IN THE MATTER OF ***THE ENGINEERING AND GEOSCIENCE PROFESSIONS ACT*** AND
IN THE MATTER OF AN INVESTIGATION RESPECTING ***ROBBIE OLSON, P. ENG.***

DECISION AND ORDER

MEMBERS OF THE HEARING PANEL:

Dan Bonnet, P. Eng – Chair
John Breakey – Public Appointee
Daryl Andrew, P. Eng.
Robert Court, P.Eng.
Ian Fleming, P.Eng.

COUNSEL FOR INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE:
Colin Ouellette

COUNSEL FOR MEMBER:
Ronald Jalmanzar

COUNSEL FOR THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE:
Allison Graham

REPORT OF THE HEARING PANEL APPOINTED AND EMPOWERED BY THE DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND GEOSCIENTISTS OF SASKATCHEWAN (APEGS) PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 33, 34, AND 35 OF *THE ENGINEERING AND GEOSCIENCE PROFESSIONS ACT*, CHAPTER E-9.3 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1996 as amended (HEREIN REFERRED TO AS THE "ACT"), AND SECTION 22(4) OF *THE ENGINEERING AND GEOSCIENCE PROFESSIONS REGULATORY BYLAWS, 1997* as amended (HEREIN REFERRED TO AS THE "BYLAWS"), TO HOLD A HEARING INTO THE CONDUCT OF ROBBIE OLSON, P. ENG.

I. Introduction

1. On December 12, 2025, a hearing panel of the Discipline Committee (the "**Discipline Committee**") of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan ("**APEGS**") held a hearing concerning allegations of professional misconduct and/or incompetence by Mr. Robbie Olson, P. Eng. Mr. Olson has been a member of APEGS since July 14, 2010 and was a member of APEGS at all material times.

2. At the outset of the hearing, counsel for the Investigation Committee filed a Joint Documents Book as Exhibit 1 before the Discipline Committee. Counsel for Mr. Olson advised that Mr. Olson consented to the Joint Documents Book. That Joint Documents Book included the following:

   a. Notice of Hearing dated November 27, 2025 (Tab A);
   b. Report of the Investigation Committee dated May 16, 2025 (Tab B);
   c. Report of the Mediator (Pre-Hearing Conference) dated October 23, 2025 (Tab C);
   d. Agreed Statement of Facts (Tab D) and referenced exhibits (Tab F(1)-(8));
   e. Joint Submissions on Penalty (Tab E); and
   f. Document List (Tab F) containing:
      1) APEGS Admin documents including *inter alia*: Threshold Review Report and Written Complaint;
      2) Cornwall Project Documents;
      3) Rochdale Project Documents;
      4) Lemberg Project Documents;
      5) Southside Project Documents;
      6) Chaplin Project Documents;
      7) Peepeekisis Project Documents; and
      8) Hudsons' Bay Project Documents.

   The parties filed Joint Submissions to the Discipline Committee (the "**Joint Submissions**") which included a proposed sanction and made submissions supporting that sanction to the Discipline Committee.

3. The Notice of Hearing, located at Tab A, sets out the particulars of the allegations against Mr. Olson as follows:

Charge 1: Robbie Olson, P.Eng., operating as Olson Engineering Inc., demonstrated professional incompetence in the design of foundations that require application of Limit States Design, including but not limited to the design of screw pile foundations and/or driven open ended steel pipe pile foundations, contrary to the provisions of section 29 of the Act, in that his actions display a lack of knowledge, skill or judgment and/or a disregard for the welfare of the public.

Charge 2A: Robbie Olson, P.Eng., operating as Olson Engineering Inc., demonstrated professional misconduct by acting in a manner which is harmful to the best interests of the public, tends to harm the standard of the profession, and/or which is a breach of the Act or Bylaws, contrary to section 30 of the Act in the design of foundations that require application of Limit States Design, including but not limited to the design of screw pile foundations and/or driven open ended steel pipe pile foundations.

