



Dr. Shyam Sunder
National Institute of Standards & Technology
100 Bureau Drive
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-1070

July 20, 2009

Re: Request for meeting regarding NIST Reports - WTC7 and Twin Towers

Dear Dr. Sunder,

We have heard you state publicly that it “would not be productive” for you to meet with the Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth. This is quite disappointing – as we now have over 700 architects and engineers at AE911Truth calling for a real investigation into the destruction of the three World Trade Center high-rises on 9/11. At what point will you take us seriously? Perhaps when our rapidly growing numbers reach 1,000 A/E’s?

Here are our talking points:

- 1) NIST has acknowledged the free-fall collapse of Building 7 for 100 feet of its 6.5-second fall only after being grilled publicly by experts who are petition signers of AE911Truth. Yet NIST does not acknowledge the obvious implications of such free-fall collapse – that the structure had to have been removed – forcibly – by explosives. High school physics makes it clear that a building cannot collapse at the rate of a freely falling object while simultaneously crushing 40,000 tons of structural steel, because all of its gravitational potential energy is being converted to energy of motion.
- 2) NIST falsified evidence of fires on the critical 12th floor (video and photos document that the fires had burned at least an hour before collapse – at the theorized area of collapse initiation)
- 3) NIST simply eliminated the evidence of melted steel documented thoroughly in Appendix C of the former FEMA BPAT report: “Rapid oxidation, intergranular melting, sulfidation... evaporation of steel”. These processes are simply not possible with “normal office fires” which NIST cites as the cause of this building’s unprecedented catastrophic failure. (See notes below for temperature comparisons.)
- 4) NIST’s computer simulations of WTC 7 look nothing like the straight-down symmetrical collapse seen in all of the videos. The animations reveal the building top folding in on itself. Then the simulation stops half way through, at the point when the model appears to begin to behave like a natural process of collapse, asymmetrically falling over. Why won’t NIST show us the whole 6.5-second collapse simulation?

We provide the accompanying packet for your convenience. It includes the new version of our DVD *9/11: Blueprint for Truth – The Architecture of Destruction*, Companion Edition, with 10-, 30-, and 60-minute versions – and the two-hour public presentation.

We have carefully documented the evidence in our [multimedia presentation](#)¹ and DVD that exposes the fraud of the official explanation of events at the World Trade Center using simple, rational

forensic inquiry and basic physics. I travel the country, and recently nine cities in Europe, speaking to building professionals and others to present the evidence and the facts of 9/11. The response to this presentation is stunning. A simple [show of hands before and after](#)² reveals that about 85% of audiences who believe the official hypothesis of “fire-weakened steel” come to accept the “explosive demolition with explosives” hypothesis after hearing the fact-based presentation. They support us in the need for a new, independent investigation with full subpoena power.

The official explanations of the destruction of the iconic Twin Towers and WTC Building 7 offered by FEMA and NIST defy the laws of physics. The existing prevalent physical evidence shows that the official explanations offered cannot be true. That such serious inconsistencies and unasked questions remain unaddressed is untenable. Every licensed architect and engineer agrees to uphold a code of ethics when obtaining licensure. Our A/Es are meeting their ethical obligation by challenging the false assumptions and lies underlying 9/11, without which there would be no “post-9/11 era.” Even the FBI’s assistant director for counterterrorism, Michael Heimbach, has found our work worthy, noting that it was “[backed by thorough research and analysis](#).”³

Our petitioners ask the questions and document the observations below, which are just a few of many that remain unanswered and ignored:

- How did the elevated building mass [destroy 80,000 tons of structural steel at nearly free-fall speed](#)?⁴
- Given that open-air jet fuel fires and normal office fires both burn at a maximum of around 1,500° F., and the melting point of steel is around 2,700° F., what thermal energy source produced the several [tons of molten metal](#)⁵ observed flowing out of the South Tower shortly before its collapse – and also seen for weeks after 9/11/01 in the basements of the Twin Towers and Building 7 by [numerous witnesses](#)⁶, including the WTC structural engineer, Leslie Robertson.
- What explains the [chemical evidence of thermite](#)⁷, an incendiary material found on the ends of steel beams and [in the leftover dust](#)⁸? FEMA documented in [Appendix C of its BPAT Report](#)⁹ “evidence of a severe high temperature corrosion attack on the steel, including oxidation and sulfidation with subsequent intergranular melting”. This is clearly not a feature of gravitational collapse, or of hydrocarbon fuel or office fires. NIST summarily dismissed this key evidence when they took over the investigation.
- What is the source of the billions of microspheres consisting of [previously molten iron](#)¹⁰ in the World Trade Center dust? The United States Geological Survey (USGS), in its “Particle Atlas of World Trade Center Dust Report,” and RJ Lee Group, Inc., an engineering firm, in its December 2003 “WTC Dust Signature Report: Composition and Morphology,” both document these once-molten drops of metal without explanation. These microspheres also contain the chemical signature of thermite, an incendiary material used by the military to cut through structural steel.
- Why did Building 7 start its sudden and uniform collapse at free-fall [acceleration rate](#)¹¹ for eight stories? Video analysis shows the upper portion of the structure accelerating at the maximum rate gravity allows. Per NIST, this can only mean that the structure below offered no resistance. It therefore must have been “removed”.

- What mechanism can account for the simultaneous failure of the critical number and distribution of columns required to produce this rate of acceleration? NIST now attributes the catastrophic collapse of Building 7 to a new phenomenon called “thermal expansion” due to “normal office fires” with little to no contribution from falling debris or diesel fuel. At this suggestion by NIST, are we to suddenly accept that our understanding of fire science, materials and structural behavior has been deeply flawed all along? The American Institute of Architects (AIA) has steadfastly resisted changes to building codes that have been proposed after 9/11. Here is the potent 5-minute AE911Truth [executive summary testimony](#)¹² delivered to NIST on December 18, 2007.
- Why did more than 100 FDNY first responders describe, in great detail, the sounds of explosions and flashes of light that they saw and heard just before and during each tower’s collapse? Why did we not know about these thousands of pages of FDNY “oral history” evidence until August, 2005 – and only then after a court order for their release? FDNY’s own Chief of Safety, Albert Turi, and FDNY’s chief, Ray Downey, the “premiere collapse expert in the country” according to a fellow chief, both spoke of the presence of explosives in the Towers prior to their failures. [More than 100 testimonies](#)¹³ referring to multiple, violent explosions were ignored and unreported by the 9/11 Commission, NIST and FEMA.
- What was the energy source, and through what mechanism was it applied, that [pulverized 400,000 cubic yards of concrete into a fine powder](#)¹⁴ in mid-air that blanketed Manhattan? [Calculations](#)¹⁵ show that the energy requirement for this pulverization and the rapid expansion of the subsequent dust clouds was far greater than the available gravitational potential energy of the structures. This simple energy imbalance alone proves the official explanation impossible. Is this the same energy source that is responsible for the vaporization of more than 10,000 steel file cabinets and 1,100 human bodies that were never found, not even the smallest traces of DNA?
- How were [4 ton steel members ejected](#)¹⁶ from the Twin Towers at 70 miles per hour – and landing 600 feet away? A simple gravitational collapse would only allow up to 100 feet of “drift”, so what provided the energy required?
- Why were [virtually no floors found](#)¹⁷ at the base of either Twin Tower? There were originally 110 floors in each Tower – each of them one acre in size. What explains the disappearance of 220 acres of four-inch thick concrete (180,000 tons) and the steel decking and trusses?
- What caused the [explosive ejections of pulverized building materials](#)¹⁸ as many as 60 stories below the rapidly descending “collapse” of each Tower? These so-called “squibs” can be seen in many publicly available videos and show materials being ejected at over 160 feet per second.
- Why were most windows within 400 feet of each Twin Tower [blown out](#)¹⁹? This has never been observed following other gravitational collapses. What was the energy source here?
- An international team of scientists has found [nanothermitic explosives residue](#)²⁰ (not ordinary thermite) in the World Trade Center dust. NIST has refused to test for explosives residue, saying that such tests “[would not necessarily have been conclusive](#).”²¹ This was clearly nonsense, even before others found the residue, especially since NIST did not test for ANY kind of explosives residue. NFPA 921 requires such testing when there is “high order damage,” as there obviously was at the World Trade Center, and it mentions ordinary

