

**IN THE MATTER OF
THE PROFESSIONAL GOVERNANCE ACT, S.B.C. 2018, c. 47**

and

IN THE MATTER OF STEPHEN PETROVICH, P. ENG.

DETERMINATION OF THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

Date and Place of Hearing:	Joint Submission provided November 18, 2025
Discipline Committee Panel:	Roz Nielsen, P.Eng., Chair Colin Smith, P.Eng. Gerald Matier
Counsel for Engineers and Geoscientists BC:	Yadwigha Le Vaillant
On his own behalf:	Stephen Petrovich, P. Eng.
Counsel for the Panel:	Tonie Beharrell
Date of Decision	February 6, 2026

Background

1. This panel of the Discipline Committee (the “Panel”) of the Association of the Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of the Province of British Columbia doing business as Engineers and Geoscientists BC (“EGBC”) was convened to make a decision relating to Stephen Petrovich, P.Eng. (the “Respondent”) under section 76 of the *Professional Governance Act*, S.B.C. 2018, c. 47 (the “PGA”) and section 10.8 of the EGBC Bylaws. The basis of the proceeding is that the Respondent is subject to discipline in other jurisdictions for his conduct as a professional engineer.
2. The parties have made joint submissions about the appropriate disciplinary order that should be made by the Panel given the findings and disciplinary action taken in other jurisdictions. The Panel accepts the joint submission of the parties and issues the order as outlined below.

Regulatory Framework

3. Under s. 76 of the PGA, and as required by section 10.8 of the EGBC Bylaws, where the Registrar of EGBC learns that a different governing body has found that a registrant committed an act that may constitute conduct of concern, the Registrar must provide a written report to the Investigation Committee.
4. If the Investigation Committee considers that the registrant’s act may constitute conduct of concern, and it is in the public interest to proceed with the discipline process, the Investigation Committee, without issuing a citation, must refer the matter to the Discipline Committee for the Discipline Committee to consider whether action should be taken pursuant to section 76 of the PGA.
5. “Conduct of concern” is defined in s. 76(1) to mean professional misconduct, conduct unbecoming a registrant, or incompetent performance of duties undertaken while engaged in the regulated practice.
6. Section 76(2) of the PGA provides:

A discipline committee of a regulatory body may make an order under section 75(5) respecting a registrant without issuing a citation under section 66(1)(d) ... or conducting a hearing under section 75, if the discipline committee learns that a different governing body has found, or the registrant has admitted to a different governing body, that the registrant committed an act that, in the opinion of the discipline committee, would constitute concern under this Act.

7. Thus, s. 76(2) authorizes the Discipline Committee to issue a discipline order on the basis of a discipline decision made in another jurisdiction.

Factual Basis

8. The Respondent has been a registrant of EGBC since March 2, 2015. In the EGBC registrant database, the Respondent's industry of practice is listed as "Consulting Engineer: Structural" and his self-declared areas of practice are: "Structural: Residential," "Structural: Bldg Design/Const-Wood," and "Structural: Bldg Design/Const-Concrete."
9. In addition to EGBC, the Respondent is currently a registrant in the following jurisdictions: Engineers Geoscientists Manitoba ("EGM"), the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta ("APEGA"), the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan ("APEGS"), and Professional Engineers Ontario ("PEO").
10. The Respondent was previously a registrant of Engineers Nova Scotia ("ENS") and Engineers and Geoscientists New Brunswick ("APEGNB"); however, he is not currently registered with either.
11. The Respondent was the subject of a complaint received by EGBC in 2018, resulting in an investigation and subsequent disciplinary action in April 2020. This action pertained to engineering services relating to the design and installation of screw piles for a new deck at a residential property. The Respondent agreed his conduct in relation to the allegations amounted to unprofessional conduct, incompetence, or negligence. As a result, the Respondent entered into a consent order with EGBC that imposed a three-month suspension followed by a general practice review within six months of

resuming to practice. The Respondent was also required to successfully complete the EGBC Professional Practice Examination and pay \$2,000 towards legal and investigative costs. At that time, the Respondent also entered into a voluntary agreement with APEGNB to suspend his license until the terms of the EGBC consent order were fulfilled. The Respondent fulfilled the terms of the order to the satisfaction of EGBC.

12. In addition, the Respondent has been the subject of the following disciplinary decisions in other jurisdictions, all of which he reported to EGBC.

2021 EGM Decision

13. On February 17, 2021, the Respondent reached a voluntary agreement with EGM in relation to a geotechnical report he prepared for a retaining wall system at a private resident in Winnipeg, Manitoba (the "2021 EGM Decision").

14. In the 2021 EGM Decision, the Respondent consented to:

- a. the registration of a conviction and issuance of a charge of professional misconduct or unskilled practice;
- b. a prohibition from practicing geotechnical engineering until the investigation committee was satisfied that he had met specified conditions;
- c. undergo supervised practice by a duly licensed geotechnical engineer for a period of no less than twelve months, and
- d. submit details of all geotechnical work performed by him under the supervision period.

15. Following this decision, the Respondent entered into a voluntary agreement with ENS under which he agreed not to practice engineering in Nova Scotia until such time as the restriction prohibiting him from practicing geotechnical engineering in the 2021 EGM Decision was lifted.

