

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

In re:	)	
	)	Chapter 11
	)	
BUILDING MATERIALS HOLDING CORPORATION, <i>et al.</i>,¹	)	Case No. 09-12074 (KJC)
	)	
Debtors.	)	Jointly Administered
	)	

**AMENDED² NOTICE OF AGENDA OF MATTERS SCHEDULED
FOR HEARING ON OCTOBER 22, 2009 AT 2:00 P.M. (ET)³**

MATTERS GOING FORWARD

1. Debtors' Motion for an Order Pursuant to Section 363(b) of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 6004 Approving Commitment Letter and Related Fee Letter By and Between Building Materials Holding Corporation and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. [D.I. 684, 10/2/09]

Response Deadline: October 15, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. (ET)

Responses Received: None.

Related Documents:

- A. Notice of Filing of Fully Executed Commitment Letter and Fee Letter [D.I. 742, 10/14/09]
- B. Certificate of No Objection [D.I. 753, 10/20/09]
- C. Notice of Withdrawal of Certificate of No Objection [D.I. 754, 10/20/09]

Status: This matter will be going forward.

¹ The Debtors, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's tax identification number, are as follows: Building Materials Holding Corporation (4269), BMC West Corporation (0454), SelectBuild Construction, Inc. (1340), SelectBuild Northern California, Inc. (7579), Illinois Framing, Inc. (4451), C Construction, Inc. (8206), TWF Construction, Inc. (3334), H.N.R. Framing Systems, Inc. (4329), SelectBuild Southern California, Inc. (9378), SelectBuild Nevada, Inc. (8912), SelectBuild Arizona, LLC (0036), and SelectBuild Illinois, LLC (0792). The mailing address for the Debtors is 720 Park Boulevard, Suite 200, Boise, Idaho 83712.

² New matter indicated in bold.

³ Those parties wishing to participate telephonically must make arrangements with CourtCall by telephone at 888-882-6878 or on the internet at www.courtcall.com no later than 12:00 p.m. (ET) on October 21, 2009.

2. Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 6, 2009 [D.I. 713, 10/6/09]

Response Deadline: July 22, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. (ET); Extended to July 27, 2009 at 11:00 a.m. (ET) for ACE Insurance Company, to September 9, 2009 for the Securities and Exchange Commission, to October 5, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. (ET) for the United States Trustee, and to October 19, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. (ET) for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors

Responses Received:

- A. Response of Vincent E. Rhynes [D.I. 253, 7/17/09]
- B. Response of William H. Milligan [D.I. 257, 7/20/09]
- C. Response of Dixon Big-O-Tires [D.I. 258, 7/20/09]
- D. Response of Steven H. Pearson [D.I. 302, 7/24/09]
- E. Response of Martin Uriarte [D.I. 307, 7/27/09]
- F. Objection of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors to the Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended July 27, 2009 [D.I. 564, 9/4/09]
- G. Objection of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors to the Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 1, 2009 [D.I. 692, 10/5/09]
- H. Maricopa County's Objection to Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended July 27, 2009 [D.I. 746, 10/15/09]

Related Documents:

- I. Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code [D.I. 19, 6/16/09]
- J. Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended July 27, 2009 [D.I. 316, 7/27/09]

- K. Blackline of Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended July 27, 2009 [D.I. 317, 7/27/09]
- L. Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 1, 2009 [D.I. 678, 10/1/09]
- M. Blackline of Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 1, 2009 [D.I. 680, 10/1/09]
- N. Blackline of Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 6, 2009 [D.I. 714, 10/6/09]
- O. Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code [D.I. 18, 6/16/09]
- P. Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended July 27, 2009 [D.I. 314, 7/27/09]
- Q. Blackline of Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended July 27, 2009 [D.I. 315, 7/27/09]
- R. Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 1, 2009 [D.I. 677, 10/1/09]
- S. Blackline of Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 1, 2009 [D.I. 679, 10/1/09]
- T. Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 6, 2009 [D.I. 711, 10/6/09]
- U. Blackline of Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 6, 2009 [D.I. 712, 10/6/09]
- V. Notice of Hearing to Consider Approval of the Disclosure Statement for Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors [D.I. 120, 6/30/09]
- W. Scheduling Order [D.I. 735, 10/9/09]
- X. Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 21, 2009 [D.I. 762, 10/22/09]**

- Y. Blackline of Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 21, 2009 [D.I. 763, 10/22/09]**
- Z. Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 21, 2009 [D.I. 764, 10/22/09]**
- AA. Blackline of Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 21, 2009 [D.I. 765, 10/22/09]**

Status: This matter will be going forward. A chart identifying the nature and responses/status of all objections is annexed hereto.

- 3. Debtors' Motion for an Order (I) Approving the Disclosure Statement; (II) Establishing Procedures for Solicitation and Tabulation of Votes to Accept or Reject the Plan, Including (A) Approving the Form and Manner of Solicitation Procedures, (B) Approving the Form and Manner of Notice of the Confirmation Hearing, (C) Establishing a Record Date and Approving Procedures for Distribution of Solicitation Packages, (D) Approving Forms of Ballots, (E) Establishing the Deadline for Receipt of Ballots, and (F) Approving the Procedures for Vote Tabulations; (III) Establishing the Deadline and Procedures for Filing Objections to (A) Confirmation of the Plan and (B) Proposed Cure Amounts Related to Contracts and Leases Assumed Under the Plan; and (IV) Granting Related Relief [D.I. 172, 7/13/09]

Response Deadline: July 22, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. (ET); Extended to October 5, 2009 at 10:00 a.m. (ET) for the United States Trustee and to October 19, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. (ET) for the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors

Responses Received: None.


