STATE OF MINNESOTA
BOARD OF ARCHITECTURE, ENGINEERING,
LAND SURVEYING, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, GEOSCIENCE
AND INTERIOR DESIGN

In the matter of Jerry Wayne Anderson
Architect
License Number 13639

STIPULATION AND ORDER

Board File No. 2009-0029

TO: Mr. Jerry Wayne Anderson
Jamb Architects
Post Office Box 310
Forest Lake, Minnesota 55025

The Minnesota Board of Architecture, Engineering, Land Surveying, Landscape
Architecture, Geoscience and Interior Design ("Board") is authorized pursuant to
Minnesota Statutes section 214.10 (2008) and Minnesota Statutes section 326.111(2008) to
review complaints against architects, professional engineers, land surveyors, landscape
architects, geoscientists, and certified interior designers, and to take disciplinary action
whenever appropriate.

The Board received information concerning Jerry Wayne Anderson
("Respondent"). The Board’s Complaint Committee ("Committee") reviewed the
information. The parties have agreed that the matter may now be resolved by this
Stipulation and Order.
STIPULATION

IT IS HEREBY AGREED by and between Respondent and the Committee as follows:

1. Jurisdiction. The Respondent has held a license to practice architecture from the Board since February 21, 1979. Respondent is subject to the jurisdiction of the Board with respect to the matters referred to in this Stipulation.

2. Facts. This Stipulation is based upon the following facts:
   a. Respondent was first licensed as an architect by the State of Minnesota on February 21, 1979.
   c. On October 20, 2008, Respondent’s Minnesota architect license was reinstated.
   d. As of the date of this Stipulation, Respondent’s Minnesota architect license status is current with an expiration date of June 30, 2010.
   e. On September 18, 2008, Respondent certified and stamped architectural drawings for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist – church roof redesign & replacement project. A true and correct copy of the complete set of drawings for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist – church roof re-design & replacement project, sheets A-1 and A-2 are available in the Board’s office. A partial copy of the sheets A-1 and A-2 drawings, showing the project name, date, and certification are attached as Exhibit A.
   f. In a letter dated October 17, 2008, to Lynette DuFresne, the Board’s
Investigator, Frank Berg, PE, City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, stated: “The drawings were brought to DSI September 19, 2008, by Mr. Tim Tacheny representing the Church ownership and in pursuit of a building permit. The drawings consisted of architectural sheets A-1 and A-2 and structural sheet S-1. The architectural sheets had been certified by Mr. Anderson the day before (September 18th) and the structural sheet by ...[name of P.E. redacted]...also the day before.” A true and correct copy of the October 17, 2008 letter to Lynette DuFresne from Frank Berg, PE, City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, with name of P.E. redacted, is attached as Exhibit B. A true and correct copy of the complete set of drawings, A-1, A-2 and S-1, with name of P.E. redacted, are available in the Board’s office. A partial copy of the A-1, A-2 and S-1 drawings, showing the project name, date, and certification, with name of P.E. redacted, are attached as Exhibit A.

g. In the same letter dated October 17, 2008, to Lynette DuFresne, Frank Berg, PE, City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, stated: “I learned that Mr. Anderson’s registration had expired as of June 30, 2008. I explained to Mr. Tacheny that this needed to be cleared up by Mr. Anderson, with the Board, before I would be able to finalize my review.” A true and correct copy of the October 17, 2008 letter to Lynette DuFresne from Frank Berg, PE, City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, with name of P.E. redacted, is attached as Exhibit B.

h. In a letter to the Board, dated January 22, 2009, Respondent admits: “During the course of finalizing plans for the Church of Christ Scientist, it was
brought to my attention that my Minnesota registration as an Architect had lapsed.” A true and correct copy of the January 22, 2009 letter is attached as Exhibit C.

i. In this same letter dated January 22, 2009, Respondent states that he did not receive a renewal notification for his Architect’s license. “I did not receive a renewal notification and overlooked the fact that my license was up for renewal. This was definitely my fault for not notifying the Board of change of address for my business at the time of the move, but was entirely a simple oversight.” A true and correct copy of the January 22, 2009 letter is attached as Exhibit C.

j. In a letter dated July 8, 2009 to Respondent, Lynette DuFresne, Board Investigator, alleged that Respondent practiced without a license as an Architect and held himself out as an Architect during the time Respondent’s Architect license had lapsed. Lynette DuFresne further alleged that the Respondent did not conduct himself properly as an Architect and that the Respondent may have practiced professional engineering without a license by preparing or having drawn the drawings identified as sheet S-1, on 09/18/08, for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist, Church Roof Re-Design & Replacement, of Saint Paul, Minnesota project. A true and correct copy of the letter dated July 8, 2009 letter, with name of P.E. redacted, is attached as Exhibit D.

k. In a letter dated July 24, 2009 from Respondent to Lynette DuFresne, Board Investigator, Respondent admits that he prepared and drew the
plans identified as sheet S-1, dated 09/18/08, for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist – Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project in St. Paul, Minnesota. Respondent states: “[Name of P.E. redacted] did not draw the plans for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist, sheet S-1. The framing plan was discussed with ...