2023 APEGA Decision

16. The Respondent was also the subject of a discipline order by APEGA dated November 14, 2023 (the “2023 APEGA Discipline Decision”), which:

- a. imposed a permanent practice restriction on the Respondent’s licence prohibiting him from practicing geotechnical engineering in Alberta;
- b. required him to review two APEG publications and provide written confirmation that he had reviewed and would comply with the requirements in them;
- c. required him to undertake two educational sessions within twelve months of signing the order;
- d. required him to provide a Professional Practice Management Plan for approval within six months of signing the order; and
- e. required him pay a fine of \$2,000.

2024 EGM Decision

17. On July 31, 2024, the Respondent reached a voluntary agreement with EGM (the “2024 EGM Decision”), in which he consented to:

- a. the registration of a conviction and issuance on a charge of professional misconduct or unskilled practice; and
- b. the imposition of a permanent practice restriction prohibiting him from practicing geotechnical engineering in Manitoba.

Findings

18. The Panel accepts the parties’ joint submission that the conduct detailed above constitutes “conduct of concern” which has been admitted to a different governing body. Pursuant to s. 76(2) of the PGA, the Panel agrees that it is appropriate to issue a disciplinary order on the basis of discipline issued in another jurisdiction.

19. In their joint submission, the Parties have also agreed on the appropriate penalty. In the Panel's view such submissions, while not determinative, are entitled to some weight.

20. The PGA does not explicitly outline the basis of which such discipline should be assessed. However, consistent with the PGA as a whole, the general duty of regulatory bodies is the protection of the public interest with respect to the exercise of the profession: PGA, s. 22(1). In addition, the previous legislation, the *Engineers and Geoscientists Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996 c. 116, directed that such orders should be "equivalent" to those made in the other province. The Panel considers that these are important factors to consider in the determination of appropriate penalty.

21. In this case, the parties submit, and the Panel accepts, that their proposed order is similar in nature to that flowing from the 2023 APEGA Decision, and appropriately protects the public interest.

Conclusion and Order

22. The Panel agrees that the proposed order is appropriate in all of the circumstances. Having reviewed the materials submitted, and on the basis of the parties' joint submission, the Panel issues an order on the following terms:

- a. Mr. Petrovich must provide written notice to Engineers and Geoscientists BC that he has, at his own expense, completed the Professional Engineering and Geoscience in BC Online Seminar offered by Engineers and Geoscientists BC by 60 days from the date of this decision. If Mr. Petrovich fails to complete the seminar by April 6, 2026, his registration with Engineers and Geoscientists BC will be suspended until he has completed the seminar.
- b. Mr. Petrovich is prohibited from acting as the Geotechnical Engineer of Record in British Columbia, or practicing geotechnical engineering except under the Direct Supervision of a qualified Professional Registrant, as those terms are defined in Engineers and Geoscientists BC's Guide to the Standard for Direct Supervision, as may be amended

from time to time (the "Practice Restriction"). If Mr. Petrovich seeks to lift or modify the Practice Restriction, he must:

- (i) As a condition of such application provide written notice to Engineers and Geoscientists BC that he, at his own expense:
 1. Completed the Professional Practice Guidelines: Geotechnical Engineering Services for Building Projects webinar offered by Engineers and Geoscientists BC; and
 2. Completed at least one of the following online courses, provided by EPIC online:
 - a. Soil Engineering - Fundamentals and Applications;
 - b. Analysis and Design of Earth Retaining Structures; or
 - c. Geotechnical Engineering Workshop - Fundamentals and Applications or in the alternative, obtain prior written approval from Engineers and Geoscientists BC to take an equivalent course or courses.
- (ii) After the successful completion of the courses set out in paragraph 2(a) above, Mr. Petrovich may apply for reinstatement of full practice rights and request that Engineers and Geoscientists BC's Credentials Committee lift the Practice Restriction (the "Competency Application").
- (iii) In partial fulfilment of the Competency Application, Mr. Petrovich must report his updated experience and competencies in the area of geotechnical engineering, completed after the effective date of this Consent Order

and under Direct Supervision, through Engineers and Geoscientists BC's Competency-Based Assessment system, using the 10 technical competencies with indicators and providing registered professional engineers practicing in the geotechnical engineering discipline as Validators, as described in the Engineers and Geoscientists BC Competency Assessment Guide, as may be amended from time to time. The validated competency assessment will be assessed by geotechnical engineering Assessors, as described in Engineers and Geoscientists BC's Competency Assessment Guide.

- (iv) After Mr. Petrovich's Competency Application is reviewed by the Validators and Assessors, Engineers and Geoscientists BC's Credentials Committee will review Mr. Petrovich's Competency Application. An interview may be required to further assess Mr. Petrovich's competency to return to full practice rights. If the Credentials Committee is of the opinion that Mr. Petrovich is competent to practice geotechnical engineering, the Credentials Committee may lift the Practice Restriction and reinstate full practice rights.

Dated: February 6, 2026

<original signed by>

Roz Nielsen, P.Eng., Chair

<original signed by>

Colin Smith, P.Eng.

<original signed by>

Gerry Matier