

Thanks for your comments. I'll note that some of the expenses you mention may not be allocated fully to ratepayers (meaning the expenses are picked up by non-regulated operations or come out of the company's bottom line), but I don't know the specifics for the costs you mentioned. I'll make sure commission staff digs into these issues.

Thanks,
Dusty

P.S. I have to add your comments to the record of this proceeding as it is an ex parte communication, but we will remove your email address and name, in accordance with your wishes.

-----Original Message-----

From: Constituent
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 10:53 AM
To: Johnson, Dustin (PUC)
Cc: Constituent
Subject: need to look at issues affecting BHP rate case--CONFIDENTIAL PLEASE!

Dear Mr. Johnson;

For many years I have questioned the following BHP actions referring to wages and retirement funding.

Instead of using the prevailing wage scale of the area, BHP always use the argument that they use the nationwide average for wage scales of Utility Companies to determine their salary levels. This is wrong, as in my investigations, the prevailing wage rates in the service area are anywhere from 25 to 35% less than those paid by BHP for the same or similar type jobs You need to take a look at this issue because it has a profound effect on the expenses which rate payers are having to pay.

Another issue which is almost ridiculous, is the payment of retirement fees to ex Board members. They are in a more or less "honorary" position, only meet occasionally, and do not do much except rubber stamp the positions as taken by the CEO. I have complained about this many years ago, but no one listened then.

Take a look at what this is costing the rate payers!?

Thanks for your consideration and review of these two issues.