[Name of P.E. redacted]...and prepared for [name of P.E. redacted]'s review and approval by Jerry W. Anderson. [Name of P.E. redacted]... and I have always agreed that he would do the engineering work and I would draft the plans for his review and approval.” “[Name of P.E. redacted]... was to complete this work while I was gone so that we could finalize the project on my return. [Name of P.E. redacted] ran the calculations during my absence, I cannot tell you the exact date, but it was between 9/19/09 and 10/02/09.” “[Name of P.E. redacted] did eventually sign and certify the work for the Church.” A true and correct copy of the July 24, 2009 letter, with name of P.E. redacted, is attached as Exhibit E.

1. In the same letter dated July 24, 2009 from Respondent to Lynette DuFresne, Board Investigator, Respondent states that the original signature on the sheet S-1 was a sticker given to the Respondent some time ago. Respondent stated: “The original signature on sheet S-1 was a sticker given to me some time ago by [name of P.E. redacted].” A true and correct copy of the July 24, 2009 letter, with name of P.E. redacted, is attached as Exhibit E.

m. In the same letter dated July 24, 2009 from Respondent to Lynette DuFresne, Board Investigator, Respondent states: “I placed [name of P.E.
redacted]’s signature (sticker) on the drawing anticipating that he would be reviewing the final project details and framing plan as well as confirming his load calculations.” “We had an understanding that [name of P.E. redacted] would perform all engineering work and that I would draw the plans and details for him. It was not our normal practice to use stickers for signature plates. [Name of P.E. redacted] had given me a few to use for him when timing issues arose or when he might be out of town and deadlines needed to be maintained.”

A true and correct copy of the July 24, 2009 letter, with name of P.E. redacted, is attached as Exhibit E.

3. **Violations.** Respondent admits that the facts specified above constitute violations of Minnesota Statutes section 326.02, subdivisions 1 and 2, Minnesota Statutes section 326.111, subdivision 4 (a) (1), (2), (3), and (9) (2008) and Minnesota Rules 1805.0100, and Minnesota Rules 1805.0200, subparts 1 and 4 (C) and (D) (2007) and are sufficient grounds for the action specified below.

4. **Enforcement Action.** Respondent and the Committee agree that the Board should issue an Order in accordance with the following terms:

   a. **Reprimand.** Respondent is reprimanded for the foregoing conduct.

   b. **Civil Penalty.** Respondent shall pay to the Board a civil penalty of Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000.00). Respondent shall submit a civil penalty of Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000.00) by cashier’s check or money order to the Board on or before June 30, 2010.
c. **Ethics Course.** On or before June 30, 2010, Respondent shall successfully complete, and submit acceptable documentation thereof, a course in professional ethics, four (4) hours, and which is approved in advance by the Complaint Committee. Completion of any courses or activities for the four (4) hours of professional ethics earned on or before June 30, 2010, that are being submitted for the purpose of fulfilling the four (4) hours of professional ethics in this order shall not count toward any continuing education requirements in the 2010-2012 renewal period or beyond.

5. **Additional Discipline for Violations of Order.** If Respondent violates this Stipulation, Minnesota Statutes Chapter 326 (2008), or Minnesota Rules Chapter 1800 (2007) or Minnesota Rules Chapter 1805 (2007), the Board may impose additional discipline pursuant to the following procedure:

   a. The Committee shall schedule a hearing before the Board. At least thirty days prior to the hearing, the Committee shall mail Respondent a notice of the violation alleged by the Committee and of the time and place of the hearing. Within fourteen days after the notice is mailed, Respondent shall submit a written response to the allegations. If Respondent does not submit a timely response to the Board, the allegations may be deemed admitted.

   b. At the hearing before the Board, the Complaint Committee and Respondent may submit affidavits made on personal knowledge and argument based on the record in support of their positions. The evidentiary record before the Board shall be limited to such affidavits and this Stipulation and Order. Respondent waives a
hearing before an administrative law judge and waives discovery, cross-examination of adverse witnesses, and other procedures governing administrative hearings or civil trials.

c. At the hearing, the Board will determine whether to impose additional disciplinary action, including additional conditions or limitations on Respondent's practice or suspension or revocation of Respondent's license.

6. Waiver of Respondent's Rights. For the purpose of this Stipulation, Respondent waives all procedures and proceedings before the Board to which Respondent may be entitled under the Minnesota and United States constitutions, statutes, or the rules of the Board, including the right to dispute the allegations against Respondent, to dispute the appropriateness of discipline in a contested case proceeding pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Chapter 14 (2008), and to dispute the civil penalty imposed by this Agreement. Respondent agrees that upon the application of the Committee without notice to or an appearance by Respondent, the Board may issue an Order containing the enforcement action specified in paragraph 4 herein. Respondent waives the right to any judicial review of the Order by appeal, writ of certiorari, or otherwise.

