

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR BOARD OF ARCHITECTURE, ENGINEERING, LAND SURVEYING,
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, GEOSCIENCE, AND INTERIOR DESIGN**

In the Matter of Professional Engineer License
of Charles Marohn

**CHARLES L. MAROHN, Jr. SECOND
DECLARATION**

Charles L. Marohn, Jr., of the City of Brainerd, County of Crow Wing, State of Minnesota,
being first duly sworn, states and testifies as follows:

1. I am the Respondent in the above captioned contested case.
2. The Board did not provide me of the Complaint by Mr. Dixon until July 24, 2020. I have reviewed the letters the Board produced in this proceeding dated March 5, 2020, and April 29, 2020. I did not receive these letters because these letters were sent to my old address. However, the Dixon Complaint included Strong Towns' street address and website address which contains Strong Towns' street address and phone number. The Board could have contacted me at Strong Towns.
3. If the Board had provided me a copy of the David Dixon Complaint prior to me submitting my reinstatement application, I would still have responded that I had not represented myself as a professional engineer while unlicensed. However, I would have provided an explanation of my answer, that the information on my website and elsewhere online was not in connection with any work, or solicitation of work, as a professional engineer.
4. I had no intent to mislead the board in my reinstatement application, nor would there have been any reason to do so. My honest interpretation of the reinstatement application

language, just like my interpretation of the prohibition on using the term “professional engineer” when not licensed, is that these requirements and prohibitions are in connection with the practice or offer to practice of engineering services. I have not practiced or offered to practice professional engineering in approximately a decade, so I did not, and do not believe, I had violated Minn. Stat. §326.02, nor been untruthful to the Board in my reinstatement application.

5. When I did obtain the Dixon Complaint, I spoke to Mr. Dixon personally, and asked why he had not informed me that my licensure had lapsed before he filed a complaint. Mr. Dixon stated that he did not inform me that my licensure had lapsed because he did not want to give me the opportunity to correct the licensure issue before the Board had a chance to punish me.
6. I declare under penalty of perjury that everything I have stated in this document is true and correct.

DATED: February 4, 2022.

s/Charles L. Marohn, Jr.
Charles L. Marohn, Jr.