

Efficiency of Operations at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center, Detroit, MI

AUDIT REPORT

Report Number 26-086-R26 | July 9, 2026



Table of Contents

Cover	
Transmittal Letter	1
Results	2
Background	2
Objective, Scope, and Methodology	2
Results Summary	3
Finding #1: Late, Canceled, and Extra Outbound Trips	4
Postal Service Response.....	5
OIG Evaluation.....	5
Finding #2: Scan Compliance	6
Postal Service Response.....	7
OIG Evaluation.....	7
Finding #3: Scanner Accountability.....	8
Postal Service Response.....	9
OIG Evaluation.....	9
Finding #4: Safety and Security	10
Postal Service Response.....	11
OIG Evaluation.....	11
Appendix A: Additional Information	12
Appendix B: Management’s Comments	13
Contact Information	17

Transmittal Letter



OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

July 9, 2026

MEMORANDUM FOR: MARK E. WILSON
LAKESHORES DIVISION DIRECTOR,
PROCESSING OPERATIONS

JASON L. MCCURRY
LAKESHORES DIVISION DIRECTOR,
LOGISTICS

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Sean Balduff", is centered below the recipient names.

FROM: Sean Balduff
Director, Field Operations, Central & Southern

SUBJECT: Audit Report – Efficiency of Operations at the Detroit Processing and
Distribution Center, Detroit, MI (Report Number 26-086-R26)

This report presents the results of our audit of the Efficiency of Operations at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

All recommendations require U.S. Postal Service Office of Inspector General's (OIG) concurrence before closure. Consequently, the OIG requests written confirmation when corrective actions are completed. Recommendations 1, 3, 4, and 6 should not be closed in the Postal Service's follow-up tracking system until the OIG provides written confirmation that the recommendations can be closed. We consider recommendations 2, 5, 7, and 8 closed with issuance of this report.

We appreciate the cooperation and courtesy provided by your staff. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schneider, Audit Manager, or me at 703-248-2100.

Attachment

cc: Postmaster General
Chief Processing and Distribution Officer and Executive Vice President
Chief Logistics and Infrastructure Officer and Executive Vice President
Vice President, Processing and Maintenance Operations
Vice President, Logistics
Vice President, Central Regional Processing Operations
Central Regional Director, Logistics
Corporate Audit Response Management

Results

Background

The U.S. Postal Service needs effective and productive operations to fulfill its mission of providing prompt, reliable, and affordable mail service to the American public. It has a vast transportation network that moves mail and equipment among approximately 308 processing facilities and 31,100 post offices, stations, and branches. The Postal Service is transforming its processing and logistics networks to become more scalable, reliable, visible, efficient, automated, and digitally integrated. This includes modernizing operating plans and aligning the workforce to meet marketplace needs; leveraging emerging technologies to provide world-class visibility and tracking of mail and packages in near real time; and optimizing the surface and air transportation network. The U.S. Postal Service Office of Inspector General (OIG) reviews the efficiency of mail processing operations at facilities across the country and provides management with timely feedback to further the Postal Service's mission.

This report presents the results of our self-initiated audit of the efficiency of operations at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center (P&DC) in Detroit, MI (Project Number 26-086). We judgmentally selected the Detroit, MI, P&DC based on a review of Leg 1 and Leg 3 failures;¹ workhours; scanning compliance;² and late, canceled, and extra trips. The Detroit P&DC is in the Lakeshores Division and processes letters, flats, and parcels. The Detroit P&DC services six 3-digit ZIP Codes in urban and rural communities³ (see Table 1).

Table 1. Population Demographics

3-Digit ZIP Codes	Urban Population	Rural Population	Total Population
434 - 436	587,931	208,875	796,806
481 - 482	2,348,124	145,787	2,493,911
492	146,467	201,980	348,447

Source: Postal Service National Distribution Labeling List and 2020 Census Bureau data.

As of February 28, 2026, the Detroit P&DC's employee availability⁴ was 81.8 percent for processing and 89.7 percent for logistics. The Postal Service's Employee Availability goal for fiscal year (FY) 2026 was 89.6 percent for processing and 93 percent for logistics.

Objective, Scope, and Methodology

Our objective was to evaluate the efficiency of operations at the Detroit P&DC.