Related Documents:

- A. Notice of Filing of Revised Exhibits to Debtors' Motion for an Order (I) Approving the Disclosure Statement; (II) Establishing Procedures for Solicitation and Tabulation of Votes to Accept or Reject the Plan, Including (A) Approving the Form and Manner of Solicitation Procedures, (B) Approving the Form and Manner of Notice of the Confirmation Hearing, (C) Establishing a Record Date and Approving Procedures for Distribution of Solicitation Packages, (D) Approving Forms of Ballots, (E) Establishing the Deadline for Receipt of Ballots, and (F) Approving the Procedures for Vote Tabulations; (III) Establishing the Deadline and Procedures for Filing Objections to (A) Confirmation of the Plan and (B) Proposed Cure Amounts Related to Contracts and Leases Assumed Under the Plan; and (IV) Granting Related Relief [D.I. 681, 10/1/09]

Status: This matter will be going forward.

Dated: Wilmington, Delaware
October 22, 2009

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP



Sean M. Beach (No. 4070)
Donald J. Bowman, Jr. (No. 4383)
Robert F. Poppiti, Jr. (No. 5052)
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street, 17th Floor
P.O. Box 391
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-0391
Telephone: (302) 571-6600
Facsimile: (302) 571-1253

----and----

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
Michael A. Rosenthal (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Matthew K. Kelsey (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Saeed M. Muzumdar (admitted *pro hac vice*)
200 Park Avenue, 47th Floor
New York, New York 10166-0193
Telephone: (212) 351-4000
Facsimile: (212) 351-4035

Aaron G. York (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Jeremy L. Graves (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2100 McKinney Avenue, Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75201-6911
Telephone: (214) 698-3100
Facsimile: (214) 571-2900

ATTORNEYS FOR THE DEBTORS
AND DEBTORS-IN-POSSESSION

CHART OF OUTSTANDING OBJECTIONS TO DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

(UPDATED OCTOBER 20, 2009)

A. Objection to Debtor(s) Disclosure Statement for Joint Plan of Reorganization filed by Vincent Rhynes. (Docket No. 253)

Objection	Response
Mr. Rhynes objects to the Disclosure Statement "On the Grounds That the Debtor(s) Seek to Subordinate & Provide Less Favorable Treatment to Certain Register Holders & Beneficial Owners Of The Debtor(s) Existing Common Stock (1125-c)." [sic] He also objects "Against Any Subordination As Found Under Section 510(a) of The Bankruptcy Code." Finally, he objects to "Any Less Favorable Treatment. See Section 1123(a)(4) Of The Bankruptcy Code." Mr. Rhynes attached to the objection a copy of a BMHC Certificate of Stock in his name.	Mr. Rhynes's objection does not address the adequacy of the Disclosure Statement. Instead, it appears to object to the proposed cancellation of BMHC Equity Security Interests. If anything, the issues he raises should be addressed at confirmation of the plan. In that regard, the Debtors submit that the cancellation of the BMHC Equity Interests is mandated by the absolute priority rule.

B. Letter Dated July 15, 2009 from William Milligan (Docket No. 257)

Objection	Response
Mr. Milligan writes to voice his rejection of the Disclosure Statement. In sum, he states that he "would like Company along with Secured Creditors to restructure its plan to negotiate a guarantee payout of all employee related claims as part of the reorganization plan."	Mr. Milligan's letter does not address the adequacy of the Disclosure Statement. Instead, he requests that all employee-related claims be paid in full. If anything, the issues he raises should be addressed at confirmation of the plan. In that regard, the Debtors submit that the proposed treatment of General Unsecured Claims is appropriate in light of the Liquidation Analysis.

C. Letter Dated July 16, 2009 from Dixon Big-O-Tires (Docket No. 258)

Objection	Response
The Dixon Big-O-Tires letter states the owner's belief that the Debtors "should pay off their debt to my business so we can continue to service them during their reorganization."	Dixon Big-O-Tires' objection does not address the adequacy of the Disclosure Statement. Instead, it contends that the debt owed to them should be paid. If anything, the issues raised should be addressed at confirmation of the plan. In that regard, the Debtors submit that the proposed treatment of General Unsecured Creditors is appropriate in light of the Liquidation Analysis.

D. Letter Dated July 23, 2009 from Steven H. Pearson (Docket No. 302)

Objection	Response
Mr. Pearson's letter offers some suggestions with respect to treatment of the SERP and Deferred Compensation Plans.	Mr. Pearson's letter does not address the adequacy of the Disclosure Statement. Instead, it addresses "potential inequities of the current plan." If anything, such issues should be addressed at confirmation of the plan. In that regard, the assets of the SERP are available to all unsecured creditors and the Debtors submit that the proposed liquidation and distribution of those assets is appropriate.

E. Notice of Hearing to Consider Approval of the Disclosure Statement for Joint Plan of Reorganization For the Debtors, with Attached Arizona Registrar of Contractors Complaint Form for Licensed and Unlicensed Contractors, Filed by Martin Uriarte (Docket No. 307)

Objection	Response
Mr. Uriarte filed a copy of the Notice of Hearing to Consider Approval of the Disclosure Statement for Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors that the Debtors mailed, with an attached Arizona Registrar of Contractors Complaint Form for Licensed and Unlicensed Contractors (the "Complaint Form")	The Complaint Form seems to assert a claim for \$4,481. It asserts no objection to the Disclosure Statement and should be disregarded.

