UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Institute of Standards and Technology
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899-

JUL 27 2007

Dr. Judy Wood

Dear Dr. Wood:

This letter is in response to your March 16, 2007 request for correction, and your March 29, 2007 and April 20, 2007 supplements, which included witness statements from first responders interviewed by the World Trade Center Task Force, pursuant to Section 515 of P.L. 106-544 (the Information Quality Act) that the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) received on March 16, 2007, March 29, 2007, and April 20, 2007, respectively. In your letters you challenge the premises and the "probable collapse sequence" proposed by NIST in NCSTAR 1 explaining the sequence of events leading up to the collapse of the World Trade Center (WTC) towers. As an alternative, you assert in your letters that "the evidence confirms that the World Trade Center towers were felled by use of Directed Energy Weaponry." In addition, you assert that Applied Research Associates (ARA), a NIST WTC Investigation contractor, had a conflict of interest in performing work for the WTC Investigation because ARA is a "significant manufacturer of directed energy weapons and/or components thereof." For the reasons presented below, NIST is denying your request for correction and does not plan to retract the NCSTAR1 report as you have requested.. To facilitate communication, the term "collapse" as used in this letter and in NCSTAR 1 means a falling in, loss of shape, or reduction to flattened form or rubble of a structure. As stated in NCSTAR 1, NIST only investigated the factors leading to the initiation of the collapses of the WTC towers, not the collapses themselves.

Your request for correction asserts that "...NIST completely failed to satisfy the first objective that it claimed to address in NCSTAR 1," namely to determine why and how WTC 1 and WTC 2 collapsed following the initial impacts of the aircraft and why and how WTC 7 collapsed. Your request for correction further asserts that NIST's findings violate the Law of Conservation of Momentum and the Law of Conservation of Energy. NIST has examined the photographs you provided in conjunction with all the other evidence and has found that the evidence does not support a theory involving directed energy weapons. The NIST analysis satisfied both the momentum and energy conservation principles and, in fact, appropriately accounted for the energy absorbed through inelastic ductile behavior of components and fractures, failures, and buckling of components. NIST fully documented its technical approach to the analysis of the aircraft impacts and the resulting damage to the WTC towers (refer to NCSTAR 1-2 and associated technical topic reports NCSTAR 1-2A and 1-2B). The analysis results were verified by using extensive photographic and video evidence. Similarly, NCSTAR 1-5 and 1-6 (and the associated technical topic reports) document the analysis of the fire

NIST

growth and spread, the thermal analysis, and the response of the damaged structures to fire loads up to the point of collapse initiation. The progression of the fires through the building and the structural response was again validated using the extensive visual evidence available. The rigorous technical approach employed by NIST resulted in findings consistent with all of the available evidence. NIST has analyzed the evidence you provided, and the totality of the evidence still supports NIST's conclusions.

In your supplement of March 29, 2007 you also assert that Applied Research Associates, one of the contractors involved in the investigation, has a "significant, clear and palpable conflict of interest that adversely affects the quality and the integrity of the work done by ARA for NIST." Prior to award, each NIST WTC Investigation Contractor underwent a rigorous organizational conflict of interest analysis. As a result of the analysis, ARA was determined not to have an organizational conflict of interest. In addition, each contract contained a provision requiring the contractor to notify NIST immediately should any organizational conflict of interest arise during the course of the contract, and no such conflicts of interest were reported. You further claim that ARA is a significant manufacturer of directed energy weapons and/or components thereof. Since there is no factual evidence to support this claim, NIST has no basis for accepting your proposed corrections to NCSTAR 1.

In conclusion, NIST is denying your request for correction because the NIST analysis of the initiation of the collapse of the WTC towers was thorough and based on all of the available evidence, and NIST continues to believe that the report is not fraudulent, deceptive or misleading.

If you are dissatisfied with this decision, you may submit an appeal within 30 calendar days of the date of the initial decision. Such an appeal must be made in writing and addressed to:

Deputy Director
National Institute of Standards and Technology
100 Bureau Drive, Mail Stop 1000
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-1000

An appeal of an initial denial must include:

a. the requester's name, current home or business address, and telephone number or electronic mail address;
b. a copy of the original request and any correspondence regarding the initial denial; and
c. a statement of the reasons why the requester believes the initial denial was in error.

Thank you for your interest. If you have questions or concerns, you may contact me at info.quality@nist.gov. Please refer to http://www.nist.gov/director/quality_standards.htm for additional information.

Sincerely ,

Catherine S. Fletcher
Chief, Management and Organization Division