To accomplish our objective, we focused on the following audit areas: mail clearance times;⁵ delayed mail; late, canceled, and extra outbound trips; scan compliance; scanner accountability; security of registry items; and safety and security. We reviewed Surface Visibility Web (SVWeb)⁶ data for late, canceled, and extra trips, as well as scan compliance for the period from April 1, 2025, to March 31, 2026. Further, we identified mail clearance time goals for the Detroit P&DC and compared them with operations shown in the Run Plan Generator report.⁷ During our site visit the week of May 4, 2026, we interviewed P&DC management and observed mail processing and dock operations. We also conducted a limited scope review of several safety and security items during the site observations.

1 Leg 1 failures occur when a mailpiece is collected and does not receive a processing scan at the origin processing facility on the day that it was intended. Leg 3 failures occur after the mailpiece has been processed at a processing facility on a final processing operation and is not delivered to the customer on the day it was intended.

2 Scans include load, depart, unload, close, assign, and arrive.

3 We obtained ZIP Code information related to population and urban/rural classification from 2020 Census Bureau information.

4 Data that compares straight workhours to the workhours that would have been recorded if all employees reported to work as scheduled.

5 Mail clearance time is the latest time committed mail can clear an operation for proper dispatch or delivery.

6 SVWeb is a Postal Service website that provides real-time transportation updates and reports on the movement of trailers in the surface network. The data captured to identify early, on-time, late, or canceled trips is also used to evaluate and improve transportation schedules.

7 The Run Plan Generator is an application mail processing facilities use to plan machine utilization based on volume, clearance times, and other criteria.

During this time, the OIG also audited three delivery units⁸ serviced by the Detroit P&DC. We will provide the results of those audits to Postal Service management in separate reports. See [Appendix A](#) for additional information about our scope and methodology.

Results Summary

We identified deficiencies that affected the efficiency of operations at the Detroit P&DC. We also observed two safety issues (see Table 2).

Table 2. Summary of Results

Audit Area	Issues Identified	
	Yes	No
Clearance Times		X
Delayed Mail		X
Late, Canceled, and Extra Outbound Trips	X	
Scan Compliance	X	
Scanner Accountability	X	
Security of Registry Items		X
Safety and Security	X	

Source: Results of OIG data reviewed from FYs 2025 and 2026 and fieldwork conducted the week of May 4, 2026.

For the audit areas where issues were not identified, we performed the following:

- Clearance Times – We analyzed mail processing schedules and data to verify that the plant was meeting the scheduled clearance times. During our visit, we also observed the timely processing of mail. We did not find any systemic issues.
- Delayed Mail – During our observations, we did not identify any delayed mail or systemic issues related to delayed mail. We reviewed the morning mail counts provided by plant personnel, which confirmed these observations.
- Security of Registry Items – We observed registry cage conditions and interviewed personnel to determine if procedures over the handling and security of Registered Mail were being followed. We did not find any systemic issues.

⁸ The three delivery units were the Grand Shelby Carrier Annex, Detroit, MI (Project Number 26-087-1); the Gratiot Station, Detroit, MI (Project Number 26-087-2); and the Strathmoor Station, Detroit, MI (Project Number 26-087-3).

Finding #1: Late, Canceled, and Extra Outbound Trips

What We Found

From April 1, 2025, through March 31, 2026, there were a total of 75,591 outbound trips from the Detroit P&DC. Of the total outbound trips, there were 14,018 late trips, 9,210 canceled trips, and 2,047 extra trips. These trips represent about 33 percent of all outbound trips during this period at the Detroit P&DC (see Table 3).

Table 3. Outbound Transportation Metrics

Transportation Metric	Number	Percentage of Total Trips
Late Trips	14,018	18.5
Canceled Trips	9,210	12.2
Extra Trips	2,047	2.7

Source: Postal Service SVWeb.

Why Did It Occur

Late trips at the Detroit P&DC were primarily caused by parking issues. The Detroit P&DC lacks on-site parking for mail trucks, so it uses parking at and around the Vehicle Maintenance Facility (VMF) located about a mile away. The off-site parking causes timing issues as drivers must first report to the VMF to clock in, then either walk or be transported to their postal vehicle and finally drive to the P&DC to pick up the trailer that is pre-loaded with mail. In addition, when drivers were making their mail collection trips to delivery units in the afternoon, they often proceeded directly from the VMF to the delivery unit without stopping at the P&DC to receive a departure scan, which caused unrecorded trips that show up as late in the SVWeb system.

Canceled trips were mostly due to unused trips not being removed from the Vehicle Information Transportation Analysis and Logistics (VITAL) system.⁹ Specifically, duplicate trips and trips that do not run regularly due to low volume had not been removed from the VITAL system. Until these trips are removed

from the system, management must regularly go in and cancel them. Regarding extra trips, over 53 percent were planned trips related to increased volume during peak season. Therefore, we are not making a recommendation for these extra trips.