F. Objection of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors to the Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended July 27, 2009 (Docket No. 564)

Note: On October 13, 2009, counsel for the Committee provided to Debtors' counsel a list of forty-nine comments to the Disclosure Statement. Counsel for the Debtors has endeavored to revise the Disclosure Statement with respect to such comments and expect to file an amended version of the Disclosure Statement incorporating such revisions. The Debtors would expect that such revisions, coupled with the responses below, would resolve any objection the Committee may have to the Disclosure Statement.

Objectors' Objection	Response and/or Status
The Disclosure Statement states that the Reorganized Debtors will obtain exit financing from a Revolving Credit Agreement in the amount of \$100 million. However the description of the availability and uses of such funds is so complex and confusing as to be meaningless to the average creditor. See Disclosure Statement § I.B. 2 at p. 4. This section should be modified to make it easier for creditors voting on the Plan to understand this critical piece of information. Such language should also be consistent with the language found in Section VIII. B.I. (p. 62) of the Disclosure Statement. (§ 12)	In the Disclosure Statement filed on October 6, 2009, the Debtors revised this section to reflect the new parameters of the Exit Credit Facilities. In addition, as requested by the Committee, the Debtors clarified in this section that the Exit Credit Facilities shall be due and payable on the third anniversary of the Effective Date. The Debtors believe that the language in section I.B. is consistent with section VIII.B.I (although section I.B contains more detail as Article I of the Disclosure Statement is designed to be a summary of the most material aspects of the Disclosure Statement). In addition, the Debtors have added a chart to section I.B. of the Disclosure Statement showing sources and uses of cash.
The Disclosure Statement further provides that the Reorganized Debtors will enter into a Term Loan Credit Agreement of \$135 million that may be increased to as much as \$190 million, depending on the extent to which the Prepetition Letters of Credit are drawn upon. See Disclosure Statement § I.B.2 at p. 4 & § VIII.B.1-2. at p. 62. Nowhere does the Disclosure Statement describe the risks associated with this arrangement. Specifically, there is no discussion of the impact on the Debtors' ability to service its secured debt going forward and the resulting effect on cash flow (and thus the proposed 55.2% distribution proposed to the unsecureds) if the term notes increase to the full \$190 million. The	The Disclosure Statement states in section I.B.3 that "[t]he Debtors do not expect that there will be draws on the Prepetition Letters of Credit during these Chapter 11 Cases or after the Effective Date." As noted above, the Debtors have added a statement to section I.B. specifying that "[t]he outstanding amount of the Exit Credit Facilities shall be due and payable in full on the third anniversary of its effective date."

Disclosure Statement further fails to prominently display the relatively short three-year term of the exit revolver and the Debtors' need to refinance that debt upon its expiration in the near future. (§ 13)	
The Disclosure Statement further provides for a Liquidating Trust from which allowed claims of general unsecured creditors are to be paid. See Disclosure Statement § 1.B.4 at p. 5 & VIII.C. at pp. 64-66. The description of the Liquidating Trust and related treatment of unsecured claims suffers from numerous infirmities. . . . (§ 14)	Because the Plan no longer contains a Liquidating Trust, all discussion with respect to it has been eliminated from the Disclosure Statement.
A casual reading of the Disclosure Statement, at least the first two pages summarizing the Plan, could lead a creditor to believe that the Liquidating Trust is entitled to 20% of EBITDA after the initial \$50 million. . . . (§ 14(a))	Because the Plan no longer contains a Liquidating Trust, all discussion with respect to it has been eliminated from the Disclosure Statement.
It is likely that most creditors will not understand the concept of EBITDA. . . . (§ 14(b))	The Plan no longer contains potential payments to General Unsecured Creditors from EBITDA.
The reduction to the Unsecured Cash Fund in the event one or more subclasses votes against the Plan will undoubtedly confuse and alarm unsecured creditors. Yet, the Disclosure Statement does not explain why, if one or more subclasses rejects the Plan, the portion of the \$10 million attributable to that subclass does not remain available to the accepting subclasses, rather than, presumably, reverting to the Debtors' secured lenders (and then owners). If the Pre-Petition Lenders are requiring this term, as the Committee presumes they are, the Debtors should make that clear and why the Debtors believe it is appropriate. (§ 14(c))	The Unsecured Cash Fund is now \$5 million, subject to reduction if one or more subclasses votes against the Plan; provided, however, that the Plan and Disclosure Statement now contain language providing that Wells Fargo Bank may elect to waive the reduction of the consideration to rejecting classes if it does so prior to the Confirmation Hearing. The Unsecured Cash Fund will also be funded with any consideration received by the Debtors upon the sale of certain Life Insurance Policies to the extent such consideration exceeds the approximately \$16.3 million cash surrender value thereof, again subject to reduction if one or more subclasses votes against the Plan (and WFB does not elect otherwise). The Disclosure Statement now states in Article I: "As a condition of funding the Unsecured Cash Fund . . . the Prepetition Lenders are requiring that if a Class of General Unsecured Claims against a particular Debtor does not vote to accept the Plan, then the rejecting Class will

