

From: Richard Kahn <[REDACTED]>

To: Jeffrey Epstein <jeevacation@gmail.com>

Subject: FW: Great St James

Date: Sun, 01 May 2016 19:17:57 +0000

slowly chipping away..

Please advise

Thank you

From: "Hugo Hodge Jr." <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sunday, May 1, 2016 at 3:09 PM

To: Richard Kahn <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: Great St James

Good afternoon Mr. Kahn,

While I must reiterate that u strongly suggest the option for the entire proposal,I can take \$5k off each option.

On May 1, 2016, at 1:55 PM, Richard Kahn <[REDACTED]> wrote:

my client is very island centric. no insult meant at all, and i apologize if you felt slighted. can you give me your best and final price so that i may once again review all alternatives and then prepare one final apples to apples analysis. Thank you.

Rich

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 30, 2016, at 8:38 PM, Hugo Hodge <[REDACTED]> wrote:

With the greatest respect for you and your client, I'm sorry but HKT will have to respectfully decline to accommodate that offer.

Apparently you have someone off island, unaware of the local requirements and hopefully the cost you are expecting to pay will not increase when they acquire that knowledge.

\$50k is more than 50% below the proposal and, for lack of better words, quite unacceptable and insulting.

Should you run into difficulties with your other option HKT stands prepared to deliver first class results as described in our written and verbal communication.

On Apr 30, 2016, at 4:04 PM, Richard Kahn <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Thank you for your email. as i told you when we spoke last week I have a bid for 40k. my instructions are to source locally if i can and save travel costs. I will increase my offer to you and for 50k we can proceed with your proposal. amy dempsey is being retained for routing.

Thank you.

Richard Kahn
HBRK Associates Inc.

[REDACTED]
New York, NY 10022

Tel [REDACTED]

Fax [REDACTED]

Cell [REDACTED]

On Apr 30, 2016, at 10:27 AM, Hugo Hodge <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Good morning Mr.Kahn,

I have thoroughly reviewed your suggestions for modifications to the bid and given your request great consideration. I honestly believe that the items you requested are important for a successful project. For example, the witnessing of the factory acceptance is not a step I would recommend omitting.

With that said, the items you suggested to remove total \$23,000. To ensure the integrity of this project I am willing to do the project with the entire scope at the original price less \$23,000 for a total of \$80,000. If you decline this option and are convinced that these items should be omitted, I am willing to reduce the remaining items by 10% resulting in a cost of \$72,000 for the revised scope.

I strongly recommend you consider the first option but I am willing to discuss this further with you if necessary.

Best Regards,

Hugo Hodge Jr

On Thu, Apr 28, 2016 at 12:32 PM, Richard Kahn <[REDACTED]> wrote:

it was a pleasure speaking with you earlier. as discussed the following areas are scopes that will not be needed and my comments:

- a) conceptual design on cable routes - *ok to keep - please revisit pricing*
- b) detailed cable specs and preparation of bid docs - *ok to keep - please revisit pricing*
- c) detailed switch and meter design and prep of all switches and metering device - *ok to keep - please revisit pricing*
- d) review all switch and cable bid submittals and submit to Wapa for approval - *ok to keep - please revisit pricing*
- e) witness factory acceptance test - *not necessary as all we need is for you to review test from manufacturer and should be included in d) above*
- f) complete final design to include civil and electrical drawings - *ok to keep - please revisit pricing*
- g) witness installation and test electrical devices - *not needed*
- h) complete as built - *not needed*

i appreciate your effort in revisiting your pricing and look forward to hearing back from you this afternoon
thank you

Richard Kahn
HBRK Associates Inc.

[REDACTED]
New York, NY 10022

tel [REDACTED]

fax [REDACTED]

cell [REDACTED]

|