Charge 2B: Robbie Olson, P.Eng., operating as Olson Engineering Inc., did not hold paramount the safety, health and welfare of the public, contrary to subsection 20(2)(a) of the Regulatory Bylaws in the design of foundations that require application of Limit States Design, including but not limited to the design of screw pile foundations and/or driven open ended steel pipe pile foundations.

Charge 2C: Robbie Olson, P.Eng., operating as Olson Engineering Inc., did not practise in a careful and diligent manner contrary to subsection 20(2)(b) of the Regulatory Bylaws in the design of foundations that require application of Limit States Design, including but not limited to the design of screw pile foundations and/or driven open ended steel pipe pile foundations.

4. These charges were further particularized as follows:

Particulars:

1. Demonstrating a lack of knowledge about what load and/or capacity values are to be considered when using Limit States Design.

2. Demonstrating a lack of knowledge that the 2015 National Building Code of Canada requires application of Limit States Design.

3. Demonstrating an inability to explain the basic principles of Limit States Design and how to execute Limit States Design when provided with factored and unfactored loads considering the ultimate pile capacities and corresponding resistance factors for checking ultimate and serviceability limit state conditions.

4. Failing to obtain clarification of information from other professionals when necessary to apply Limit States Design.

Project Specific Particulars:

Rochdale Project:

5. Designing the screw piles for the Rochdale Project without using Limit States Design as required by the 2015 National Building Code of Canada (NBC 2015) and/or the site-specific geotechnical report

Hudson Bay Project:

8. Designing the screw piles for the Hudson Bay Project without using Limits States Design as required by the 2015 National Building Code of Canada (NBC 2015).

9. Designing the screw piles for the Hudson Bay Project using a geotechnical report completed for another construction project 1.5 KM away, which was not prepared for the design of the foundation of a tower.

Peepeekisis Project

10. Designing the driven open ended steel pipe piles without using Limit States Design as required by the 2015 National Building Code of Canada (NBC 2015) and/or the site-specific geotechnical report.

11. Designing driven open ended steel pipe piles which were undersized based on required values when calculated in accordance with the recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical report. The factored resistance of the piles as compared to the factored pile loads were not adequate in tensile nor compression.

Southside Project

12. Designing the driven open ended steel pipe piles without using Limit States Design as required by the 2015 National Building Code of Canada (NBC 2015) and/or the site-specific geotechnical reports;

13. Utilizing bored concrete pile recommendations from the geotechnical engineer in designing the driven open ended steel pipes without having recommendations for the design of an open-ended steel pipes foundation and failing to factor the loads when preparing the foundation design.

5. At the outset of the hearing, it was confirmed that the Discipline Committee was properly constituted. Mr. Olson, through his legal counsel, waived a reading of the charges and entered pleas of guilty to the allegations as set out in the Notice of Hearing. Counsel further indicated that an Agreed Statement of Facts and Joint Submission were being filed and put forward in Tabs D and E.

6. An Order was issued by the Discipline Committee (as outlined below) on April 8, 2026 by email, with reasons to follow. The within report constitutes those reasons.

II. Evidence

7. At the outset of the hearing, the following Agreed Statement of Facts was filed as Tab D with the Discipline Committee:

Background:

1. Robbie Olson, P. Eng. has been a member of APEGS since July 10, 2014, and was a member at all material times, holding registration number 16128.

2. Mr. Olson holds a Permission to Consult with his field of practice listed as Mechanical/Structural Engineering: Foundations, Oilfield Drilling and Servicing Structures.

3. Mr. Olson is registered as the Official Representative and Responsible Engineer for Olson Engineering Inc.

4. Olson Engineering Inc. obtained a Certificate of Authorization on September 17, 2014, under registration number 31763.

5. At all material times, Mr. Olson was a consultant at, and operating as, Olson Engineering Inc.

6. On November 12, 2024, Mr. Olson agreed to an Undertaking requiring him to refrain from practicing Limits States Design.