	receive no distribution under the Plan and the amount funded into the Unsecured Cash Fund will be reduced proportionately. Such treatment is appropriate based on the Liquidation Analysis which shows that Holders of General Unsecured Claims would receive no distribution in a hypothetical chapter 7 liquidation of the Debtors.”
The Disclosure Statement not only fails to provide adequate information, but the information that is provided is done so in an unnecessarily burdensome and confusing way. (¶ 15)	Article I of the Disclosure Statement is designed as a summary of the most material parts of the Disclosure Statement that could be read and understood without necessarily reading the rest of the Disclosure Statement. In addition, the revised Plan has a less complex structure from the perspective of General Unsecured Creditors than the previous version.
One example will more than illuminate this point. In the summary of Classes 2(a)-(I), the Funded Lender Claims, the Disclosure Statement includes the following <i>sentence</i>: Each Holder of an Allowed Funded Lender Claim shall, in full satisfaction, release and discharge of an in exchange for such Claim, receive (i) the Funded Lender’s Share of Sale Cash Collateral Excess Proceeds Account Effective Date Amount as to such Claim, (ii) a Term Note issued by the Reorganized BMHC under the Term Loan Credit Agreement in an original principal amount equal to the Maximum Funded Lenders Term Note Cap multiplied by such Holder’s Pro Rata share of all Allowed Funded Lender Claims, and (iii) its Pro Rata share of the Reorganized BMHC equity Interest Funded Lender Issuance, subject to dilution by (a) any Reorganized BMHC Equity Interests issued on the Effective Date and from time to time thereafter to the Holders of Allowed L/C Lender Claims and (b) any Reorganized BMHC Equity Interests issued after the Effective Date in respect of the Long Term Incentive Plan. (¶ 16)	The Debtors have added to Article I of the October 6 Disclosure Statement the following summary of the treatment of Funded Lender Claims: “The Holders of the Prepetition Funded Lender Claims in Classes 2(a)-(I), which are claims under the Debtors’ prepetition secured credit agreements in the amount of approximately \$302 million, shall receive a pro rata share of notes under a term loan credit agreement in the aggregate principal amount of \$135 million, less amounts such Holders receive from the sale of certain excess real estate. On the Effective Date, Reorganized BMHC will emerge from chapter 11 as a private company and 100% of the Reorganized BMHC Equity Interests shall be owned by the Holders of Prepetition Funded Lender Claims. This ownership interest is subject to dilution by up to 10% in connection with the Long Term Incentive Plan and by the Reorganized BMHC Equity Interests, if any, issued to the Holders of liquidated Allowed L/C Lender Claims (i.e., holders of any prepetition letters of credit that are drawn in the future).” At the request of the Committee, in the most current version of the Disclosure Statement, the above paragraph has been revised to add a clarifying clause specifying that the “Long

	Term Incentive Plan shall provide, as an incentive mechanism, for the allocation to management of the Reorganized Debtors of restricted stock units, stock options, and/or stock appreciation rights”.
In short, the Disclosure Statement’s significant reliance on defined terms is unnecessarily confusing and burdensome (¶ 18)	As noted above, the Debtors have added nearly all applicable revisions to the October 6 Disclosure Statement requested by the Committee in their September 3, 2009 mark-up and have added additional language to Article I to make that section a virtually stand-alone summary of the Disclosure Statement. In addition, in the most current version of the Disclosure Statement the Debtors have made substantial revisions in response to the Committee’s list of forty-nine comments provided on October 13, 2009.
Similarly, the summary of the treatment of Classes 3(a)-3(l), the L/C Lender Claims, is all but unreadable (except, presumably, to the L/C Lenders)—continuing for nearly two single-spaced pages with more than 25 defined terms from the Glossary and almost half a dozen dense and complex sentences that are 10 lines or more in length. (¶ 19)	Section I.B.3 of the Disclosure Statement contains this summary description of the treatment of Prepetition Letters of Credit: “More specifically, if the Prepetition L/C Lender funds a draw under a Prepetition Letter of Credit on or after the Petition Date, the Prepetition L/C Lender shall have an L/C Lender Claim. Each Holder of an L/C Lender Claim shall receive term notes issued under the Term Loan Credit Agreement based on a formula set forth in the Plan. If there are draws on the Prepetition Letters of Credit, this formula is designed to give the Prepetition L/C Lenders a distribution of term notes that is equivalent to the distribution that the Holders of Prepetition Funded Lender Claims receive on account of their claims. The formula is complex and takes into consideration a number of factors. Basically, the maximum amount of term notes that could be issued on account of L/C Lender Claims is approximately \$51 to 52 million and the percentage, if any, of these term notes that are actually issued would be equal to the ratio between Prepetition Letters of Credit that are drawn and all Prepetition Letters of Credit. Accordingly, for example, if 10% of the Prepetition Letters of Credit are drawn, roughly \$5.1 to \$5.2 million of

