTHER PURPOSES

NOVEMBER 30, 2016.—Referred to the House Calender and ordered to be printed

Mr. CHAFFETZ, from the Committee on Oversight and Government
 Reform, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 6303]

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to whom
 was referred the bill (H.R. 6303) to designate facilities of the
 United States Postal Service, to establish new ZIP Codes, and for
 other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably there-
 on without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

CONTENTS

	Page
Committee Statement and Views	1
Section-by-Section	4
Explanation of Amendments	4
Committee Consideration	5
Roll Call Votes	5
Application of Law to the Legislative Branch	5
Statement of Oversight Findings and Recommendations of the Committee	5
Statement of General Performance Goals and Objectives	5
Duplication of Federal Programs	5
Disclosure of Directed Rule Makings	5
Federal Advisory Committee Act	5
Unfunded Mandate Statement	6
Earmark Identification	6
Committee Estimate	6
Budget Authority and Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	6

COMMITTEE STATEMENT AND VIEWS

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

H.R. 6303, to designate facilities of the United States Postal
 Service, to establish new ZIP Codes, and for other purposes, would
 designate the name of ten United States Postal Service facilities,

and would help five communities resolve long-standing ZIP Code issues. To accomplish this second goal, the legislation instructs the Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for each of the five communities.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Established in 1963 by the former Post Office Department, the Zone Improvement Plan Code (ZIP Code) system was designed as a way to help improve the efficiency of mail delivery nationwide.¹ Initially overlaid on existing street grids, ZIP Codes have been expanded to cover new housing developments and have become a key feature of American addresses.

In general, ZIP Codes are accurate tools that are often used as proxy identifiers for the jurisdictions they serve by both private business and state and local governments. Unfortunately, nationwide there are a small set of ZIP Codes that do not align with existing jurisdictional boundaries and thus create issues for mail delivery and the delivery of state and local government services.

H.R. 6303 seeks to resolve the problems of five communities that have been impacted by ZIP Code misalignment. ZIP Code misalignment can create issues with mail delivery services, sometimes causing “wrong-mail, delayed-mail, and lost-mail.”² In the case of Southampton, New York, there are 50 similarly or identically named streets in the same ZIP Code.³ ZIP Code complications in Glendale, New York, have caused residents to express concern over their mail order medications failing to arrive on time.⁴ Occasionally as a result of ZIP Code boundaries, residents of some cities must list a city that is not their city of residence in their mailing address, increasing the chances that their mail services could be delayed.

Due to the variety of purposes ZIP Codes serve, ZIP Code misalignment creates problems that apply to more than just on-time mail delivery. For instance, the community of Ocoee, Florida is served by six different ZIP Codes.⁵ Because of this, the community faces a lack of identity and some Ocoee residents are forced to pay non-resident rates or are flatly denied public services because they are not identified by the correct ZIP Code.⁶ Beyond community identity and public services provided, ZIP Code misalignment can affect public health situations as well. Communities without a unique ZIP Code are at higher risk for extended response times when calling 911 due to confusion and similar street names.⁷

To help solve these problems, the Postal Service has implemented a review process that allows communities to submit requests for ZIP Code changes. Once the United States Postal Service

¹Smithsonian Nat'l. Postal Museum, *Flashing Across the Country: Mr. Zip and the ZIP Code Promotional Campaign*, available at <http://postalmuseum.si.edu/zipcodecampaign/> (last visited Nov. 22, 2016).

²Email from Office of Representative Lee Zeldin Staff to H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform Majority Staff (Feb. 13, 2016, 2:15 p.m.).

³Letter from Christine P. Scalera, Councilwoman for the Town of Southampton, to Congressman Lee Zeldin (Aug. 12, 2015) (on file with Committee staff).

⁴Letter from Brian Dooley, President of the Glendale Property Owners Association Inc., to Congressman Robert L. Turner, (May 10, 2012) (on file with Committee staff).

⁵Letter from Rusty Johnson, Mayor of the City of Ocoee, to Senator Marco Rubio, (March 10, 2016) (on file with Committee staff).

