

To: Therese McAllister <Therese.McAllister@nist.gov>, Catherine Fletcher <catherine.fletcher@nist.gov>  
From: Judy Wood <lisajudy@nctv.com>  
Subject: Evidence of Non-self-quenching toxicity at World Trade Center Site  
Cc: Jsleaphart@cs.com  
Bcc: lisajudy@nctv.com  
X-Attachments: :Harvey:584882:080229\_AFFIDAVITtight.pdf:

Dear Catherine Fletcher and Theresa McAllister,

As you know, I have previously engaged in an RFC process that is now completed and concluded. As you may know, I have also initiated a lawsuit under the False Claims Act against many of the contractors NIST hired for professional services on the investigation of what caused the destruction of the Twin Towers. I have also voiced objection to the way in which the Building 7 (WTC7) investigation is proceeding.

In NIST's July 27, 2007, Response to my RFC, it was stated "[A]s you know, NIST did not investigate the actual collapses" of the Twin Towers. Actually, I suspected that, so I greatly appreciated your confirmation of that, which was stated in your letter. The statement that NIST did not investigate the destruction of the Twin Towers was not explicitly stated in NCSTAR 1, but Footnotes 2 and 13 vaguely hinted at the possibility that no investigation was done. But, those footnotes mainly implied that a choice to limit what was being reported on was for sake of "brevity" and not because no part of the phase of actual destruction of the WTC had been investigated.

That stunning admission of fraudulent omission has consequences.

I have attached to this email an affidavit that has been submitted in connection with my lawsuit against NIST's contractors. The affidavit documents the existence of ongoing cleanup problems that are highly consistent with a continuing reaction and continuing molecular dissociation at GZ. A continuing reaction implies that this effect is non-self-quenching, so the public may be exposed to continuing danger. The destruction of WTC7 exhibited nearly all of the same characteristics as the destruction of WTC1&2. Noting that many of the contractors are the same, so it is likely that NIST's ongoing investigation of WTC7 may be dangerously and fraudulently flawed to such a degree that if it is not halted and if the current contractors are

not removed, then the problems associated with the cover-up of the fact that the World Trade Center was destroyed by directed energy weapons may continue to multiply.

After you review the attached affidavit, please feel free to contact either me or my counsel, Jerry Leaphart, if you have questions. I am advised that a copy of this correspondence will be sent by Mr. Leaphart to the U.S. Attorney's Office in New York City, care of Benjamin Torrance.

In conclusion, I strongly urge NIST to suspend its investigation of WTC 7.

In December, 2007, the public was told that:

"At this point, the analysis of the initiating event we expect will be completed in January of 2008, which is about a month, a month and a half from now. We expect to finish the global analysis of the initiating event by March and at that stage, we will then identify a leading collapse hypothesis, which will then lead to the drafting of our reports for internal review by the tactical team followed by a revised draft that is shared with the advisory committee - that's you folks -- as well as reviewed at NIST. We have a normal NIST quality control for all publications released by NIST. It's called the Editorial Review Board at NIST and all publications before they are released by NIST are reviewed by that independent body, and that will be done concurrently with the Advisory Committee review some time in June and we expect to release the report for public comment soon after that in July, and there will be a period of public comment similar to what we had for the Towers at the end of which we will then release the final reports. So that is really the overall schedule. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer. If there are none, we'll just move to Terri's presentation."

Because of the way NIST has conducted its WTC investigation, namely, by ignoring the actual events of destruction, and thus engaging in a fraudulent investigation, assisted by companies that are also engaging in fraud, there is no viable way for NIST to be anywhere near reaching a "leading hypothesis." Rather NIST can only be reaching a stage where a fraudulent hypothesis may be on the verge of being put forth.

The consequences of this fraudulent process are ongoing and are manifested in the ongoing remediation using dirt and hazmat procedures in NYC, up to and including the present. The fuming, which many assumed was 'smoke' that lingered at GZ for months is, in fact, still taking place there. I, myself, have provided photographic evidence of this and have set it out in the attached affidavit.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Dr. Judy Wood

cc  
Jerry Leaphart  
Attorney  
8 West Street  
Suite 203  
Danbury, CT 06810  
203-825-6265

-----