



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 26, 2014

Mr. Jeffrey W. Giles
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2014-17139

Dear Mr. Giles:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 535926 (City GC No. 21509).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for four categories of information pertaining to the "city's use of the Chapter 380 economic development tool." You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of the following third parties: Ainbinder Heights, L.L.C.; Almeda Mall, L.P.; Center Point Hotels; CH2M Hill, Inc.; Costco Wholesale, Inc.; Dynamo Stadium, L.L.C.; EastGroup Properties; Energy Corridor Management District; The Finger Companies; Halliburton Company; HEB Grocery Company, L.P. ("HEB"); Houston Baptist University; InTown Homes; J.M. Mullis, Inc.; Kroger Company ("Kroger"); The Menil Collection; Municipal Utility District No. 390; Product Marketing International, Inc.; Schlumberger Technology Corporation ("Schlumberger"); Texas Land and Cattle II, Ltd. ("TLC"); and Westchase Community Development District. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain

circumstances). We have received comments from HEB, Kroger, Schlumberger, and TLC. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, HEB and TLC argue portions of the submitted information are not responsive to the request for information. A governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to information that is within its possession or control. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990). In this instance, the city has reviewed its records and determined the documents it has submitted are responsive to the request. Thus, we find the city has made a good-faith effort to relate the request to information within its possession or control. Accordingly, we find the information at issue is responsive to the request and will determine whether the city must release the information at issue to the requestor under the Act.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received comments from HEB, Kroger, Schlumberger, and TLC. We have not received comments from any of the remaining third parties. Thus, the remaining third parties have failed to demonstrate they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in the information.

HEB, Kroger, and the city assert portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 321.3022 of the Tax Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses section 321.3022 of the Tax Code, which provides in part:

(a-1) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the [Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts (the "comptroller")] on request shall provide to a municipality or other local governmental entity that has adopted a tax under [chapter 321 of the Tax Code]:

(1) information relating to the amount of tax paid to the municipality or other local governmental entity under [chapter 321 of the Tax Code] during the preceding or current calendar year by each person doing business in the municipality or other local governmental entity

who annually remits to the comptroller state and local sales tax payments of more than \$5,000; and

(2) any other information as provided by this section.

...

(f) Information received by a municipality or other local governmental entity under this section is confidential, is not open to public inspection, and may be used only for the purpose of economic forecasting, for internal auditing of a tax paid to the municipality or other local governmental entity under [chapter 321 of the Tax Code], or for the purpose described in Subsection (g).

(g) Information received by a municipality or other local governmental entity under Subsection (b) may be used by the municipality or other local governmental entity to assist in determining revenue sharing under a revenue sharing agreement or other similar agreement.

Tax Code § 321.3022(a-1), (f), (g). HEB, Kroger, and the city state the submitted information contains sales tax information the city received from the comptroller pursuant to section 321.3022(a-1). HEB, Kroger, and the city also seek to withhold information which HEB, Kroger, and the city state is derived from the information received from the comptroller. We have no indication the information at issue is being sought for economic forecasting, to conduct an internal audit, or on behalf of the city to determine revenue sharing under a revenue sharing agreement. Based on the submitted representations and our review, we find the information we have marked is confidential under section 321.3022(f) of the Tax Code, and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ However, HEB and the city have failed to demonstrate the city received the remaining information at issue from the comptroller pursuant to section 321.3022(a-1). Consequently, the remaining information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 321.3022(f) of the Tax Code.

HEB raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 151.027 of the Tax Code for portions of its information. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 151.027 of the Tax Code. Section 151.027(a) provides confidentiality for information collected under the Limited Sales, Excise, and Use Tax Act. Section 151.027(b) provides for the confidentiality of information obtained during the course of an examination of a taxpayer's books. *See id.* § 151.027. Section 151.027 only applies to information furnished to and reviewed by the comptroller during its investigation of a taxpayer. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 520 (1989) (section 151.027 of the Tax Code

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address Kroger's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

applies only to records and information in the comptroller's custody and not to information in another governmental body's possession). Therefore, section 151.027 applies only to the comptroller, not the city. See Tax Code § 151.027; ORD 520. In this instance, the information at issue is not in the custody of the comptroller. Thus, we find the information at issue is not subject to section 151.027. Consequently, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 on such basis.

HEB asserts the submitted W-9 forms are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms), 226 (1979) (W-2 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term "return information" as "a taxpayer's identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Internal Revenue Service] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]" See 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term "return information" expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer's liability under title 26 of the United States Code. See *Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff'd in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). However, W-9 tax forms are requests for taxpayer identification numbers and do not fall within the definition of "tax return information." Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted W-9 tax forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.