7. Mr. Olson has completed the following courses to further his engineering education and competency:
   (a) November 18, 2024, Helical Piles – Performance and Design, EPIC Educational Program Innovations Center;
   (b) October 24-27, 2023, Web Series: Foundation Engineering: From Site Investigation to Design, EPIC Educational Program Innovations Center;
   (c) December 12-13, 2022, Analysis and Design of Earth Retaining Structures, EPIC Educational Program Innovations Center;
   (d) November 1-3, 2021, Welding Design and Metal Fatigue for Structural Engineering, EPIC Educational Program Innovations Center;
   (e) November 12-13, 2020, Applied Soil Mechanics and Shoring Design; and
   (f) October 13, 2014 — Helical (Screw) Piles Foundation System Design Workshop (1.2 CEUs).

8. Throughout APEGS' investigation Mr. Olson has fully cooperated with APEGS.

Rochdale Project

9. The Rochdale Project was for the construction of a new three storey office building.

10. The primary structural engineer for the building, Driftstone Consulting Inc., included a pile design identifying loads for the piling contractor, Dart Services Ltd., to design the piles. A site-specific geotechnical investigation and report was also completed for the project. Pile design shop drawings were sealed by Mr. Olson for Dart Services Ltd.

11. A Building Code Engineer for the City of Regina reviewed a pile which was required to resist the largest load on the project. Drawings sealed by Mr. Olson indicated the pile had a capacity of 1085KN (compression), which could meet the needs as specified by the primary structural engineer. Upon calculation of the Building Code Engineer, however, the pile was not able to support even 25% of the load.

12. The piles were installed prior to obtaining the required permit from the City of Regina, which occurred without Mr. Olson's knowledge.

13. Mr. Olson participated in the remediation process by jointly funding the dynamic pile testing report, in collaboration with Dart Services Ltd., which was subsequently submitted to the City of Regina.

14. Upon the Building Code Engineer raising concerns, since several piles had already been installed at the time, a third party was engaged to conduct dynamic pile testing and two pile types (impacting piles 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) had inadequate capacity. A report was provided to the City of Regina, indicating the design used for the screw piles had not followed the methodology prescribed in the site-specific geotechnical investigation. Since piles were already installed, the structural design of the building was revised to reduce the loads on the piles.

15. Mr. Olson admits he did not to use the site-specific geotechnical report when preparing his design but one for a nearby project. The nearby project geotechnical report was for a different structure type, being a Sasktel Monopole. Notwithstanding this, on the shop drawings sealed by Mr. Olson referenced he used the site-specific geotechnical report.

16. When originally responding to APEGS, Mr. Olson admitted to "not completely understanding the actual loading" when his design was sealed. Mr. Olson claimed he was provided with "incomplete" pile loading by the structural engineer on whether the stated loads were ultimate or service loads and it was

identified later the drawings provided service loads requiring a 0.4 resistance factor added to the ultimate capacities of the piles.

17. Jason Parks, P.Eng. of JSP Engineering ("**JSP**") was retained by APEGS to review Mr. Olson's work on the Rochdale Project. Upon initial review, JSP's calculations indicate factored resistance of the piles when calculated in accordance with the site-specific geotechnical report are within the 20-28% range of required values, consistent with the City of Regina's initial analysis and review

18. Upon further review and after interviewing Mr. Olson, JSP determined Mr. Olson was unable to adequately explain the use of Limit States Design requirements for foundations, and the original pile design sealed by Mr. Olson was not completed using Limit States Design, notwithstanding the structural drawings did provide factored and unfactored values to be used with Limits States Design. Further, site specific pile elevation cut-offs were not noted in Mr. Olson's sealed shop drawings. Specifically, JSP confirmed Mr. Olson's design methodology omitted a required 0.4 resistance factor which was provided in both geotechnical reports. Using limit states design principles, JSP confirmed Mr. Olson's provided pile capacities were overstated by a factor of 2.5 times.

