

EXHIBIT 29

Message

From: Jim O'Keefe [jjimo@4taconic.com]
Sent: 7/22/2003 6:52:20 PM
To: 'Tom McCarthy' [tomm@4taconic.com]; 'Andy kawczak' [andyk@4taconic.com]; 'Andy Russell' [andyr@4taconic.com]
Subject: RE: PFOA results - by Adirondack sampling & testing

Tom,

Can the retains be checked for Chemical X without further sampling?

Jim O'Keefe, President, Co-CEO
TACONIC
136 Coonbrook Road, Petersburg, NY 12138 USA
Voice: 518-658-3202 x-325 Fax: 518-658-9710
email: jjimo@4taconic.com

How can Taconic serve you better?

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

From: Tom McCarthy [mailto:tomm@4taconic.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2003 12:03 PM
To: 'Andy kawczak'; 'Andy Russell'; 'James O'Keefe'
Subject: RE: PFOA results - by Adirondack sampling & testing

The results are only valid for the incidental contact where the PFOA was not exposed to heat. If the major route of exposure is the heating of the PFOA, then the PFOA will decompose into Chemical X (perfluorocyclohexane) and testing should be done for Chemical X. Because the PFOA is heated through the low zones and high zones it will probably be found as follows:

Chemical X: low zone alley way, fume eliminator, top of stack – we need to look for chemical X

Incidental exposure where PFOA has seen no heat – then you need to look for PFOA and this part of Adirondack's testing is valid.

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

From: Andy kawczak [mailto:andyk@4taconic.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2003 11:57 AM
To: Andy Russell; Tom McCarthy; James O'Keefe
Subject: PFOA results - by Adirondack sampling & testing

Jim/AndyR:

Tom & I spoke with Tara Daniels of Adirondack Environmental regarding the lab testing of air samples taken in June at Taconic. As you may recall from this morning's meeting, we needed to have more confidence that the test methods used were supportive of measuring PFOA. Apparently, since Adirondack Environmental did some testing here several years ago, they had a baseline of data in which the new samples were compared against. Thus, after a lengthy interrogation by Tom, it appears that the test data we received on July 17, 2003 is valid for the type of sampling performed. That is, the test method chosen measures surrogates that really are only valid for un-decomposed PFOA. Fortunately (in this case) the targeted PFOA collected was determined to be un-decomposed since it was not subjected to elevated temperatures (greater than 250 degrees F). If however we begin to measure surfaces or interfaces that were at elevated temperatures, another test method would need to be used.

The TAKE AWAY MESSAGE IS: The data in the Adirondack Environmental report appears valid and should be released to the affected employees and others as determined by Jim/AndyR. -- As a side note, even though the PFOA was undetected, employees should still be required to wear sleeved uniforms and leave them at work to limit the spread of other chemistry. -- Eventually, we will likely want to sample the oven room ceiling dust, the ditchwater, the fume eliminator effluent and low zone oven emissions so that we can be confident that we know where things are going (assuming they are here).

<<<<Tom if my interpretation (above) is incorrect or mis-stated, please advise - strongly.>>>>

AndyR/Jim: I will be awaiting your guidance before anything else is performed.

AndyK

Andrew Kawczak
Environmental Manager
TACONIC
P.O. Box 69
136 CoonBrook Road
Petersburgh, New York 12138

Tel. (518) 658-3202 x288
Fax. (518) 658-3204