7. Collection. In accordance with Minnesota Statutes section 16D.17 (2008), in the event this order becomes final and Respondent does not comply with the condition in paragraph 4(b) above, Respondent agrees that the Board may file and enforce the unpaid portion of the civil penalty as a judgment without further notice or additional proceedings.
8. **Board Rejection of Stipulation and Order.** In the event the Board in its discretion does not approve this Stipulation or a lesser remedy than specified herein, this Stipulation shall be null and void and shall not be used for any purpose by either party hereto. If this Stipulation is not approved and a contested case proceeding is initiated pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Chapter 14 (2008), Respondent agrees not to object to the Board’s initiation of the proceedings and hearing the case on the basis that the Board has become disqualified due to its review and consideration of this Stipulation and the record.

9. **Unrelated Violations.** This settlement shall not in any way or manner limit or affect the authority of the Board to proceed against Respondent by initiating a contested case hearing or by other appropriate means on the basis of any act, conduct, or admission of Respondent justifying disciplinary action which occurred before or after the date of this Stipulation and which is not directly related to the specific facts and circumstances set forth herein.

10. **Record.** The Stipulation, related investigative reports and other documents shall constitute the entire record of the proceedings herein upon which the Order is based. The investigative reports, other documents, or summaries thereof may be filed with the Board with this Stipulation.

11. **Data Classification.** Under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, this Stipulation is classified as public data upon its issuance by the Board, Minnesota Statutes Chapter 13.41, subdivision 5 (2008). All documents in the record shall maintain the data classification to which they are entitled under the Minnesota Government Data
Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes Chapter 13 (2008). They shall not, to the extent they
are not already public documents, become public merely because they are referenced
herein. A summary of this Order will appear in the Board's newsletter. A summary
will also be sent to the national discipline data bank pertaining to the practice of
architecture.

12. **Entire Agreement.** Respondent has read, understood, and agreed to this
Stipulation and is freely and voluntarily signing it. The Stipulation contains the entire
agreement between the parties hereto relating to the allegations referenced herein.
Respondent is not relying on any other agreement or representations of any kind,
verbal or otherwise.

13. **Counsel.** Respondent is aware that he may choose to be represented by
legal counsel in this matter. Respondent knowingly waived legal representation.

14. **Service.** If approved by the Board, a copy of this Stipulation and Order
shall be served personally or by first class mail on Respondent. The Order shall be
effective and deemed issued when it is signed by the Chair of the Board.

**RESPONDENT**

Jerry Wayne Anderson

Dated: 6 December, 2009

**COMPLAINT COMMITTEE**

By: Billie Lawton

Billie Lawton, Public Member,
Committee Chair

Dated: 2-05-2010
ORDER

Upon consideration of the foregoing Stipulation and based upon all the files, records and proceedings herein, all terms of the Stipulation are approved and hereby issued as an Order of this Board on this the 5th day of February, 2009.

MINNESOTA BOARD OF
ARCHITECTURE, ENGINEERING,
LAND SURVEYING, LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE, GEOSCIENCE AND
INTERIOR DESIGN

By: Kristine A. Kubes, J.D.
Board Chair
A. Prefinished metal flashing and keepers (copper to match existing)
B. Prefinished gutters and downspouts (copper to match existing)
C. Existing Brick
D. New Brick (to match existing)
E. New or existing trim – painted (to match existing)
F. Prefinished aluminum louver vents (w/ insect screens)
G. 340# fiberglass reinforced asphalt shingles
H. Existing stucco finish
I. 1” stucco finish (texture & color to match existing stucco)
J. Precast concrete splashblocks

* Verify all colors, textures, finishes and material selections with Owner prior to application
SECTION

1/8" = 1'-0"
Mailing Schedule:

a. Joists or studding of stud walls 8" on center.
b. Joists or studding of stud walls 6" on center.
c. 6" nominal wood top chord shall be used in lieu of the 4" nominal wood top chord specified in Section D.4.2 of the 1985 Uniform Building Code.
d. All joists and walls shall be fastened to the top of the stud with screws or nails as specified in Section D.4.2 of the 1985 Uniform Building Code.

Backfilling:

a. All backfilling shall be compacted in layers not to exceed 8" in thickness, and shall be compacted to a density of 95% of Standard Proctor density.

Construction and Control Joint:

Construction joints shall be made as needed on the drawings.

Expansion Joints:

a. All expansion joints shall be EPDM sheet or equivalent.

Contraction Joints:

a. The contraction shall be in accordance with the provisions of the 1985 Uniform Building Code.