19. JSP also calculated the factored design resistances of the original screw piles considering the recommendations provided in the non-site specific geotechnical report prepared for the nearby Sasktel Monopole. JSP confirmed 4 of the 5 initial pile designs were inadequate with some having as little as 58% of the required capacity. Accordingly, JSP confirmed Mr. Olson's original pile design did not satisfy the Limit States Design requirements of the NBC 2015, using either geotechnical report.

Hudson Bay Project

20. The Hudson Bay Project included the design of screw piles to support a 30-metre tower for Saskatchewan Public Safety Agency in Hudson Bay, Saskatchewan. Westower Communication Ltd. prepared the drawings for this project.

21. A geotechnical investigation was completed by P. Machibroda Engineering Ltd. for a different project being proposed buildings for a Forest Protection Base at NW/-33-44-03- W2M Hudson Bay, Saskatchewan. The geotechnical investigation provided design criteria for limit states design for screw piles, but the project tower at issue was 1.5 km away from the site of the geotechnical report, and the geotechnical report was not prepared for the design of the foundation of a tower.

22. Mr. Olson designed the foundation, including the pile cap details and the screw piles to suit the loads provided on the drawings, using the geotechnical investigation prepared by P. Machibroda Engineering Ltd. which had been provided to him.

23. JSP found reliance on the non-site specific geotechnical report which was not prepared for the design of the foundation of a tower was inappropriate, and accordingly the design criteria should have been verified by a geotechnical engineer.

Peepeekisis Project

24. The Peepeekisis Project included the design of driven open ended steel pipe piles for the Peepeekisis Cree Nation new Community Hub, located at section 4 NW corner township 22 range 10 west of the second, located near Balcarres, Saskatchewan. Manasc Isaac Architects Ltd. prepared the drawings for this project with the subconsultant being Fast + Epp. Site specific geotechnical pile installation documentation and high strain dynamic pile testing was provided by P. Machibroda Engineering Ltd..

25. Mr. Olson sealed drawings concerning the design of the foundation, including the pile cap details and the driven open ended steel pipe piles to suit the loads provided on the drawings.

26. JSP reviewed Mr. Olson's design and found the pile design was in accordance with geotechnical report recommendations. However, the factored resistance of the piles as compared to the factored pile loads was not adequate in tensile nor compression. Pile P1, had a percentage difference of -4.5% above the factored compressive resistance when using the design pile embedment length. All piles were over the factored tensile pile resistance varying in percent difference from -30.0% to -44.4% when using the design pile embedment lengths. Using the actual pile embedment lengths, 40 piles out of 144 piles, were over the factored compressive pile resistance, varying in percent different from 0% to -11.1% over the factored resistance. As well, 140 piles out of 144 piles were over the factored tensile pile resistance, varying from percent difference from 0% to -56.4% over the factored resistance when using the actual pile embedment lengths.

27. In summary, JSP calculations confirm the factored resistance of the piles as compared to the factored pile loads are not adequate in tensile nor compression.

28. On April 9, 2025, Chris Wimmer (Director of Professional Standards for APEGS) wrote to Chief Francis Dieter of the Peepeekisis Cree Nation, advising of JSP's findings and recommending consultation with a professional engineer to complete the detailed analysis recommended by JSP.

Southside Project

29. The Southside Project included the design of driven open ended steel pipe piles for the proposed office building for Southside Auto Wreckers located at Highway No. 39 East R.M. of Weyburn, Saskatchewan.

30. Armor Building Systems Ltd. prepared the drawings for this project. A site-specific geotechnical investigation was completed for the project which provided design criteria for limit states design for bored concrete piles and helical steel screw piles.

31. Mr. Olson sealed drawings regarding the design of the foundation including the pile cap details and the driven open ended steel pipe piles to suit the loads provided on the drawings.

32. JSP was unable to calculate factored resistances for the piles installed for the Southside Project as the geotechnical report only provided design criteria for limits states design for bored concrete piles and helical streel screw piles.