	additional term notes will be issued under the Term Loan Credit Agreement.”
Classes 5(a)-(l), the L/C General Unsecured Claims, are entirely undefined. The Disclosure Statement fails to provide what these general unsecured claims are or how and why they will be reinstated and paid in full. (§ 19)	Article I of the Disclosure Statement contains this summary description of Classes 5(a)-(l): “Holders of Unsecured Claims that are beneficiaries of Prepetition Letters of Credit, or that have claims against the Debtors that are covered by insurance or performance bonds that would entitle an insurer or surety to draw under a Prepetition Letter of Credit if the claim was not paid, are grouped in Classes 5(a)-(l). These claims shall be paid in full by the applicable Reorganized Debtors to avoid draws on the Prepetition Letters of Credit.”
[T]he Disclosure Statement describes a Plan that appears to afford these Classes [6(a)-6(l)] a “take it or leave it” alternative pursuant to which the creditors receive virtually nothing if they fail to vote in favor of the Plan. See Disclosure Statement § I.C. at pp. 9-16 (Treatment of Classes 6(a)-6(l)). The Disclosure Statement does not explain the reason for this unnecessarily punitive treatment toward the general unsecured creditors who have supported the company for years. This is particularly worrisome due to the harsh reality that, presumably, the Debtors can rely on the Pre-Petition Lenders as an impaired accepting class and thus do not need the general unsecured creditors to vote in favor of the Plan in order to achieve confirmation. Such harsh treatment will undoubtedly have a negative effect on general unsecured creditors, who are the true stakeholders in these cases, thus, explanation is essential.	As noted above, the Debtors have added language to Article I of the Disclosure Statement specifying that the Prepetition Lenders are requiring that if a class 6 class votes to reject the Plan, then the rejecting class will receive no distribution and that this is appropriate given that the Liquidation Analysis shows that General Unsecured Claims would receive no distribution in a chapter 7 liquidation. Unfortunately, only the Prepetition Lenders are the true stakeholders in these cases and any funds they contribute to General Unsecured Claims is a gift on their part. The Debtors have also added language to the Plan and Disclosure Statement providing that WFB as agent for the Prepetition Lenders can elect, prior to the Confirmation Hearing, to not reduce the consideration to rejecting classes.
In addition, the Disclosure Statement’s Feasibility Analysis provides misleading information because it is based almost entirely on projections, with absolutely no reference to the Debtors’ historical performance. See	As explained in the notes to the Feasibility Analysis, revenue is forecast to grow from \$693 million to \$1,830 million over the forecast period due to an anticipated recovery in single family home construction from

Disclosure Statement § XVII.B.2 at p. 90. This information is critical because the Debtors seek to solicit acceptances based on a proposed 55.2% distribution, the vast majority of which will allegedly come from future Cash Flow (¶ 21)	current historically low levels. Management's expectation for such a recovery is supported by its view that 2009 housing starts have fallen to roughly 30% of a more normalized run rate (calculated as an average of the last 15 years excluding the top three years in each market). Thus, the projections do have reference to historical performance as influenced by anticipated events.
It is also inappropriate to presume that the average creditor will even read a Feasibility Analysis contained solely in one of numerous exhibits, moreover, understand it. Because this information is absolutely critical to the proposed distribution (upon which creditors are being asked to vote), the feasibility should be clearly described within the Disclosure Statement itself. (¶ 22)	Distributions to General Unsecured Claims are no longer dependent on Company performance. Nonetheless, the Debtors have added the following to Article I of the October 6 Disclosure Statement: "The Feasibility Analysis and Projections indicate that the Reorganized Debtors will have sufficient cash flow to service and pay their debt obligations and to fund their operations. Under the Plan, the Reorganized Debtors will emerge from chapter 11 with approximately \$131 million of net debt ("Net Debt"), which is reduced to approximately \$62 million by December 2012 (end of projection period). The Reorganized Debtors will have approximately \$125 million of unrestricted balance sheet cash (excluding another \$9 million in restricted balance sheet cash) at December 2012. Accordingly, the Debtors believe that the Plan satisfies the feasibility requirement of section 1129(a)(11) of the Bankruptcy Code." In the most current version of the Disclosure Statement, the Debtors have further revised the above paragraph to update the numbers and provide even more clarity.
The Disclosure Statement (at p. 29) recites that the Debtors owe prepetition payment-in-kind interest of approximately \$6 million under the Prepetition Term Loan, but does not explain how this interest operates or how it will be satisfied. (¶ 24(a))	With respect to payment-in-kind interest, section IV.A. of the Disclosure Statement states: "In addition, the Debtors . . . owe prepetition payment-in-kind interest of approximately \$6 million under the Prepetition Term Loan, which constitutes additional debt, which arose when the Company was unable to pay interest currently prepetition." This payment-in-kind interest is part of the prepetition Funded Lender Claims.