Schlumberger raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for portions of its submitted information. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. We note an individual's name, education, prior employment, and personal information are not ordinarily private information subject to common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 554 (1990), 448 (1986). Upon review, we find none of the submitted information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the information at issue is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Schlumberger also raises section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand Schlumberger to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As previously mentioned, common-law privacy protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert*’s interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. See *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the comptroller. See *id.* at 348. Upon review, we find none of the submitted information at issue is subject to section 552.102(a); therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue on that basis.

HEB, Schlumberger, and TLC claim some of their information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. See Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

HEB asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find HEB failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find HEB has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information at issue. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, none of HEB's information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

²The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

HEB, Schlumberger, and TLC claim portions of their information consists of commercial or financial information that, if released, would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find TLC has demonstrated portions of its information constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find TLC has not demonstrated that the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. In addition, we find HEB and Schlumberger have failed to demonstrate the release of any of their information at issue would cause them substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because bid specifications and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982). Therefore, we find none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual

data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

Further, section 552.111 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 563 at 5-6 (1990) (private entity engaged in joint project with governmental body may be regarded as its consultant), 561 at 9 (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561 at 9.

You assert a portion of the submitted information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to city policymaking. You state the information at issue consists of communications between city officials, employees, and outside parties with whom the city shares a privity of interest regarding specified economic development agreements. Upon review, we find you have failed to establish that any portion of the information at issue constitutes advice, opinions, recommendations, or other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the city. Accordingly, you may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

TLC also raises section 552.131 of the Government Code. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides, in part, the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

Gov't Code § 552.131(a). Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only "trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect" and "commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained." *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Because we have already disposed of TLC's claims under section 552.110, the city may not withhold any of TLC's remaining information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the account and bank routing numbers, a representative sample of which we have marked, under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 321.3022(f) of the Tax Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the account and bank routing numbers, a representative sample of which we have marked, under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/dls

Ref: ID# 535926

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Clark Martinson
General Manager
The Energy Corridor Management
District
14701 St. Mary's Lane, Suite 290
Houston, Texas 77079
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brent Wood
Senior Vice President
EastGroup Properties
4220 World Houston Parkway, Suite 170
Houston, Texas 77032
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Barton L. Duckworth
President
Ainbinder Heights, LLC
2415 West Alabama, Suite 205
Houston, Texas 77098
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Guillory
President
Center Point Hotels
4702 La Branch Street
Houston, Texas 77004
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Stratus
Vice President and Counsel
Costco Wholesale, Inc.
999 Lake Drive
Issaquah, Washington 98027
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph M. Schwartz
Attorney for Municipal Utility
District No. 390
1300 Post Oak Boulevard, Suite 1400
Houston, Texas 77056
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marvy A. Finger
President
The Finger Companies
99 Detering, Suite 200
Houston, Texas 77007
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Hastings
Transaction Tax Manager
Schlumberger Technology Corp.
100 Gillingham, Room 104
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Dragoo
Houston Baptist University
7502 Fondren Road
Houston, Texas 77074
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lori Fixley Winland
Attorney for Kroger Texas, L.P.
Locke Lord, LLP
600 Congress, Suite 2200
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Woody Kemp
Halliburton Company
3600 Lincoln Plaza
500 North Akard Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ted Fikre
Chief Officer
Dynamo Stadium, LLC c/o AEG
Suite 305
800 West Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90015
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Bauer-Martinez
Vice President & Director of Tax
CH2M Hill Inc.
14701 St. Mary's Lane
Houston, Texas 77079
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sheryl Kolasinski
Chief Operating Officer
The Menil Collection
1511 Branard Street
Houston, Texas 77006
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Frank Liu
President
InTown Homes
1520 Oliver Street
Houston, Texas 77007
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Mullis
President & CEO
J.M. Mullis, Inc.
3753 Tynedale Drive
Memphis, Tennessee 38125
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Irma Sanchez
Vice President
Westchase Community Development
District
10375 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1175
Houston, Texas 77042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stephen M. Robinson
Attorney for Texas Land and Cattle II,
Ltd.
Allen Boone Humphries Robinson, LLP
3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2600
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Nip
Product Marketing International,
Inc.
Suite B33
11205 Bellaire Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77072
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stephen C. Mount
Corporate Law Compliance
HEB Grocery Company, LP
P.O. Box 839999
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3999
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wayne C. Fox
Almeda Mall, LP
1177 West Loop South, Suite 1670
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)