

November 30, 2009

Clerks Office
824 N. Market Street, 3rd Floor
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

RE: Case No. 09-12074 (KJC)

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is in response to the proposed reorganization plan and my concerns how it addresses both former and current employees who participated in both the SERP and Deferred Compensation Plans.

My name is Joseph J. Zuendel and I am a current employee of BMHC. I am one of the original business unit managers who helped form the company and am currently the manager of material distribution for northern California. I have been included as participant in the Supplemental Employee Retirement Plan for the past 15 years. The SERP plan was always presented to the employee as a form of compensation. I too was extremely disappointed when the latest disclosure statement reduced the recovery rate of my earned compensation to 12.1% without opportunity for any additional recovery in the future.

The recent passing of HR-3458 was unanticipated when the final disclosure statement was drafted and would most likely have changed the recovery rate of unsecured creditors. It would be extremely unfair to just turn over a multi million dollar tax refund windfall to the lenders without considering other creditors. I too agree with letters submitted by William H. Milligan and Steven H. Pearson (filed documents #971 and #985 – attached). I have spoke with coworkers who are current SERP participants and they also are in complete agreement.

In light of the new financial circumstances I am asking the Judge to intervene and make a fair and equitable decision.

Sincerely,



Joseph J. Zuendel
2619 Bertella Rd.
Cameron Park, Ca. 95682

0111 2009
NOV 30 2 54 PM '09

November 17, 2009

Clerks Office
824 N. Market Street, 3rd Floor
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

RE: Case No. 09-12074 (KJC)

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is William H. Milligan and I am a senior concerned about my future. I read the new Disclosure Statement that awards unsecured creditors like me approximately 12.1% of what was originally due to me. You can imagine my shock to learn that my "recovery rate" was now being reduced from 55.2% indicated in the Debtor's original Disclosure Statement from June, 2009. I had been employed with SelectBuild-BMHC for over 20 ½ years. My employment was terminated on February 19, 2009 about three months shy of my 60th birthday.

I am writing this letter to you (the Judge overseeing Case No. 09-12074) to voice **my disagreement with the recovery amount for class 6C claims** in new the Disclosure Statement for the Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors that was recently approved. At this point I have no choice but to accept the plan because I am terrified that if I do not accept this plan, I will get nothing. The law may indicate that what is being done is perfectly legal including the treatment of the unsecured class, but in my view, it doesn't make it right.

I am asking the Judge in this case (No. 09-12074) to intervene and make things right or least a bit more equitable and fair.

Through my research of the Disclosure Statement, the Plan, and previous 10K filings, I am almost certain that the one party not being too "harmed" by this case is the Lender Group. Not only did this group make a ton of money from fees associated with covenant defaults and debt restructuring, but it also received approximately \$50 Million of the \$56 Million tax refund it obtained from the amendment of previous years tax returns just 2 months before the Company filed a petition for Bankruptcy. While the Lender group may be at risk with the Company, most of the amount at risk is secured. And now, with President Obama signing into law "HR-3458 "Worker, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act of 2009"", the Company will be able to amend the tax returns for an additional two years that could generate a tax refund of up to an additional \$40 Million most of which will likely go towards the Lender Group. **Couldn't some of this money go towards improving the recovery rate to unsecured creditors? I think it can and I think it should.**

I have served my country honorably in my younger years and worked the balance of my years in construction until this past year. I always believed that the purpose of a Bankruptcy proceeding was to "freeze" things for the Company so that it could work with BOTH secured and unsecured creditors on a plan to move forward while coming to terms on the past. From an unsecured creditor perspective, where have we come to terms? How have we come to terms?

I am requesting, on behalf of myself and all of my fellow unsecured creditors, that the Judge in this case "balance the scales of justice" and intervene to ensure that the unsecured creditors, and in particular class 6C, is helped in terms of improving our recovery rate, and at the very least, consider the impending tax refund that will be forthcoming to the Debtors. You see, as I mentioned earlier, most of us understand the Disclosure Statement but we feel like there is a "gun to head" because, at my age, I need every bit of income I can get.

I am also asking that if any of my fellow unsecured creditors think the same as I do that they let themselves be heard from by writing similar letters to the Judge.

Sincerely,

William H. Milligan
3300 Tea Rose Drive
El Dorado Hills, CA. 95762

cc: Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
200 Park Ave
New York, New York 10166
Attn: Michael A. Rosenthal and Matthew K. Kelsey

ArentFox LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Attn: Christopher J. Giarmo and Katie A. Lane

Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP
55 Second Street 24th Floor
San Francisco, CA. 94105
Attn: Kevin Fisher and Seth Mennillo

Richards, Layton & Finger
One Rodney Square
920 North King Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
Attn: Paul N. Heath

United States Trustee for the District of Delaware
844 King Street, Suite 2207
Lockbox #35
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
Attn: Joseph J. McMahon

Clerk's Office
824 N. Market Street, 3rd Floor
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

November 20, 2009

Re: Case No. 09-12074 (KJC)

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Steven H. Pearson and I am writing to encourage the Judge in the above named case to review the letter of William H. Milligan dated 11-17-2009 (filed document #971-attached). It also represents the views of me, and I believe, the current, retired and terminated employees whose deferred compensation and retirement assets were affected negatively to a significant degree by the BMHC bankruptcy.

I believe that the recent passing of HR-3458 will provide the lenders with a substantial tax refund windfall that was unanticipated when they approved the proposed payments to the unsecured creditors in the final disclosure statement. As such the unsecured creditors should also benefit from this substantial tax refund that would help make the treatment of unsecured creditors more equitable and still provide the lenders and the company with a significant reduction in outstanding debt.

Many affected employees are reluctant to write a similar plea for fear that there might be adverse consequences including not receiving what little has been offered in the disclosure statement (12.1% of unsecured debt). Increasing the amount available to unsecured creditors would be fair and appropriate given the new money available. It would also have a positive impact on the employees that the company needs to retain to be successful as well as to the terminated or retired employees who have no other means to recoup the significant losses to their retirement account and other deferred savings.

In closing I would like to strongly urge the Judge to request that the lenders in this case substantially increase the funds available to unsecured creditors in light of the major positive change to the debt structure as a result of the pending large tax refund.

Sincerely,



Steven H. Pearson
1321 E. Bræmner Rd.
Boise, Idaho 83702

FILED
2009 NOV 23 AM 11:25