

BEFORE THE
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20268-0001

COMPLAINT OF GAMEFLY, INC.)
) Docket No. C2009-1
)

RESPONSE OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO DISCOVERY REQUEST OF GAMEFLY, INC.
(GFL/USPS-216)
(November 10, 2009)

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 27 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and
Procedure, the Postal Service hereby provides its responses to discovery
request GFL/USPS-216 of GameFly, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:
Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr.
Chief Counsel, Pricing and Product
Support

Jacob Howley
Keith E. Weidner

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, DC 20260-1137
(202) 268-6252, Fax -6187

RESPONSE OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
TO DISCOVERY REQUEST OF GAMEFLY INC.

GFL/USPS-216. Please refer to your response to GFL/USPS-97(b) where it states, “[t]he Postal Service has not denied access to automation or machinable letter prices to any companies with two-way mailers that are substantially similar in design to Netflix’s mailpieces as a result of the mailing standards change referenced in response to (a) above.”

(a) Please list all companies that have requested approval to mail two-way mailers that are substantially similar in design to Netflix’s mailpieces at automation or machinable letter prices (for both the outbound and return legs) since the change in mailer standard referenced in your response to GFL/USPS-97(a).

(b) For each company listed in response to subpart (a), please state what determination was made by Postal Service Engineering made as to the machinability of the two-way mailer when used in return mailings.

(c) For each company whose two-way mailer was determined to be nonmachinable on the return leg by USPS Engineering, please explain why the Postal Service believes that the company was not denied access to automation or machinable letter prices for the two-way mailer. Specifically, please address whether (i) the mailer design was ever used by the company; and (ii) the determination of USPS Engineering was overruled.

RESPONSE:

(a) Not applicable. No companies requested such approval since the date of the mailing standards change in question (August 14, 2008).

(b) Not applicable. See response to (a).

(c) Not applicable. See response to (a).