Coordinations with Architectural Drawings:

a. All coordinations with architectural drawings shall be made by the Architect.

New Work in Combination with Existing Construction:

a. All new construction shall be coordinated with existing structural elements. All new structural elements shall be designed and constructed to accommodate existing conditions.

Side Drains:

a. Side drains shall be installed at each change in grade and at all changes in direction. Side drains shall be installed at not less than 10-foot intervals along the length of the structure.

Steel Structures:

a. All steel structures shall be fabricated in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Trenching:

a. All trenching shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Concrete:

a. All concrete shall be placed and finished in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Reinforcing Steel:

a. All reinforcing steel shall be placed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Welding:

a. All welding shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Painting:

a. All painting shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Signage:

a. All signs shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Fire Protection:

a. All fire protection shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Electrical:

a. All electrical systems shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plumbing:

a. All plumbing systems shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Mechanical:

a. All mechanical systems shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

HVAC:

a. All HVAC systems shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Sprinkler Systems:

a. All sprinkler systems shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Structural Steel:

a. All structural steel shall be fabricated in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Aluminum:

a. All aluminum components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Steel:

a. All steel components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Wood:

a. All wood components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Concrete:

a. All concrete components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Brick:

a. All brick components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Stone:

a. All stone components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Ceramic Tile:

a. All ceramic tile components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Paint:

a. All paint components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Paper:

a. All paper components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Glass:

a. All glass components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Plastic:

a. All plastic components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.

Metal:

a. All metal components shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and drawings provided by the Architect.
A. Prefinished metal flashing and keepers (copper to match existing)
B. Prefinished gutters and downspouts (copper to match existing)
C. Existing Brick
D. New Brick (to match existing)
E. New or existing trim - painted (to match existing)
F. Prefinished aluminum louver vents (w/ insect screens)
G. 340# fiberglass reinforced asphalt shingles
H. Existing stucco finish
I. 1" stucco finish (texture & color to match existing stucco)
J. Precast concrete splashblocks

* Verify all colors, textures, finishes and material selections with Owner prior to application
SECTION 1

Wall Footing

Roof - 32.7 x 53 = 1799
15" Bk. Wall - 19 x 100 = 1900
Gen. FRC = 650 x 875 = 2625
3962

3962 / 2000 = 1.98' OK
6.76' - 1.75' = 4.9'
Answering such a question may involve understanding the context and the content of a page in a document, which requires a more fluent model to accurately comprehend and respond. A model like Qwen can be very helpful in this regard. However, without the actual document content, it's impossible to provide a meaningful text representation.

If you have a specific question or need assistance with something else, feel free to ask!
A. Prefinished metal flashing and keepers (copper to match existing)
B. Prefinished gutters and downspouts (copper to match existing)
C. Existing Brick
D. New Brick (to match existing)
E. New or existing trim — painted (to match existing)
F. Prefinished aluminum louver vents (w/ insect screens)
G. 340# fiberglass reinforced asphalt shingles
H. Existing stucco finish
I. 1" stucco finish (texture & color to match existing stucco)
J. Precast concrete splashblocks

* Verify all colors, textures, finishes and material selections with Owner prior to application
*REPLACE EXIST. CAP FLASHING
VEE GUTTER INDO.
EXIST. AT WALL
JAMB ANG. EXIST. OR NEW WALL
PLATE 6 1/4" X 12" EPoxy ANG.
T=7/8".012"

EXISTING ""MASONRY"" CONSTR

EXISTING LAMINATED WD BEAM

SECTION
1/8" = 1'-0"
(This page contains technical and construction specifications for a building project, including material lists, dimensions, and construction details. It is likely a part of a larger set of building plans or specifications document.)
October 17, 2008

Lynette Dufresne
Minnesota Board of Architecture, Engineering, Land Surveying,
Landscape Architecture, Geoscience & Interior Design
85 E 7th Place, Suite 160
St. Paul, MN 55101-2113

Re: Jerry Anderson, Architect #13639

Dear Ms. Dufresne:

I am writing in my capacity as the staff structural engineer for the City of Saint Paul’s Department of Safety and Inspections (DSI). This letter is regarding both Mr. Anderson and Mr. Anderson because what I have to say all has to do with one project that was certified by both individuals.

The project consists of adding a fairly steep, pitched roof structure over what is presently a flat roof to the 1st Church of Christ Scientist.

The drawings were brought to DSI September 19, 2008, by Mr. Tim Tacheny representing the Church ownership and in pursuit of a building permit. The drawings consisted of architectural sheets A-1 and A-2 and structural sheet S-1. The architectural sheets had been certified by Mr. Anderson the day before (September 18th) and the structural sheet by also the day before. I began my structural plan review right in my office and in the presence of Mr. Tacheny.