What Should Have Happened

Postal Service policy¹⁰ states that key elements to effective dispatch and routing include evaluating transportation performance to planned schedules and ensuring that planned dispatches are compatible with an effective mail arrival profile at the destination.

Effect on the Postal Service and Its Customers

When there are late, canceled, and extra trips, there is an increased risk that the mail will not be delivered on time, which can adversely affect Postal Service customers, harm the brand, send mailers to competitors, increase operating costs, and cause the Postal Service to lose revenue.

Recommendation #1

We recommend the **Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics Operations**, analyze and adjust transportation schedules to ensure drivers arrive on time for mail pickups at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Recommendation #2

We recommend the **Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics Operations**, identify and remove unused trips from the Vehicle Information Transportation Analysis and Logistics system at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

⁹ VITAL is a centralized web-based application for Postal Vehicle Service (PVS) management. VITAL improves asset management, vehicle and employee scheduling, and production of paperwork required to dispatch a PVS vehicle.

¹⁰ Handbook M-22, *Dispatch and Routing Policy*, dated March 2025.

Postal Service Response

The Postal Service agreed with this finding and associated recommendations. Regarding recommendation 1, management stated that a plan is in place for drivers to follow mail pickup schedules, with logistics supervisors monitoring and confirming compliance daily to the logistics manager. Regarding recommendation 2, management stated that it will review PVS trips and eliminate legs no longer needed. The target implementation date for both recommendations is August 31, 2026. See [Appendix B](#) for management's comments in their entirety.

OIG Evaluation

The OIG considers management's comments responsive to the recommendations, and corrective actions should resolve the issues identified. During this audit, management provided documentation showing that it identified and eliminated unnecessary trips. Based on the actions taken, we will close recommendation 2 upon issuance of the final report.

Finding #2: Scan Compliance

What We Found

The Detroit P&DC did not consistently meet load and unload scanning goals. From April 1, 2025, to March 31, 2026, the average score for load scanning was 85.23 percent, and the average score for unload scanning was 91.49 percent (see Table 4). This was below the goal of 93.69 percent for FY 2025 and 94 percent for FY 2026.

Table 4. Scanning Compliance

Month	Scan Type	
	Load	Unload
April 2025	88.48%	91.64%
May 2025	85.79%	92.15%
June 2025	87.61%	92.96%
July 2025	87.88%	92.18%
August 2025	88.85%	92.97%
September 2025	87.29%	91.32%
October 2025	87.11%	91.60%
November 2025	83.99%	92.34%
December 2025	81.26%	90.43%
January 2026	81.22%	90.70%
February 2026	83.31%	89.70%
March 2026	81.30%	89.95%

Source: Postal Service SVWeb.

Why Did It Occur

Scans were not performed consistently due to a lack of management oversight. Processing management stated that it did not consistently enforce scan compliance because it was more focused on service performance, including meeting clearance times, increasing productivity, and avoiding mail delays. In addition, logistics management stated that scan performance was hindered by a shortage of PVS

scanners due to broken scanners that had not been replaced. Further, the logistics manager stated that sometimes employees print extra placards¹¹ that are not used and not terminated. Unused placards that are not terminated lead to missed load scans in the SVWeb system.

What Should Have Happened

Postal Service policy¹² states that employees are required to perform scans of containers and trailers to ensure 100 percent mail visibility.

Effect on the Postal Service and Its Customers

Low scanning compliance could contribute to inaccurate utilization of data, missent mail, and operational inefficiencies. Management uses scanning data to streamline outbound container operations, enhance dispatch quality, and increase efficient use of transportation containers and trailers. When scans are not made, management may not have the information needed to make accurate operational decisions.

Recommendation #3

We recommend the **Lakeshores Division Director, Processing Operations**, coordinate with the **Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics**, to implement a plan to verify that load and unload scanning is completed in accordance with policy at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Recommendation #4

We recommend the **Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics**, verify proper placarding procedures are followed and consistently completed at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

¹¹ A placard is a large sign or card attached to various types of mail transport equipment that provides internal information about the content, mail processing operation, or dispatch of the mail.

¹² *Surface Visibility User Scanning SOP*, updated November 18, 2025.