Under the heading “Trade Credit/Expense Accrual” in the earlier Disclosure Statement, the Debtors estimate that they owe approximately \$31 million to their unsecured trade creditors. At the Debtors’ request, however, the Court has approved payments to critical vendors, who are presumably included within this amount. The amended Disclosure Statement does not explain who much of this \$31 million is covered by the critical vendor order, and instead contains a bracket where that amount will purportedly be entered in the future. There is no way for the creditors to ascertain what the aggregate principal unpaid trade debt will ultimately consist of. (§ 24(b).	Section IV.B., related to Trade Credit/Expense Accrual, of the October 6 Disclosure Statement reads as follows: “The Debtors also receive unsecured credit from most vendors and suppliers, though the Debtors do have two trade suppliers whose rights to payment are secured by Prepetition Letters of Credit. The Debtors estimate that, as of the Petition Date, they owe approximately \$10 to \$13 million to their unsecured trade creditors that will not be paid during the Chapter 11 Cases pursuant to Bankruptcy Court orders.” In the most current version of the Disclosure Statement, the Debtors have updated the amount unsecured trade creditors’ claims to approximately \$9 million.
Further, in several different filings with the Court, the aggregate amount of the Debtors’ pre-petition secured debt has changed. The precise amount and a breakdown of each component should be clearly set forth in the Disclosure Statement. (§ 25)	The October 6 Disclosure Statement contains a footnote 5, in Article I.B.3 that states that the prepetition Funded Lender Claims “consist of approximately \$269 million under the Prepetition Term Loan, \$16 million under the Prepetition Revolving Credit Facility, accrued interest of \$11 million, and long-term swap liability of \$6 million.” In the most current version of the Disclosure Statement, this language is now in footnote 6.
The Disclosure Statement describes a Supplemental Employee Retirement Plan (“SERP”) maintained by the Debtors, pursuant to which the Debtors have apparently accrued obligations of \$21 million. See Disclosure Statement § IV.B. at p. 30. It does not explain, however, the details of the SERP or how the Debtors intend to address it. The Disclosure Statement also notes that the SERP is funded by life insurance policies, held by BMHC in a rabbi trust, with a cash surrender value of approximately \$16 million. Id. The Disclosure Statement states that it is the Debtors’ belief that such funds are available to “pay all BMHC creditors,” but notably fails to state whether the proceeds of such policies will in fact be surrendered and made available to	The Debtors have revised section IV.B. of the October 6 Disclosure Statement, related to “SERP Claims/Other Deferred Compensation Claims/Executive Bonus,” to explain that the Debtors intend to use commercially reasonable efforts to liquidate the Life Insurance Policies for cash in an amount in excess of the cash surrender value of the policies. This excess amount is called the “Life Insurance Policies Residual.” Under the Plan, the applicable portion of the Life Insurance Policies Residual is a supplement to the Unsecured Cash Fund for the benefit of Holders of Allowed General Unsecured Claims whose classes have voted to accept the Plan. The applicable portion is, in effect, the percentage of the Life Insurance Policies Residual that corresponds to the ratio

general unsecured creditors. Indeed, the Disclosure Statement is noticeably silent on this issue. In view of the amounts at issue, answers to these questions are essential to an understanding of the Plan that will permit creditors to vote intelligently. (§ 26).	of aggregate Allowed General Unsecured Claims in Classes that vote to accept the Plan divided by the aggregate Allowed General Unsecured Claims in all General Unsecured Claim Classes. In the current version of the Disclosure Statement, the Debtors have added additional clarifying language to these paragraphs in response to the Committee's comments provided on October 13, 2009.
In addition, the Disclosure Statement refers generally to two class actions proceedings that are pending against the Debtors, but fails to describe the potential exposure of these actions and the effect that they might have on the proposed 55% distribution to unsecured creditors. The Disclosure Statement should contain more detail describing these actions, their posture, the Debtors' efforts at resolving them, the likelihood of success on the merits and the resulting potential claims against the estates, including, but not limited to, whether such claim could be entitled to priority. The discussion of pending litigation appears to be out of date, and the throwaway paragraph at the end captioned "Other Litigation" does not describe what the "other litigation" is, or how much is at issue. See Disclosure Statement § IV.C.2. p. 32. Again, the information provided is inadequate to permit an informed vote. (§ 27)	Section IV.C.1.b. of the Disclosure Statement now states that the Acevedo class action has been settled and such settlement was approved by the Court by order dated September 18, 2009. Section IV.C.1.a. of the October 6 Disclosure Statement states that the Alvarado action seeks to be certified as a class action, but no motion to certify was filed. Further, that section describes how Alvarado has filed a motion in the Bankruptcy Court requesting authority to file a class proof of claim and that the Debtors, the Committee and WFB have objected to such motion. The Debtors have deleted the "Other Litigation" section from the Disclosure Statement. The most current version of the Disclosure Statement states that the Court entered an order on October 13, 2009 denying the Alvarado request to file a class proof of claim.
The Disclosure Statement asserts that Avoidance Actions are expressly reserved and "Avoidance Actions are expressly preserved and shall vest in the applicable Reorganized Debtor on the Effective Date." See Disclosure Statement § VIII.C.4. at p. 63. Even if this treatment were appropriate—and the Committee does not believe it is—much more is needed in this description. The Debtors should describe the Avoidance Actions with specificity, including a discussion of the amounts at issue and the likelihood of success if such Avoidance Actions are pursued. (§ 28)	To preserve their business relationships, the Debtors do not intend to pursue Avoidance Actions. The most current version of the Disclosure Statement specifies: "For business reasons, at this time the Debtors do not believe it would be prudent to pursue such avoidance actions as the target of such actions would necessarily include the Debtors' trade vendors and/or customers."

The Liquidation Analysis lists a \$7 million priority tax liability with a reference to a note (a). Yet, note (a) explains the security interests of the "Pre-Petition Secured Lender Claim" rather than a priority tax liability. (§ 29)	The Liquidation Analysis attached as Exhibit E has been corrected. The footnote with respect to Priority Tax Claims now reads: "Priority tax claim of the IRS related to the audit of the 2005 to 2008 taxable years is senior to BMHC Parent General Unsecured Claims and Pre-Petition Secured Lender Claims at the BMHC Parent level. Also includes State/Local accrued tax expense."
With a Plan that proposes to pay general unsecured creditors largely on the basis of the Debtors' future success, it is essential that those creditors know the identity of the individuals on whom they will be compelled to rely before they vote "yes" or "no" on the Plan. Including that information only in a Plan Supplement, which may or may not be available before the date by which ballots are due, is entirely insufficient.	Payment to General Unsecured Claims is no longer dependent on success of the enterprise. Nonetheless, the Plan Supplement shall be filed no later than 10 days prior to the Voting Deadline.

