



ENGINEERS &
GEOSCIENTISTS
BRITISH COLUMBIA

IN THE MATTER OF THE *PROFESSIONAL GOVERNANCE ACT*
S.B.C. 2018, CHAPTER 47 (the “*PGA*”)

and

IN THE MATTER OF THEODORE (TED) SORENSEN, P.ENG.
ENGINEERS AND GEOSCIENTISTS BC FILE NO. T22-004

CITATION

TO: Theodore (Ted) Sorensen, P.Eng.
c/o Aron M. Bookman at Carfra Lawton LLP
395 Waterfront Crescent
Victoria, BC V8T 5K7

TAKE NOTICE that a Panel of the Discipline Committee of the Association of Engineers and Geoscientists of the Province of British Columbia, doing business as Engineers and Geoscientists BC, will meet on a date to be determined, for the purpose of conducting a discipline hearing pursuant to the *PGA*. The *Engineers and Geoscientists Act*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 116 (the “*EGA*”) was repealed and replaced by the *PGA* on February 5, 2021. While the allegations herein are made under the *EGA*, the procedures established by the *PGA* and the current Bylaws of Engineers and Geoscientists BC will be followed as far as they can be adapted to this proceeding.

AND TAKE NOTICE that in connection with an 11-storey concrete building then known as Danbrook One located at 2766 Claude Road, Langford, British Columbia [now known as the RidgeView at 2770 Claude Road, Langford, British Columbia] (the “Building”), in respect of which you were responsible for the structural design of the Building’s core and seismic elements, the allegations against you are that you acted contrary to the *EGA* as follows:

1. You demonstrated unprofessional conduct as certain aspects of the structural design of the Building's core elements (the "Building's Core Design") and of the seismic elements (the "Building's Seismic Design"), as depicted in design drawings dated June 11, 2019 (the "Structural Drawings"), do not comply with the 2012 British Columbia Building Code ("2012 BCBC") and CAN/CSA A23.3-04 Design of Concrete Structures ("CAN/CSA A23.3-04"), which standards you were obligated to meet.¹ In particular:
 - a. the flexural resistance of the core in the cantilever (North-South) direction of the Building is too high and therefore offers inadequate protection from failure in shear and the less ductile sections of the Building;
 - b. the coupled wall system in the East-West direction does not comply with the in-plane factored shear and flexural resistance requirements of the 2012 BCBC;
 - c. the embedment length for some of the header diagonal reinforcing in the Building's core is inadequate; and
 - d. the Structural Drawings contain incorrect and incomplete information regarding the seismic force resisting system used for the Building's Seismic Design, including: incorrect force reductions factors, missing header details for critical headers, and missing "typical" tie details for 8 bars.
2. The existence of the defects identified in paragraph 1 demonstrates incompetence on your part.
3. You demonstrated unprofessional conduct as you failed to undertake an adequate design process, in particular:
 - a. you failed to take the time needed to properly prepare the Building's Core Design and the Building's Seismic Design;
 - b. you failed to consider or design certain structural seismic elements located outside of the Building's core;
 - c. you failed to integrate the Building's Core Design and the Building's Seismic Design with the overall structural design for the Building that was completed by your colleague, Brian McClure, including with respect to the following elements of the Building, some of which are structural seismic elements located outside of the Building's core:

¹ Including updates No. 1 (December 2005), No. 2 (July 2007), and No. 3 (August 2009).

- i. the core footing, which is under-designed as its load and shear capacities do not meet the requirements of the 2012 BCBC;
 - ii. the overall foundation design scheme, which is inadequate to resist seismic forces;
 - iii. the long, thin gravity load walls on Level 1, which do not contain required buckling prevention ties or the required curvature capacity; and
 - iv. the gravity load columns on Levels 1, which do not contain required buckling prevention ties;
 - d. you failed to integrate your design with, or sufficiently review, the Building's architectural design, including with respect to some of the core header depth and the minimum clear height required between floors; and
 - e. in breach of Bylaw 14(b)(2), you failed to obtain or perform regular, documented checks of your own engineering work in respect of the Building's Seismic Design and the Building's Core Design, including by failing to manually check the work you performed using ETABS building analysis and design software.
4. You demonstrated unprofessional conduct when you agreed with Mr. McClure that your engineering firm would take on the structural design for the Building with Mr. McClure acting as engineer of record, despite knowing that Mr. McClure lacked the training and ability required to competently complete the structural design for the Building.

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE that you, Theodore (Ted) Sorensen, P.Eng., have the right, at your own expense, to be represented by legal counsel at the hearing by the Panel of the Discipline Committee pursuant to s. 79 of the *PGA*, and you or your legal counsel will have the full right to cross-examine all witnesses called and to call evidence in defence and reply in answer to the allegations.

[space intentionally left blank]

AND FURTHER TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to s. 78 of the *PGA*, in the event you fail to attend or remain in attendance at a discipline hearing held under s. 75 of the *PGA*, the Panel of the Discipline Committee may, if satisfied that you have been notified of the hearing, proceed with the hearing in your absence and make any order that the Panel of the Discipline Committee could have made in your presence.

DATED this 31 day of May, 2022.

The Investigation Committee of the Association
of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of
the Province of British Columbia

<original signed by>

Per: Peter Helland, P.Eng.
Chair, Investigation Committee