The drawings indicated the width of the existing church building to be 65 feet with the proposed new roof trusses spanning in that direction. Mr. Tacheny indicated to me that the existing flat roof structure spanned in the same direction utilizing a center bearing wall.

My concerns were 1) lack of detail indicating the configuration of the new trusses, specifically, was it the designer’s intent that the new trusses bear at the center bearing wall or that they span the entire 65 feet thus doubling the load at the exterior walls, 2) load path to the foundation for either scenario, and 3) anchorage, or hold-down, with respect to wind load.

In the presence of Mr. Tacheny I called to discuss what I would consider questions very basic to the structure of the building. With permission I put him on speaker phone. did not recall having certified the drawings even though his certification was dated the previous day, nor did he recall the project at all. In fact, he began discussing a totally different project.

EXHIBIT B
Mr. Tacheny took it on his own to bring the drawings to his office. He called me later that day with Mr. Tacheny at his office. It was at that time that I took up my questions with

... did not appear familiar with the two details pertaining to load path that were indicated on architectural sheet A2. When I brought up the question of whether or not the intent was for the new trusses to bear on an existing center bearing wall his answer was “that’s a good question”. Hold-downs did not appear to have been considered. I left it with Mr. Tacheny to modify his drawings for re-submittal.

Mr. Tacheny returned to DSI at a later date with supposedly revised drawings. All that had been added was a handwritten note pertaining to a footing size with no indication as to its significance, nor was there any reference as to where it applied. None of my questions had been addressed.

I suggested to Mr. Tacheny that we pursue answers to my structural questions through the architect. Mr. Anderson had not been very readily available until now because he was on a trip to London. It was at this point that I decided to check with the State Board on the status of Mr. Anderson’s registration.

I learned that Mr. Anderson’s registration had expired as of June 30, 2008. I explained to Mr. Tacheny that this needed to be cleared up by Mr. Anderson, with the Board, before I would be able to finalize my review. My meeting with Mr. Tacheny ended with a message to Mr. Anderson to call me back.

A couple days later Mr. Anderson returned my call. He understood my questions, appeared to welcome the input, and agreed to take up my questions with Mr. Tacheny. I informed Mr. Anderson of his certification having expired. Mr. Tacheny had already made him aware.

At still a later date Mr. Tacheny returned again with revised drawings. However, there were no revisions to the structural drawings. The architectural details on the A-2 sheet were revised. With Mr. Tacheny stating that he understood that the trusses would be supported at a center bearing wall and the drawings still not indicating a center wall I decided to put Mr. Anderson on a conference call.

Mr. Anderson was very professional and very responsive. With Mr. Tacheny part of the conference call a work plan was agreed to that I indicated would move us in the direction of my sign-off. The work plan involved during-construction site time for Mr. Anderson along with approval of roof truss shop drawings by Mr. Anderson, all with Mr. Anderson coordinating necessary structural input with Mr. Tacheny. It was understood by both Mr. Anderson and Mr. Tacheny, however, that there would be no more progress toward a building permit until Mr. Anderson cleared up the issue of his expired registration.

It surprised me that this later issue of the architectural drawings still had Mr. Anderson’s September 18, 2008, certification.
As of the date of this letter nothing further has transpired.

Sincerely,

Frank Berg, P.E.
DSI Staff Structural Engineer
22 January, 2009

Minnesota Board of AELSLAG&ID
85 East 7th Place, suite 160
St. Paul, Minnesota  55101

To Ms. Lynette DuFresne:

During the course of finalizing plans for the Church of Christ Scientist, it was brought to my attention that my Minnesota Registration as an Architect had lapsed. I received this information while out of the Country and visiting family in London. Upon returning to the U.S. I took the necessary steps to reinstate the License and paid the late fee associated with the late date of renewal.

I had moved my office in November of 2007 and found out that the postal services standard for forwarding mail is now six months instead of one year. It can be renewed again within the one year time frame. I did not receive a renewal notification and overlooked the fact that my license was up for renewal. This was definitely my fault for not notifying the Board of change of address for my business at the time of the move, but was entirely a simple oversight.

As per your request, I am submitting for your review:

1) copies of certified plans, correspondence, invoices and a varied number of proposals to the Church of Christ Scientist

2) Copies of my letterhead; I do not advertise and to my knowledge other than the Church of Christ Scientist did not send out materials during this time.

3) Copy of my business card for your review.

4) I have neither written nor published any professional articles during that time.

5) The only other project that was current during that time was the Pinnacle Building in Minneapolis. This project started construction in January of 2008 and was under construction during this time. I performed Construction Contract Administration. (Owner Nic Thomley 612.730.3592).