G. Objection of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors to the Disclosure Statement With Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended October 1, 2009 (Docket No. 692) (the "October 5 Objection")

Objection	Response
The Committee's October 5 Objection primarily objected "because the Committee and the unsecured creditor body have not been provided with ample time to review the materially different Second Amended Disclosure Statement and Plan and the myriad exhibits that accompany them." (§ 2)	The Committee's October 5 Objection was essentially resolved by the Court by continuing the Disclosure Statement hearing to October 22, 2009

H. Maricopa County's Objection to Disclosure Statement with Respect to Joint Plan of Reorganization for the Debtors Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code Amended July 27, 2009 (Docket No. 746)

Objection	Response
"Maricopa County objects to the approval of the Disclosure Statement to the extent that it fails to provide for the accrual of interest from the Petition Date at the statutory rate of 16% per annum in accordance with 11 U.S.C. § 511 and A.R.S. § 42-18053. In addition, the Disclosure Statement does not specify whether Secured Tax Claimants fall under the Classification of 'Other Secured Claims.' Consequently, it is unclear as to whether the Debtors are attempting to classify Maricopa County's secured tax claims as priority tax claims."	Section 4.4.2 of the Plan, and related Disclosure Statement provisions, specify that "Other Secured Claims" include "a secured tax claim." Further, section 4.4.2 of the Plan specifies: "Allowed Secured Tax Claims may be treated in accordance with the terms set forth in section 1129(a)(9) of the Bankruptcy Code and any interest required to be paid on Allowed secured tax claims will be paid in accordance with section 511 of the Bankruptcy Code."

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:

BUILDING MATERIALS HOLDING
CORPORATION, *et al.*,¹

Debtors.

Chapter 11

Case No. 09-12074 (KJC)

Jointly Administered

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

STATE OF DELAWARE)
) SS
NEW CASTLE COUNTY)

Casey S. Cathcart, an employee of the law firm of Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP, co-counsel to the above-captioned debtors, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that on October 22, 2009, she caused a copy of the **Amended Notice of Agenda of Matters Scheduled for Hearing on October 22, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. (ET)** to be served via facsimile upon the parties identified on the attached service list.


Casey S. Cathcart

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED before me this 22nd day of October, 2009.


Notary Public
My Commission Expires:

**ERICA A. BROYLES
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF DELAWARE**
My commission expires Sept. 6, 2013

¹ The Debtors, along with the last four digits of each Debtor's tax identification number, are as follows: Building Materials Holding Corporation (4269), BMC West Corporation (0454), SelectBuild Construction, Inc. (1340), SelectBuild Northern California, Inc. (7579), Illinois Framing, Inc. (4451), C Construction, Inc. (8206), TWF Construction, Inc. (3334), H.N.R. Framing Systems, Inc. (4329), SelectBuild Southern California, Inc. (9378), SelectBuild Nevada, Inc. (8912), SelectBuild Arizona, LLC (0036), and SelectBuild Illinois, LLC (0792). The mailing address for the Debtors is 720 Park Boulevard, Suite 200, Boise, Idaho 83712.

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

THE BRANDYWINE BUILDING
1000 WEST STREET, 17TH FLOOR
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
P.O. Box 391
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-0391

Voice: (302) 571-6600

Fax: (302) 571-1253

FROM: Casey S. Cathcart, Paralegal (#762)
PHONE: (302) 571-4753

DATE: October 22, 2009
CLIENT MATTER: 68301.1001

PLEASE DELIVER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO:

<u>RECIPIENT</u>	<u>COMPANY</u>	<u>TELEPHONE NO.</u>	<u>FACSIMILE NO.</u>
David G. Aelvoet, Esq.	Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson LLP	210-225-6763	210-226-4308
Christopher M. Alston, Esq.	Foster Pepper PLLC	206-447-2906	206-749-1904
Sanjay Bhatnagar, Esq.	Cole, Schotz, Meisel, Forman & Leonard, P.A.	302-652-3131	302-652-3117
Brian W. Bisignani, Esq.	Post & Schell, P.C.	717-612-6041	717-731-1985
Robert McL. Boote, Esq.	Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP	215-665-8500	215-864-8999
Barbara Lee Caldwell, Esq.	Aiken Schenk Hawkins & Ricciardi P.C.	602-248-8203	602-248-8840
Celeste H. Campbell	KPMG LLP	770-317-6700	678-827-0409
Andrew Cardonick, Esq.	Greenberg Traurig, LLP	312-456-8400	312-456-8435
Scott T. Citek, Esq.	Lamm & Smith, P.C.	713-228-2481	713-651-1044
Scott D. Cousins, Esq. Dennis A. Melero, Esq.	Greenberg Traurig, LLP	302-661-7000	302-661-7360
Raniero D'Aversa, Jr., Esq. Laura D. Metzger, Esq. Weston T. Eguchi, Esq.	Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP	212-506-5000	212-506-5151
Tobey M. Daluz, Esq. Joshua E. Zugerman, Esq.	Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP	302-252-4465	302-252-4466

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This facsimile (this page and any accompanying page(s)) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information, may be strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

THE BRANDYWINE BUILDING
1000 WEST STREET, 17TH FLOOR
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
P.O. Box 391
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-0391

