

## **DECLARATION OF ROLAND ANGLE**

1. My name is Roland Angle. I was a licensed civil engineer in the State of California for more than 50 years and am now retired from professional practice. My education includes graduating from the University of California at Berkeley with a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering and obtaining a Standard Secondary Teaching Credential issued by the California Department of Education. My professional experience includes designing launch control facilities for intercontinental missiles, hydraulic facilities, blast containers, compacted soil barriers, flood control facilities, light commercial buildings, residential projects, retaining walls, and harbor terminal facilities; testing concrete batch samples and revetment grading samples; owning three construction companies (a sole proprietorship, a partnership, and a corporation incorporated in two states); and teaching engineering subjects to high school students. I currently serve as President and Chief Executive Officer of the non-profit organization Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth (AE), incorporated in California.

2. AE's mission is to establish the full truth surrounding the events of September 11, 2001. We pursue this mission by conducting research and educating the public about the scientific evidence related to the destruction of the three World Trade Center towers and by working with victims' families and other stakeholders to advocate for a new investigation. At the heart of AE's work is the deeply held conviction that establishing the truth is essential to achieving justice for the nearly 3,000 people murdered on 9/11 and their families.

3. Since its founding in 2006, AE has conducted an independent, multi-year scientific investigation into the causes of the destruction of World Trade Center Building 7 (WTC 7) as well as the destruction of the World Trade Center Twin Towers (WTC 1 and 2).

4. AE has made hundreds of public presentations and produced hundreds of publications and videos over the years regarding the technical evidence that supports the conclusion that pre-placed explosives and/or incendiaries were used to destroy WTC 7, WTC 1, and WTC 2 on 9/11.

5. AE has submitted a petition to the U.S. Congress, now signed by more than 3,500 verified architects and engineers, calling upon the U.S. Congress to open a new investigation into the causes of the destruction of WTC 7, WTC 1, and WTC 2 on 9/11.

6. It is my understanding that the National Construction Safety Team Act required the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to not only prepare a report that included an analysis of the likely technical cause of the destruction of WTC 7 but that it also required NIST to make its WTC 7 Report available to the public, including to AE.

7. The WTC 7 Report prepared and publicly released by NIST in 2008 was so technically erroneous and incomplete in its description of the alleged probable collapse sequence, so opaque in regard to its computer modelling (still kept secret), and so misleading from a factual, technical, and engineering standpoint that not only did it not serve the goal of Congress in making such reports public (to inform the public and relevant professions regarding the causes of significant building collapses), it was more harmful to AE's mission than would have been the case had NIST issued no report at all.

8. Had NIST issued no WTC 7 Report, AE could have provided the public transparent engineering, architectural, and scientific analyses explaining the technical causes of the WTC 7 building collapse that could have simply been objectively and independently evaluated by the public and other engineers, architects, and scientists. Instead, AE has, in addition, had to expend considerable time and resources to rebut the erroneous and misleading

NIST WTC 7 Report, which many in the public assume to be credible because it was issued by a government agency.

9. AE's mission has also been made more difficult than necessary by NIST's conscious decision to use "black box" (secret) computer modelling, which prevents independent engineers, architects, and scientists from determining whether NIST's technical findings as to the cause of WTC 7's collapse can be independently replicated, and if NIST's findings cannot be replicated, where NIST's computer modelling work was in error (or intentionally misleading).

10. From the moment that NIST issued its draft report for public comment on the destruction of WTC 7 on August 21, 2008, AE has been involved in costly examination of the NIST WTC 7 Report. This NIST report purports to provide an analysis of the likely technical cause of the destruction of WTC 7 but, in fact, fails to provide a complete, coherent, and evidentially supported technical cause of the building's destruction. NIST's demonstrable failure to establish and provide an analysis of the likely technical cause of the destruction of WTC 7 has severely impeded for 13 years AE's mission of establishing the full truth surrounding the events of 9/11, leading AE to devote substantial resources to scrutinizing the NIST WTC 7 Report and publicly critiquing NIST's findings.

11. As part of AE's now-13-year effort to scrutinize the NIST WTC 7 Report and publicly critique its findings, AE commissioned and funded a computer modeling study by researchers at the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF), expending \$316,153 that it paid to UAF from 2015 to 2020. The UAF researchers, led by Professor Leroy Hulsey, concluded that "fire did not cause the collapse of WTC 7 on 9/11, contrary to the conclusions of NIST and private engineering firms that studied the collapse," and that "the collapse of WTC 7 was a



global failure involving the near-simultaneous failure of every column in the building” (see <https://ine.uaf.edu/wtc7>).

12. Further, as part of AE’s 13-year effort to scrutinize the NIST WTC 7 Report and educate the public regarding the errors in NIST’s findings, AE in 2019 and 2020 expended \$38,304 to print and mail postcards to approximately 100,000 engineers in the U.S. informing them about the release and findings of the UAF study. In addition, AE expended \$54,044 to produce a 45-minute documentary film titled “SEVEN” that followed the four-year process of the UAF study and explained the study’s findings to both technical and lay audiences, and AE expended \$9,000 to have a 5-minute version of SEVEN air on PBS to approximately 3 million viewers across the U.S. In addition, AE expended \$16,860 on sending teams of engineers to three American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) conferences in 2018 and 2019 for the purpose of educating other engineers about AE’s findings relative to the NIST WTC 7 Report and the findings of the UAF WTC 7 study. (These outreach efforts to major conferences largely ceased in 2020 and 2021 due to the Covid-19 pandemic.)

13. Further, as part of AE’s 13-year effort to scrutinize and educate the public regarding the NIST WTC 7 Report, AE expended \$4,000 on attorney fees and devoted an estimated 300 hours of staff time at a cost of approximately \$37.50 per hour to research and draft the Request for Correction to the WTC 7 Report submitted to NIST on April 20, 2020, the administrative Appeal of NIST’s Initial Decision submitted on September 28, 2020, and the Supplement to this appeal submitted on December 7, 2020.

14. AE has also devoted substantial staff and volunteer resources over the years to publishing booklets and articles scrutinizing the NIST WTC 7 Report. These booklets and articles include:

- Beyond Misinformation: What Science Says About the Destruction of World Trade Center Buildings 1, 2, and 7 (50-page booklet)
- The NIST Analyses: A Close Look at WTC 7 (article)
- Free Fall and Building 7 on 9/11 (article)
- 25 Areas of Specific Concern in the NIST WTC Report (article)
- NIST's WTC 7 Reports: Filled with Fantasy, Fiction, and Fraud (article series)
- 15 years later: on the physics of high-rise building collapses (article published in *Euromphysics News*, of which the primary author was an AE staff member)

15. All of the activities and expenditures described above would have been unnecessary, and AE's mission would not have been severely impeded, had NIST issued a report that provided a complete, coherent, and evidentially supported technical cause for the destruction of WTC 7.

16. Should NIST be ordered by this court to respond in a substantive, meaningful, and non-erroneous way to the Request for Correction, which would necessarily entail conducting new analyses and revising the NIST WTC 7 Report to address the information quality violations contained therein, the harm caused to AE's mission would be remedied, and AE's expenditures of its resources over the past 13 years will have contributed significantly to serving the public interest and AE's mission.

17. Pursuant to 28 USC Section 1746, I, Roland Angle, hereby swear, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my information and belief.

Roland E. Angle, P.E.  
Roland Angle, P.E.

1/31/22  
Date