Postal Service Response

The Postal Service agreed with this finding and associated recommendations. Regarding recommendation 3, management stated that it will train designated employees on scanning procedures and monitor compliance. The target implementation date for recommendation 3 is March 31, 2027. Regarding recommendation 4, management stated that it will conduct reviews to verify that proper placarding procedures are followed. The target implementation date for recommendation 4 is October 31, 2026.

OIG Evaluation

The OIG considers management's comments responsive to the recommendations, and corrective actions should resolve the issues identified.

Finding #3: Scanner Accountability

What We Found

We identified 30 out of 113 (26.5 percent) Surface Visibility (SV) scanners¹³ and 41 out of 115 (35.7 percent) PVS scanners assigned to the Detroit P&DC in the Ethos system¹⁴ that had not been used since before February 4, 2026. Management could not find any of these scanners during our visit.

Why Did it Occur

The scanner accountability issues were primarily caused by a lack of internal controls and a lack of management oversight. For example, not all scanners were uniquely numbered in the Ethos system to enable accurate tracking. In addition, management was not familiar with the scanner accountability play book¹⁵ and had not conducted a baseline or monthly inventory.

Prior to our visit, SV and PVS scanners were not always adequately secured and accounted for. Specifically, SV scanners were stored in the general clerk office without adequate security measures. Employees were expected to sign out scanners. However, due to occasional absences of staff in the clerk office, employees sometimes took scanners without signing them out. Plant management had recently moved the SV scanners to the registry cage to ensure security. Management informed us that employees are now required to check out and return scanners daily, with access denied the following day if scanners were not returned. Additionally, lost scanners resulted in management issuing a letter of demand to the employee who last checked out the scanner for the scanner replacement.

The PVS scanners used by drivers were stored at the VMF, where drivers report to and receive their vehicles. Logistics management stated that there were no sign-in or sign-out procedures for the PVS

scanners about a month prior to our audit. However, management implemented sign-out procedures within the past month, which we verified during our audit.

What Should Have Happened

Postal Service policy states that scanners should be numbered in Ethos the same way they are numbered on the workroom floor for easy identification.¹⁶ Policy also states that management is responsible for scanner accountability, including keeping scanners secure, maintaining a process for checking scanners in and out, and conducting a monthly audit of the physical scanner inventory.¹⁷ If a scanner becomes lost, site management is responsible for retrieving the scanner from the last signed-in user, or to retrieve it, if lost to another site.¹⁸

Effect on the Postal Service and Its Customers

Lack of controls and oversight of scanner accountability could lead to lost or stolen scanners. We consider the 71 scanners that have not been used for over three months and could not be found as questioned costs¹⁹ of \$40,825. In addition, a lack of scanner accountability could impact scanning compliance. If there are not enough scanners for employees to perform load and unload scans, especially during peak dispatch hours, it could contribute to inaccurate trip utilization data, missent mail, and operational inefficiencies.

Recommendation #5:

We recommend the **Lakeshores Division Director, Processing Operations**, and the **Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics**, take measurable actions to retrieve all lost scanners at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

¹³ Scanners enable facilities to scan trays, tubs, and sacks of mail into containers and onto trailers and to track the mail across the surface network via wi-fi.

¹⁴ Ethos is a collection of applications that help track deployments, surveys, and other field communications for the deployment of major equipment programs.

¹⁵ The scanner accountability play book contains guidelines issued August 2025 for the inventory, accountability, and repair/replacement of the scanners.

¹⁶ *SV & PVS Scanner and Ethos FAQ*, updated June 2025.

¹⁷ *National Performance Initiative Playbook: SV Scanner Accountability*, August 2025.

¹⁸ *Surface Visibility Lost Scanner Recovery Quick Reference Guide*, updated May 21, 2025.

¹⁹ A questioned cost is a type of cost that the OIG believes is unnecessary, unreasonable, or an alleged violation of law, regulation, or contract. To calculate the value of the lost scanners, we multiplied the 71 scanners by the Postal Service's assigned value of \$575 per scanner.

Recommendation #6:

We recommend the **Lakeshores Division Director, Processing Operations**, and the **Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics**, conduct a baseline scanner inventory that includes properly numbering scanners in the Ethos system; and conduct monthly audits of scanners at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Postal Service Response

The Postal Service agreed with this finding and associated recommendations. Regarding recommendation 5, management stated that it will attempt to retrieve missing scanners and update the inventory to reflect only scanners on hand. The target implementation date for recommendation 5 is August 31, 2026. Regarding recommendation 6, management stated that it will reiterate scanner accountability policies and that scanner log compliance will be monitored. The target implementation date for recommendation 6 is October 31, 2026.

