

BEFORE THE  
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

EXPERIMENTAL PERIODICALS  
CO-PALLETIZATION DROPSHIP DISCOUNTS FOR  
HIGH EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, 2004

Docket No. MC2004-1

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE ERRATUM  
TO ITS RESPONSE TO AMERICAN BUSINESS MEDIA'S  
MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSES TO  
INTERROGATORIES ABM/USPS-T1-11 AND 13

The United States Postal Service hereby files an erratum to its response to American Business Media's motion to compel responses to interrogatories ABM/USPS-T1-11 and ABM/USPS-T1-13. The title of the Postal Service's response, filed yesterday, inadvertently referred to interrogatory ABM/USPS-T11-13, instead of ABM/USPS-T1-13. A corrected first page for the Postal Service's response is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Daniel J. Foucheaux, Jr.  
Chief Counsel, Ratemaking

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David H. Rubin  
Attorney

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137  
(202) 268-2986; Fax -6187  
April 9, 2004

BEFORE THE  
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

EXPERIMENTAL PERIODICALS  
CO-PALLETIZATION DROPSHIP  
DISCOUNTS FOR HIGH EDITORIAL  
PUBLICATIONS, 2004

Docket No. MC2004-1

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
TO MOTION OF AMERICAN BUSINESS MEDIA TO COMPEL RESPONSES  
TO INTERROGATORIES ABM/USPS-T1-11 and ABM/USPS-T1-13  
(April 8, 2004)

Pursuant to Rule 26(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, the United States Postal Service hereby responds to American Business Media's (ABM's) motion to compel responses to interrogatories ABM/USPS-T1-11 and ABM/USPS-T1-13, filed April 1, 2004 (Motion). Interrogatory ABM/USPS-T1-11 asks for the identity of the one printer/consolidator who provided the data for AP 9 in the first co-palletization data collection report provided under Docket No. MC2002-3. Interrogatory ABM/USPS-T1-13 asks for the identity of all printers/consolidators who were participating in the existing co-palletization program as of the end of FY 2003, and the identity of all printers/consolidators who are participating now.

The Postal Service objected on the basis of relevance and confidentiality. In its Motion to Compel, ABM argued that any claim of confidentiality should come from the mailer, rather than the Postal Service. While the Postal Service does not agree as a

Revised April 9, 2004