⁶*Id.*

⁷Letter from Brian Dooley, President of the Glendale Property Owners Association Inc., Congressman Robert L. Turner, (May 10, 2012) (on file with Committee staff).

(USPS) receives a written request from a community, the local district manager reviews the requested change, and generally provides a determination within 60 days. If the request is denied, a community may appeal the decision to USPS headquarters. Once USPS reviews the appeal and issues a final ruling, the community is not allowed to reapply for a ZIP Code change for 10 years.⁸

For Miami Lakes, Florida and others, local leaders within the new ZIP Code designations have completed the review and appeal process, and have exhausted all options to obtain the requested changes. Local leaders in Glendale, New York, for example, have faced these challenges since the 1980s, and have had multiple requests denied by USPS.⁹ Federal legislation is the final option to provide relief and assistance to these communities. All of the ZIP Code designations in this bill are driven by local community leaders and are supported by the relevant Member of Congress. It is important to note that the local communities are not asking for new postal buildings, and no new construction will be required to accommodate the changes.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

H.R. 6303, to designate facilities of the United States Postal Service, to establish new ZIP Codes, and for other purposes, was introduced on November 14, 2016, by Representative Jason Chaffetz (R-UT) and was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. On November 16, 2016, the Committee ordered H.R. 6303 favorably reported, without amendment, by voice vote.

Certain ZIP Codes addressed in H.R. 6303 have been introduced in prior bills. In the 114th Congress, H.R. 5714, the Postal Service Reform Act of 2016, introduced by Rep. Chaffetz, included provisions related to the designation of ZIP Codes in Miami Lakes, Florida; Storey County, Nevada; and Southampton, New York. Also in the 114th Congress, Rep. Grace Meng (D-NY) introduced H.R. 657, which would designate a ZIP Code for Glendale, New York. Legislation related to the creation of a Glendale, New York ZIP Code was previously introduced by Rep. Meng in the 113th Congress as H.R. 4911, and in the 111th Congress by Rep. Timothy Bishop (D-NY) as H.R. 4721.

H.R. 6303 also consolidates 10 postal naming bills that have passed the House during the 114th Congress, but had not yet been considered by the Senate at the time of the filing of this bill report:

(1) H.R. 3218 (Rep. Lois Capps, D-CA); Passed the House on May, 23, 2016.

(2) H.R. 4887 (Rep. Pete Visclosky, D-IN); Passed the House on September 20, 2016.

(3) H.R. 5150 (Rep. Dan Donovan, R-NY); Passed the House on September 20, 2016.

(4) H.R. 5309 (Rep. Trent Kelly, R-MS); Passed the House on September 20, 2016.

⁸United States Postal Service, *USPS FAQ: What does each involved party need to do?*, <http://faq.usps.com/?articleId=221593>.

⁹Letter from Melinda Katz, Queensborough President, Joseph Addabbo, New York State Senator, Michael Miller, New York State Assemblyman, and Andrew Hevesi, New York State Assemblyman, to Congresswoman Grace Meng, (Sept. 15, 2016) (on file with Committee staff).

(5) H.R. 5356 (Rep. Kevin Brady, R-TX); Passed the House on September 20, 2016.

(6) H.R. 5591 (Rep. Henry Cuellar, D-TX); Passed the House on September 20, 2016.

(7) H.R. 5612 (Rep. Tom Price, R-GA); Passed the House on September 20, 2016.

(8) H.R. 5676 (Rep. Mike Quigley, D-IL); Passed the House on September 20, 2016.

(9) H.R. 5889 (Rep. Gregorio Sablan, D-CNMI), Passed the House on September 20, 2016.

(10) H.R. 5798 (Rep. Jan Schakowsky, D-IL); Passed the House on September 22, 2016.

SECTION-BY-SECTION

Section 1. Post Office designations

Designates the USPS facility located at 1221 State Street Suite 12, Santa Barbara, California as the “Special Warfare Operator Master Chief Petty Office (SEAL) Louis ‘Lou’ J. Langlais Post Office Building.”