If you should require additional information or would like to discuss any of the enclosed information with me, please feel free to contact me at 612.670.0358.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jerry W. Anderson
Jamb Architects, Inc.
A. Prefinished metal flashing and keepers (copper to match existing)
B. Prefinished gutters and downspouts (copper to match existing)
C. Existing Brick
D. New Brick (to match existing)
E. New or existing trim – painted (to match existing)
F. Prefinished aluminum louver vents (w/ insect screens)
G. 340# fiberglass reinforced asphalt shingles
H. Existing stucco finish
I. 1” stucco finish (texture & color to match existing stucco)
J. Precast concrete splashblocks

* Verify all colors, textures, finishes and material selections with Owner prior to application.
REMOVE EXIST. CAP FLASHING
SECRET IF W. " develops a HULL THE ANG. EXIST. OR NEW WALL PLATE 2 1/2" X 1" BEAD ANG. 2 1/2" O.C.

SEE OTHER SECTION FOR ROOF CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING LAMINATED WD. BEAM

SECTION
1/8" = 1'-0"
The fabricator shall verify the 3-dimensional coordinates of the column top flange and weld it to the fabricated column. The top flange shall be checked for concentricity with the column axis. The weld shall be inspected for penetration, fusion, and outward appearance.

Expansion bolts

The expansion bolts shall be used for the foundation to resist the vertical load from the column and the horizontal load from the wind. The expansion bolts shall be placed in the foundation at the designated locations and shall be tightened to the specified torque. The foundation bolts shall be marked with the manufacturer's name and model number for identification.

Coordination with architectural drawings

The structural engineer shall verify the compatibility of the structural design with the architectural drawings. Any discrepancies or conflicts shall be resolved through mutual agreement.

New work in connection with existing construction

The structural engineer shall verify the compatibility of the new construction with the existing structural design. Any discrepancies or conflicts shall be resolved through mutual agreement.

Shop drawings

Shop drawings shall be submitted for review and approval by the owner or the architect. The drawings shall include details of the fabrication and installation of all components, including bolts, plates, and welds. The shop drawings shall be submitted in accordance with the project specifications and shall be reviewed by the owner or the architect for approval.
July 8, 2009

Mr. Jerry Anderson
JAMB Architects
Post Office Box 310
Forest Lake, Minnesota 55025

RE: Jerry Anderson, File No. 2009-0029

Dear Mr. Anderson:

Please be informed that the Minnesota Board of Architecture, Engineering, Land Surveying, Landscape Architecture, Geoscience, and Interior Design ("Board") is continuing its investigation in the above referenced matter. Originally, it had come to the attention of the Board that you may have practiced architecture without a license and held yourself out as an Architect in the State of Minnesota, by signing the drawings for the Church Roof Re-Design & Replacement project for 1st Church of Christ Scientist on September 18, 2008, during the time your Architect license had lapsed. The alleged violations were for Minnesota Statutes section 326.02, subdivisions 1 and 2 (2008). In addition to the practice of architecture and holding yourself out as an Architect during the time your license lapsed, it is further alleged that you may not have conducted yourself properly as an Architect and that you may have practiced professional engineering without a license by preparing or having drawn the drawings identified as sheet S-1, on 09/18/08, for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist, Church Roof Re-Design & Replacement, of Saint Paul, Minnesota project (See Exhibit A enclosed) and that your actions may be violations of Minnesota Statutes section 326.02, subdivision 3, Minnesota Statutes section 326.03, subdivision 1, Minnesota Statutes section 326.111, subdivisions 1 and 4 (a) (1), (2), and (3) (2008) and Minnesota Rules 1805.0100, Minnesota Rules 1805.0200, subparts 1 and subparts 4 (C), and (D) (2007).
The purpose of this investigation is to determine whether or not the facts alleged are true and, if so, whether enforcement action should be initiated pursuant to Minnesota law. This investigation is authorized by Minnesota Statutes section 214.10 (2008) and Minnesota Statutes section 326.111 (2008). Enclosed are the statutes and rules the Board is empowered to enforce.

Please provide a detailed written response to these allegations on or before Wednesday, July 22, 2009. The Board specifically requests that the following information or documents be included in your written response:

a. Did you prepare/draw the plans identified as sheet S-1, dated 09/18/08, for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist – Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project in St. Paul, MN? (See enclosed Exhibit A).

b. If you prepared/drew the plans identified as sheet S-1, dated 09/18/08, for the for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist – Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project in St. Paul, MN (See enclosed Exhibit A), did a licensed Minnesota Professional Engineer review them? If so, please specify the name and license number of the licensed Minnesota Professional Engineer who reviewed these particular plans. Also, specify the date when you prepared/drew the plans and the date the licensed Professional Engineer reviewed them.