Voice: (302) 571-6600

Fax: (302) 571-1253

Robert J. Dehney, Esq. Erin R. Fay, Esq.	Morris Nichols Arsht & Tunnell LLP	302-658-9200	302-658-3989
John P. Dillman, Esq.	Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson LLP	713-844-3478	713-844-3503
Ted Jorgenson, O/O	Dixon Big-O-Tires	707-678-1668	707-678-2614
Mark W. Eckard, Esq.	Reed Smith LLP	302-778-7500	302-778-7575
Kevin B. Fisher, Esq. Seth Mennillo, Esq.	Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP	415-856-7000	415-856-7100
John M. Flynn, Esq.	Carruthers & Roth, P.A.	336-478-1146	336-478-1145
Christopher J. Giaimo, Jr., Esq. Katie A. Lane, Esq.	Arent Fox LLP	202-857-6000	202-857-6395
Paul N. Heath, Esq.	Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.	302-651-7590	302-498-7590
Melody C. Hogston	Royal Mouldings Limited	276-783-8161	276-781-2524
James E. Huggett, Esq. Amy D. Brown, Esq.	Margolis Edelstein	302-888-1112	302-888-1119
Thomas W. Isaac, Esq.	Dietrich, Glasrud, Mallek & Aune	559-435-5250	559-435-8776
Neal Jacobson, Esq.	Securities and Exchange Commission	212-336-0095	212-336-1324
Michael J. Joyce, Esq.	Cross & Simon, LLC	302-777-4200	302-777-4224
Thomas L. Kent, Esq.	Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP	212-318-6060	212-230-7899
Gary H. Leibowitz, Esq.	Cole, Schotz, Meisel, Forman & Leonard, P.A.	410-528-2971	410-528-9401

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This facsimile (this page and any accompanying page(s)) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information, may be strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

THE BRANDYWINE BUILDING
1000 WEST STREET, 17TH FLOOR
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
P.O. Box 391
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-0391

Voice: (302) 571-6600

Fax: (302) 571-1253

Bruce J. Iddings	Louisiana-Pacific Corporation		877-523-7192
Cliff W. Marcek, Esq.	Cliff W. Marcek, P.C.	702-366-7076	702-366-7078
Dan McAllister	San Diego County Treasurer-Tax Collector, Bankruptcy Desk	619-531-5261	619-685-2589
Frank F. McGinn, Esq.	Bartlett Hackett Feinberg, P.C.	617-422-0200	617-422-0383
Joseph J. McMahon, Jr., Esq.	Office of the United States Trustee	302-573-6491	302-573-6497
Joseph McMillen	Midlands Claim Administrators, Inc.	405-840-0950	405-840-0584
Kathleen M. Miller, Esq.	Smith, Katzenstein & Furlow LLP	302-652-8400	302-652-8405
Sheryl L. Moreau, Esq.	Missouri Department of Revenue - Bankruptcy Unit	573-751-5531	573-751-7232
Charles J. Pignuolo, Esq.	Devlin & Pignuolo, P.C.	713-840-9414	713-840-1841
Margery N. Reed, Esq. Wendy M. Simkulak, Esq.	Duane Morris LLP	215-979-1000	215-979-1020
Michael Reed, Esq.	McCreary, Veselka, Bragg & Allen, P.C.	512-323-3200	512-323-3205
Debra A. Riley, Esq.	Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP	619-235-1520	619-233-1158
Richard W. Riley, Esq.	Duane Morris LLP	302-657-4900	302-657-4901
Randall A. Rios, Esq. Timothy A. Million, Esq.	Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, PC	713-222-1470	713-222-1475
Martha E. Romero, Esq.	Romero Law Firm	562-907-6800	562-907-6820

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This facsimile (this page and any accompanying page(s)) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information, may be strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you

YOUNG CONAWAY STARGATT & TAYLOR, LLP

THE BRANDYWINE BUILDING
1000 WEST STREET, 17TH FLOOR
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
P.O. Box 391
Wilmington, Delaware 19899-0391

Voice: (302) 571-6600

Fax: (302) 571-1253

Howard C. Rubin, Esq.	Kessler & Collins	214-379-0722	214-373-4714
Bradford J. Sandler, Esq. Jennifer R. Hoover, Esq. Jennifer E. Smith, Esq.	Benesch, Friedlander, Coplan & Aronoff LLP	302-442-7010	302-442-7012
Ellen W. Slights, Esq.	U.S. Attorney's Office	302-573-6277 x158	302-573-6431
Tennessee Department of Revenue	c/o Tennessee Attorney General's Office, Bankruptcy Division	615-532-2504	615-741-3334
Kimberly Walsh, Esq.	Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Bankruptcy & Collections Division	512-475-4863	512-482-8341
Christopher A. Ward, Esq. Shanti M. Katona, Esq.	Polsinelli Shughart PC	302-252-0920	302-252-0921
Paul M. Weiser, Esq.	Buchalter Nemer	480-383-1800	480-824-9400
Elizabeth Weller, Esq.	Linebarger Goggan Blair & Sampson LLP	214-880-0089	469-221-5002
Joanne B. Wills, Esq. Sally E. Veghte, Esq.	Klehr, Harrison, Harvey, Branzburg & Ellers LLP	302-552-5555	302-426-9193

Total number of pages including these pages: 21

If you have any problems with this transmission, please call (302) 571-6611.

Message: Please see attached.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This facsimile (this page and any accompanying page(s)) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information, may be strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you