thermite by name. Even if NFPA 921 is considered a guideline and not a law, the failure to follow it in this case is inexcusable, and might very well have helped allow as-yet unknown perpetrators to escape justice. See also “[Wake Up and Smell the Aluminothermic Nanocomposite Explosives](#)” by Jim Hoffman, 3/3/09.²²

- Why does NIST manipulate its computer model data inputs – even acknowledging doing so – until, through the most “severe cases,” it finally achieves “collapse initiation”? See Jim Hoffman’s “[Building a Better Mirage: NIST’s 3-year \\$20,000,000 Cover-Up of the Crime of the Century](#),” 12/8/05.²³
- Why does NIST stop its entire report at the “collapse initiation” acknowledging that it “does not actually include the structural behavior of the tower after the conditions for collapse initiation were reached”? Such an analysis should have been well within a \$20M project scope.
- Finally, how can we let the following September, 2007 [admission by NIST](#) remain unexplained:

“...we are unable to provide a full explanation of the total collapse [of the Towers].”²⁴

Forgive me for being so forward, but time is of the essence for our country now. Therefore, on behalf of the more than 4,600 petition signers at Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth – and of the millions of citizens becoming aware of the deception regarding the destruction of these three high-rises on 9/11 I urge you, and your colleague, Mr. John Gross, S.E., to come clean with your conscience and with the American people who have placed their trust in their government and its National Institute for Standards and Technology. It is not too late to do the right thing. Let’s meet and we’ll go from there.

We will be returning to Washington DC on November 1-6 and could meet with you then if you are willing.

Sincerely,

Mr. Richard Gage, AIA

cc: Members of the Board, AE911Truth

References

¹ http://www.ae911truth.net/ppt_web/slideshow.php

² <http://www.ae911truth.org/speakings.php#speak89>

³ <http://www.ae911truth.org/info/45>

⁴ http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Journal_5_PTransferRoss.pdf

⁵ http://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=south+tower+molten+metal&search_type=&aq=f

-
- 6 [http://nasathermalimages.com/#\[\[World%20Trade%20Center%20Hot%20Spots\]\]](http://nasathermalimages.com/#[[World%20Trade%20Center%20Hot%20Spots]])
 - 7 <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/JLobdillThermiteChemistryWTC.pdf>
 - 8 <http://www.bentham-open.org/pages/content.php?TOCPJ/2009/00000002/00000001/7TOCPJ.SGM>
 - 9 http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/metallurgy/WTC_apndxC.htm
 - 10 <http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/WTCHighTemp2.pdf>
 - 11 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gC44L0-2zL8>
 - 12 <http://www.ae911truth.net/downloads/AE911Truth-NIST-Writ-Subm12-18-07.pdf>
 - 13 http://www.journalof911studies.com/articles/Article_5_118Witnesses_WorldTradeCenter.pdf
 - 14 <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/collapses/concrete.html>
 - 15 <http://911research.wtc7.net/papers/dustvolume/volumev3.html>
 - 16 <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/collapses/mushrooming.html>
 - 17 <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/collapses/steel.html>
 - 18 <http://911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/collapses/squibs.html>
 - 19 <http://911research.wtc7.net/talks/wtc/expulsion.html>
 - 20 <http://www.bentham-open.org/pages/content.php?TOCPJ/2009/00000002/00000001/7TOCPJ.SGM>
 - 21 http://wtc.nist.gov/pubs/factsheets/faqs_8_2006.htm
 - 22 http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/thermite/explosives_evidence_timeline.html
 - 23 <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/nist/index.html>
 - 24 <http://journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/NISTresponseToRequestForCorrectionGourleyEtal2.pdf>