c. Did [blank] prepare/draw the plans identified as sheet S-1, dated 09/18/08, for the for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist – Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project in St. Paul, MN (See enclosed Exhibit A)? If not, please provide the name, address, and phone number of the person who did prepare/draw these plans. If you drew the plans, did you and [blank] have an agreement or understanding that you would draw the plans instead of [blank] personally sign and certify the drawings as a Professional Engineer, on the plans/drawings identified as sheet S-1, dated 09/18/08, for the for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist – Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project in St. Paul, MN (See enclosed Exhibit A)? If so, state the date when [blank] did so. If not, please provide the name, address and phone number of the person who signed and certified them, the date when the signing and certifying was done, and state whether the signature was handwritten or made using a stamp of [blank] signature.

d. Did [blank] give you his permission to use his Professional Engineer’s certification on the drawings, for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist – Church Roof
Re-design & Replacement project in St. Paul, MN (See enclosed Exhibit A)? Did give you his permission to sign his name on the drawings, for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist-Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project in St. Paul, MN (See enclosed Exhibit A), and if so, was the permission for you to place a handwritten signature or use a stamp of signature?

f. Did you have an agreement or an understanding that you could prepare or draw the “Roof Framing Plan”, identified as sheet S-1, dated 09/18/08, for the 1st Church of Christ - Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project in St. Paul, MN (see enclosed Exhibit A) and that would review, sign, and certify them? If you prepared the drawings on the original of enclosed Exhibit A, did actually review the drawings and, if so, when?

g. Did you have an agreement or an understanding that you could prepare ‘structural design plans’ on projects other than the 1st Church of Christ Scientist-Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project, and that would review them? Did you have an agreement or an understanding that you could prepare ‘structural design plans’ on projects other than the 1st Church of Christ Scientist-Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project, and that you had permission to use his Professional Engineer’s certification and place his signature (handwritten or stamped) on the drawings you prepared as it relates to the practice of professional engineering?

h. Did you pay any money or other form of compensation in exchange for his permission to use his Professional Engineer’s certification and place his signature on the drawings identified as sheet S-1, dated 09/18/08, for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist - Church Roof Re-design & Replacement project in St. Paul, MN (see enclosed Exhibit A)? If so, how much money did you pay him? If a form of compensation other than money was provided to state specifically the nature and extent/amount of the compensation.

Please include File Number 2009-0029 on all correspondence. Of course, you may include any additional information or documents that you believe will explain your position.

Information provided to the Board or to the Office of the Attorney General as part of an active investigation is confidential pursuant to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes section 13.41 (2006). Such information is for the use of the Board and the Attorney General in evaluating the complaint. In accordance with
statutes, rules, and professional standards governing legal action, information provided to the Board and the Attorney General may, in some circumstances, be disclosed to certain other persons or entities, including but not limited to the Office of Administrative Hearings and appellate courts. Thus, this information may thereby become public data. Please read the enclosed Tennessen Warning.

Your cooperation is requested. Should you have any questions, please contact me by dialing (651) 757-1510.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lynette DuFresne
Investigator

Enclosure:  
Minnesota Statues 326.02 – 326.15 (2008)
Minnesota Rules 1800 and 1805 (2007)
Exhibit A
Tennessen Warning
Filing of a Complaint Brochure
WEST ELEVATION

A. Prefinished metal flashing and trim (copper to match existing)
B. Prefinished metal soffit (copper to match existing)
C. Heel of Roof
D. New Brick (to match existing)
E. New or existing trim — galvanized (to match existing)
F. Predrilled aluminum J-plate vents (not present premise)
G. 3400 fiberglass reinforced asphalt shingles
H. Existing stone floors
I. 1" stone finish (texture & color to match existing stonework)
J. Prevent concrete splashblocks

* Verify all colors, textures, finishes and materials selections with Owner prior to application

FIRST
SUBMITTAL
A. Prefinished sandblasted and impregnated (copper to match existing)
B. Prefinished grays and downspouts (copper to match existing)
C. Existing Brick
D. New Brick (to match existing)
E. New or existing grays -- painted (to match existing)
F. Prefinished aluminum, painted vents (of same colors)
G. 1" Hungover瓦ched asphalt shingles
H. Raised step finish
I. 1" stone finish (brown & color to match existing stone)
J. Nature, Versatex shingles

* Verify all colors, textures, finishes and materials related to owner prior to application
July 24, 2009

The Minnesota State Board of AELSLAG & ID
85 East 7th Place, Suite 160
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

Attention: Ms Lynette DuFresne
Reference: File No. 2009-0029

Dear Ms. DuFresne:

Please find the enclosed answers to your request for information in the same order it appears in your letter.

a. Yes, I did draw the plan. As has been our relationship for over twenty years of professional practice, [name redacted] conducts the engineering and I act as his draftsman in preparing the work under his direction for his review and eventual certification. It should be noted that [name redacted] checked the loading for the existing footings on this particular project as it relates to span of the trusses, I prepared a framing plan for the purpose of obtaining bids, and the final design, certification and calculations are to be provided by the truss manufacturer as specified in section 9. PRE-ENGINEERED WOOD TRUSSES.