OIG Evaluation

The OIG considers management's comments responsive to the recommendations, and corrective actions should resolve the issues identified. During this audit, management provided evidence that it attempted to retrieve missing scanners. Based on the actions taken, we will close recommendation 5 upon issuance of the final report. To close recommendation 6, management will need to provide documentation showing that it has updated the scanner inventory list and provide support showing that it is monitoring scanner inventory monthly.

Finding #4: Safety and Security

What We Found

During our site observations, we observed two safety issues. Specifically, we observed 13 out of 22 trucks and trailers parked at the docks without wheel chocks placed next to the tire to prevent them from

rolling away (see Figure 1). We also found that fire extinguishers were missing their annual inspections. Many fire extinguishers did not have an annual inspection tag, and the ones that did have a tag were last inspected in 2023 (see Figure 2).

Figure 1. Trailers Without Wheel Chocks



Source: OIG photos taken on May 5, 2026.

Figure 2. Fire Extinguishers With Expired Inspection and No Annual Inspection Tag



Source: OIG photos taken May 5-6, 2026.

Why Did It Occur

The inconsistent use of wheel chocks and missing annual fire extinguisher inspections were due to lack of management oversight. Management was not adequately enforcing or monitoring the use of wheel chocks. Specifically, the logistics manager had only been at the plant for five months at the time of our visit, and he relied on the supervisors to monitor and enforce the use of wheel chocks. The maintenance manager stated that he was unaware that the annual inspections were incomplete because he was verifying only that the monthly inspections had been done.

What Should Have Happened

Postal Service policy²⁰ states that drivers must prevent trailers from rolling away from docks by using wheel chocks. In addition, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requires employers to provide a safe and healthy workplace free of recognized hazards.²¹ Further, OSHA requires portable fire extinguishers to undergo an annual maintenance review.²²

Effect on the Postal Service and Its Customers

When employees do not observe safe working practices and safety rules, there is an increased risk of employee accidents and injuries.

Recommendation #7:

We recommend the **Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics**, verify that management at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center monitors and enforces the use of wheel chocks on trucks and trailers.

Recommendation #8:

We recommend the **Lakeshores Division Director, Processing Operations**, verify that fire extinguishers are inspected annually at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Postal Service Response

The Postal Service agreed with this finding and associated recommendations. Regarding recommendation 7, management stated that it will train PVS and HCR drivers on wheel chock safety and monitor compliance. Regarding recommendation 8, management stated that annual fire extinguisher inspections have been completed. The target implementation date for recommendations 7 and 8 is July 31, 2026.

OIG Evaluation

The OIG considers management's comments responsive to recommendations 7 and 8. During this audit, management provided documentation showing that it is monitoring and enforcing wheel chock usage. In addition, management provided documentation showing that it completed annual fire extinguisher inspections. Based on the actions taken, we will close recommendations 7 and 8 upon issuance of the final report.

20 Handbook EL-803, *Maintenance Employee's Guide to Safety*, Section 1, subsection C, dated July 2020.

21 OSHA Act of 1970 and Handbook EL-801, *Supervisor's Safety Handbook*, dated July 2020.

22 Occupational Safety and Health Administration, *Fire Protection*, Sections 1910.157(E)(3).

Appendix A: Additional Information

We conducted this audit from April through July 2026, in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards and included such tests of internal controls as we considered necessary under the circumstances. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We discussed our observations and conclusions with management on June 25, 2026, and included its comments where appropriate.

In planning and conducting the audit, we obtained an understanding of the mail processing operations internal control structure to help determine the nature, timing, and extent of our audit procedures. We reviewed the management controls for overseeing the program and mitigating associated risks. Additionally, we assessed the internal control components and underlying principles, and we determined that the following four components were significant to our audit objective:

- Control Environment
- Control Activities
- Information and Communication
- Monitoring

We developed audit work to ensure that we assessed these controls. Based on the work performed, we identified internal control deficiencies related to control environment, control activities, information and communication, and monitoring that were significant within the context of our objective. Our recommendations, if implemented, should correct the weaknesses we identified.

We assessed the reliability of SVWeb and Ethos data by reviewing existing information, observing operations, and interviewing Postal Service officials knowledgeable about the data. We determined that the data were sufficiently reliable for the purposes of this report.

Appendix B: Management's Comments



June 26, 2026

SUBJECT: Management Response: Efficiency of Operations at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center, Detroit, MI (Audit 26-086)

Thank you for providing the Postal Service with an opportunity to review and comment on the findings and recommendations contained in the draft audit report, *Efficiency of Operations at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center, Detroit, MI*.

