

---

**From:** jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 11, 2016 2:44 PM  
**To:** Richard Joslin  
**Cc:** Brad Wechsler; Richard J Bronstein; Melanie Spinella [REDACTED]; John Castrucci; Joe Avantario  
**Subject:** Re: Re:

it says charter and OTHER , where is the apollo reimbursement then ? what is the amount ?

On Thu, Feb 11, 2016 at 9:37 AM, Richard Joslin <[REDACTED]> wrote:

The 42 hours include both Part 91 and Part 135 hours. Part 135 is the charter component and that gives rise to charter revenue.

From: jeffrey E. [mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2016 9:21 AM  
To: Brad Wechsler <[REDACTED]>  
Cc: Richard J Bronstein <[REDACTED]>; Melanie Spinella [REDACTED]; John Castrucci [REDACTED]; Richard Joslin [REDACTED]  
Subject: Re:

it says charter revenue only 312 but letter says apollo hours were 42 at 18k each hour?

On Tue, Feb 9, 2016 at 6:41 PM, Brad Wechsler <[REDACTED]> wrote:

MEMORANDUM

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

TO: =C2 Rick Bronstein =C2 =A0 =C2 CC: =A0 John Castrucci

=A0 Leon Black =C2 =A0 =C2 =A0 =C2 Joe Avantario  
=A0 =C2 =A0 =C2 =A0 =C2 =A0 Rich =oslin

FROM: Brad Wechsler =A0 =C2 =A0 =C2 =A0 Jeffrey Epstein

DATE: February 9, 2016

Leon,

1. Attached, please find the January 26th memo on the airplane which was sent to you previously. It deals with Part 91 vs. 135 and attendant costs and income tax benefits. The office feels that with respect to income tax, Part 135 is more favorable, but not significantly so, i.e., between 0 and \$400K depending on use.
2. Also included are detailed operating costs. These were previously sent to Jeffrey but not previously not sent to you.
3. The final note details the FET and sales tax consequences of moving from the current structure to a simplified structure. Were we to move to a very simple Part 91 only structure you could likely save \$200K/year but would have to own and operate the plane in your personal name (your insurance is sufficient, but there would be a certain lack of privacy). If you held the plane in a sole purpose LLC the aforementioned savings would disappear. If Jeffrey wants to take a deep dive we have much detailed material and we would also suggest he speak to Rich J and our aviation attorney.
4. Bottom-line, a lot of work has been done and there is not a compelling answer, one way or another. Taking into account income tax attributes, sales tax attributes and ease of use attributes it's almost a push, though I would probably marginally favor Part 135. I believe Jeffrey favors Part 91, which in my mind, is a sufficient reason to go that route. We should discuss.

Thanks

--

please no=e

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of

JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [jeevacation@gmail.com](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com) <<mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>> , and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

--

please =ote

The information contained in this communication is confiden=ial, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside informati=n, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the propert= of JEE Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communica=ion or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If =ou have received this communication in error, please notify us immediat=ly by return e-mail or by e-mail to [jeevacation@gmail.com](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com) <<mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>> , and destroy this comm=ication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -=ll rights reserved