b. The plans were prepared on September 18, 2008. They were picked up by the Owner’s representative, Mr. Tim Tacheny for the Churches review and comment. I was headed out of town for 12 days and Mr. Tacheny knew the final Engineering work was not complete. [name redacted] was to complete this work while I was gone so that we could finalize the project on my return. [name redacted] ran the calculations during my absence, I cannot tell you the exact date, but it was between 9/19/09 and 10/02/09. He informed me that Mr. Tacheny had picked up copies of his calculations, etc. while I was gone as he was in a hurry for the building permit.

c. [name redacted] did not draw the plans for the 1st Church of Christ Scientist, sheet S-1. The framing plan was discussed with [name redacted] and prepared for [name redacted] review and approval by Jerry W. Anderson. [name redacted] and I have always agreed that he would do the engineering work and I would draft the plans for his review and approval. Please see item a.

d. [name redacted] did eventually sign and certify the work for the Church. It was my understanding that that his original calculations were either misplaced or inadvertently taken with the original drawings by Mr. Tacheny while I was out of town. Once Mr. Berg filed the complaint, I tried for some time to help [name redacted] retrieve the original Church plans so he could recalculate the loads for the existing footings. This process was somewhat complicated by the fact that our contact at the Church had been removed from the Project. I finally contacted Mrs. Kathy Furch of
d. the Church to again obtain copies of the original plans for use. It was now the middle of February and I again ran calculations for the truss loads on the existing footings. I know that I signed and forwarded copies to Mr. Frank Berg and had him copy me for my files. The original signature on sheet S-1 was a sticker given to me some time ago by . I assume that the signature on his 02/21/09 calculations is original.

e. Mr. Tacheny was supposed to forward copies of the work to for his engineering input, review and calculations while I was out of town. My understanding is that Mr. Tacheny attempted to obtain a building permit without the Engineering work being completed. I provided Mr. Tacheny with two separate proposals for the work at the Church. He gave me the go ahead for the drawing phase without the use of field as-built verification or design work. I had informed Mr. Tacheny that final engineering would be required to obtain a permit and that the work should be completed during my absence. I spoke with regarding this work and he indicated that he could have it finished before my return. However, Mr. Tacheny turned the plans into the City prior to obtaining the final engineering review. I placed a signature (sticker) on the drawing anticipating that he would be reviewing the final project details and framing plan as well as confirming his load calculations.

f. Yes, we agreed that I would prepare the drawing and he would review and prepare calculations for the existing footing loads. I had also discussed with him the load placement for the trusses and whether the existing roof could be left in-place to help keep the Church weather-tight during the construction. told me that Mr. Tacheny did come to his office while I was out of town and that he reviewed the drawings and prepared calculations for him. I met with upon my return, reviewed the work with him and prepared detail changes he requested (removal of the knee wall for bearing and bearing on plates attached to the top of the existing masonry wall - see the revised plans dated 10/03/08). He did not require any revisions to the S-1 sheet at that time and he thought Mr. Tacheny had forwarded his calculations to Mr. Frank Berg.

g. We did not agree that I would prepare Structural Design Plans on the Church or any other projects. We had an understanding that would perform all engineering work and that I would draw the plans and details for him. It was not our normal practice to use stickers for signature plates. had given me a few to use for him when timing issues arose or when he might be out of town and deadlines needed to be maintained. He always reviewed his work and provided input to me as to the final engineering work.
h. was compensated with a $250.00 payment in the nature of Services traded. Because of his health he has limited mobility and is unable to easily visit jobsites. I made a trip to one of projects to prepare field measurements and as bulits for him. My time equated very closely to his costs on the Church so we simply traded those Services.

has always been professional and thorough in our working relationship. It is my feeling that two things happened which led to this situation.

1) The fact that I was traveling did not allow for proper communications
2) The fact that Mr. Tacheny attempted to forgo the cost of Engineering or attempted to obtain a building permit without it being complete creates the appearance of wrong doing when in fact that is not the case.

If you should have any further questions or require additional information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jerry W. Anderson
AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE BY MAIL

RE: In the matter of Jerry Wayne Anderson,
ARCHITECT
License Number 13639

STATE OF MINNESOTA )
COUNTY OF RAMSEY ) ss.

Lynette DuFresne, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That at the City of St. Paul, County of Ramsey and State of Minnesota, on this the 8th day of FEBRUARY, 2010, she served the attached Stipulation and Order by depositing in the United States mail at said city and state, a true and correct copy thereof, properly enveloped, with first class and certified postage prepaid, and addressed to:

Mr. Jerry Wayne Anderson
Jamb Architects
Post Office Box 310
Forest Lake, Minnesota 55025

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
Number 7003 3110 0004 8527 5477

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this the 8th day of FEBRUARY, 2010.

Lisa Maria Detomaso
(Notary Public)