Management generally agrees with the findings in the report.

Finding #1: Late, Cancelled and Extra Outbound Trips
Finding #2: Scan Compliance
Finding #3: Scanner Accountability
Finding #4: Safety and Security

Management also agrees with monetary impact related to scanner accountability.

Following are our comments on each of the eight recommendations.

Recommendation 1:

We recommend the Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics Operations, analyze and adjust transportation schedules to ensure drivers arrive on time for mail pickups at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Management Response/Action Plan:

Management **agrees** with this recommendation. A plan exists to ensure drivers adherence to mail pick up schedules at the processing plant. Logistics supervisors will monitor for compliance to mail pick up schedules and provide confirmation to the logistics manager daily. Additionally, management conducted observations to determine root cause.

Target Implementation Date: 08/31/2026

Responsible Official:

Division Directors, Logistics Operations

Recommendation 2:

We recommend the Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics Operations, identify and remove unused trips from the Vehicle Information Transportation Analysis and Logistics system at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Management Response/Action Plan:

Management **agrees** with this recommendation. Management will review PVS trips in VITAL to confirm accuracy and eliminate legs that are no longer needed.

Target Implementation Date: 08/31/2026

Responsible Official: Division Director, Logistics Operations

Recommendation 3:

We recommend the Lakeshores Division Director, Processing Operations, coordinate with the Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics, to implement a plan to verify that load and unload scanning is completed in accordance with policy at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Management Response/Action Plan:

Management **agrees** with this recommendation. Management will provide scanning compliance training to responsible employees on proper scanning procedures and monitor for compliance.

Target Implementation Date: 03/31/2027

Responsible Official:

Division Director, Processing Operations

Recommendation 4:

We recommend the Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics, verify proper placarding procedures are followed and consistently completed at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Management Response/Action Plan:

Management **agrees** with this recommendation. Management will conduct reviews to verify proper placarding procedures are followed.

Target Implementation Date: 10/31/2026

Responsible Official:

Division Director, Logistics Operations

Recommendation 5:

We recommend the Lakeshores Division Director, Processing Operations, and the Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics, take measurable actions to retrieve all lost scanners at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Management Response/Action Plan:

Management **agrees** with this recommendation. Management will attempt to retrieve missing scanners and update the inventory to reflect only scanners on hand.

Target Implementation Date: 8/31/2026

Responsible Official:

Division Director, Processing Operations

Recommendation 6:

We recommend the Lakeshores Division Director, Processing Operations, and the Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics, conduct a baseline scanner inventory that includes properly numbering scanners in the Ethos system; and conduct monthly audits of scanners at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Management Response/Action Plan:

Management **agrees** with this recommendation. Management will reiterate requirements for maintaining scanner accountability and potential impacts for noncompliance. Scanner check-out and check-in logs will be required and monitored for compliance.

Target Implementation Date: 10/31/2026

Responsible Official:

Division Director, Processing Operations

Recommendation 7:

We recommend the Lakeshores Division Director, Logistics, verify that management at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center monitors and enforces the use of wheel chocks on trucks and trailers.

Management Response/Action Plan:

Management **agrees** with this recommendation. Management will provide wheel chock safety training to PVS and HCR drivers and monitor for compliance. Management requests closure of this recommendation with issuance of the final report.

Target Implementation Date: 7/31/2026

Responsible Official:

Division Director, Logistics Operations

Recommendation 8:

We recommend the Lakeshores Division Director, Processing Operations, verify that fire extinguishers are inspected annually at the Detroit Processing and Distribution Center.

Management Response/Action Plan:

Management **agrees** with this recommendation. Annual fire extinguisher inspections have been completed. Management requests closure of this recommendation with issuance of the final report.

Target Implementation Date: 07/31/2026

Responsible Official:

Division Directors, Processing and Logistics

Sincerely,

E-SIGNED by MARK E WILSON
on 2026-06-29 11:19:05 EDT

Mark Wilson
Division Director, Processing Operations

E-SIGNED by JASON L MCCURRY
on 2026-06-29 10:20:58 EDT

Jason McCurry
Division Director, Logistics

cc: Corporate Audit & Response Management

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE



Contact us via our [Hotline](#) and [FOIA](#) forms. Follow us on social networks. Stay informed.

1735 North Lynn Street, Arlington, VA 22209-2020
(703) 248-2100

For media inquiries, please email press@uspsig.gov or call (703) 248-2100