Designates the USPS facility located at 23323 Shelby Road in Shelby, Indiana, as the “Richard Allen Cable Post Office.”

Designates the USPS facility located at 3031 Veterans Road West in Staten Island, New York, as the “Leonard Montalto Post Office Building.”

Designates the USPS facility located at 401 McElroy Drive in Oxford, Mississippi, as the “Army First Lieutenant Donald C. Carwile Post Office Building.”

Designates the USPS facility located at 14231 TX-150 in Coldspring, Texas, as the “E. Marie Youngblood Post Office.”

Designates the USPS facility located at 810 N US Highway 83 in Zapata, Texas, as the “Zapata Veterans Post Office.”

Designates the USPS facility located at 2886 Sandy Plains Road in Marietta, Georgia, as the “Marine Lance Corporal Squire ‘Skip’ Wells Post Office Building.”

Designates the USPS facility located at 6300 N. Northwest Highway in Chicago, Illinois, as the “Officer Joseph P. Cali Post Office Building.”

Designates the USPS facility located at 1 Chalan Kanoa VLG in Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands, as the “Segundo T. Sablan and CNMI Fallen Military Heroes Post Office Building.”

Designates the USPS facility located at 1101 Davis Street in Evanston, Illinois, as the “Abner J. Mikva Post Office Building”.

Section 2. Establishing new Zip Codes

Instructs the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP code for (1) Miami Lakes, Florida; (2) Storey County, Nevada; (3) Flanders, Northampton, and Riverside in the Town of Southampton, New York; (4) Ocoee, Florida; and (5) Glendale, New York, to improve the provision of mail delivery in those areas.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments to H.R. 6303 were offered or adopted during Full Committee consideration of the bill.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On November 16, 2016, the Committee met in open session and ordered reported favorably the bill, H.R. 6303, by voice vote, a quorum being present.

ROLL CALL VOTES

No roll call votes were requested or conducted during Full Committee consideration of H.R. 6303.

APPLICATION OF LAW TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Section 102(b)(3) of Public Law 104–1 requires a description of the application of this bill to the legislative branch where the bill relates to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services and accommodations. This bill designates facilities of the United States Postal Service and establishes new ZIP Codes. As such this bill does not relate to employment or access to public services and accommodations.

STATEMENT OF OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII and clause (2)(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the descriptive portions of this report.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In accordance with clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's performance goals and objectives are to designate facilities of the United States Postal Service and to establish new ZIP Codes.

DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

No provision of this bill establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTED RULE MAKINGS

The Committee estimates that enacting this bill does not direct the completion of any specific rule makings within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 551.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

The Committee finds that the legislation does not establish or authorize the establishment of an advisory committee within the definition of 5 U.S.C. App., Section 5(b).

UNFUNDED MANDATE STATEMENT

Section 423 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act (as amended by Section 101(a)(2) of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, P.L. 104-4) requires a statement as to whether the provisions of the reported include unfunded mandates. In compliance with this requirement the Committee has received a letter from the Congressional Budget Office included herein.

EARMARK IDENTIFICATION

This bill does not include any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

COMMITTEE ESTIMATE

At the time of this writing, the Committee had yet to receive a formal cost estimate from the Congressional Budget Office for H.R. 6303. In information provided by the U.S. Postal Service to the Committee, the Postal Service estimated that the legislation would create total one-time costs of \$540,000, and annual costs of \$55,000; however, some ZIP Codes established in the legislation may be less cost intensive to create, potentially lowering the cost to the Postal Service. As a result, the Committee asserts that the legislation should cost the Postal Service no more than approximately \$1 million over ten years.

BUDGET AUTHORITY AND CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

With respect to the requirements of clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and with respect to requirements of clause (3)(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has not received a cost estimate for this bill from the Director of Congressional Budget Office, and instead has included a committee estimate in the section prior to this one.