33. JSP concluded it was not appropriate for Mr. Olson to have used a different design criteria than as stipulated in the site-specific geotechnical report.

8. Counsel for both the Investigation Committee and Mr. Olson executed the Agreed Statement of Facts.

III. Findings on Guilt

9. Upon reviewing and considering the evidence, submitted by way of the Agreed Statement of Facts, and as the Discipline Committee advised at the hearing, the Discipline Committee accepts Mr. Olson's guilty plea and finds him guilty of professional misconduct and professional incompetence as defined in *The Engineering and Geoscience Professions Act*, SS 1996, c E-9.3 [*Act*] on the charges in the Notice of Hearing and the Report of the Investigation Committee dated May 16, 2025.

10. Professional incompetence is defined in section 29 of the *Act* as follows:

> **29** Professional incompetence is a question of fact, but the display by a member of:
>
> (a) a lack of knowledge, skill or judgment; or
>
> (b) a disregard for the welfare of members of the public served by the profession;
>
> of a nature or to an extent that demonstrates that the member is unfit to continue in the practice of the profession, is professional incompetence within the meaning of this Act.

11. Professional misconduct is defined in section 30 of the *Act* as follows:

> **30** Professional misconduct is a question of fact, but any matter, conduct or thing, whether or not disgraceful or dishonourable, is professional misconduct within the meaning of this Act if:
>
> (a) it is harmful to the best interests of the public or the members;

(b) it tends to harm the standing of the profession;
(c) it is a breach of this Act or the bylaws; or
(d) it is a failure to comply with an order of the investigation committee, the discipline committee or the council.

12. Regarding Charge 1, the Discipline Committee finds that Mr. Olson committed professional incompetence within the meaning of s. 29 of the *Act*. Mr. Olson's conduct demonstrated a lack of knowledge and skill relating to Limit State Designs, including in relation to load and/or capacity values, what the 2015 National Building Code of Canada requires and the basic principles and execution of Limit State Designs. The Discipline Committee is also satisfied that this lack of knowledge and skill was of a nature and to an extent that demonstrates the member is unfit to continue to practice in this aspect of the profession.

13. Regarding Charges 2A, 2B and 2C, the Discipline Committee finds that Mr. Olson committed professional misconduct with the meaning of s. 30 of the *Act*. The Discipline Committee finds that Mr. Olson prepared designs in non-compliance with the 2015 National Building Code, in disregard of information and recommendations in geotechnical reports, and which were undersized based on required values. It is satisfied that this conduct amounts to a breach of Mr. Olson's obligations pursuant to the Code of Ethics in s. 20 of the *Engineering and Geoscience Professions Regulatory Bylaws, 1997* (particularly s. 20(2)(a) and (b)), such that it is professional misconduct pursuant to s. 30(c) of the *Act*. It is also satisfied that this is conduct that is harmful to the best interests of the public and that tends to harm the standing of the profession such that it is also professional misconduct pursuant to s. 30(a) and (b) of the *Act*.

IV. Consideration of Joint Submission

14. Having accepted that Mr. Olson is guilty of professional misconduct and professional incompetence, consideration then turned to an assessment of the appropriate penalty. Counsel for both the Investigation Committee and Mr. Olson confirmed that Tab E of Exhibit 1 represented their joint submission regarding penalty (the "**Joint Submission**"). The Joint Submission seeks the following:

a. Mr. Olson, P. Eng., will receive a written reprimand for professional incompetence, professional misconduct, and breaches of the Code of Ethics.

b. Mr. Olson, P. Eng. shall successfully complete the APEGS "Annual Ethics Refresher" modules 1-6 and "The Law and Professional Practice in Engineering and Geoscience" courses within 6 months of approval of the Order by the Discipline Committee.

c. Mr. Olson, P. Eng. shall practice under a licence restriction wherein he is not permitted to practice structural engineering other than conducting field reviews and stamping as-built drawings. Subject to the following conditions:

i. After advising the Registrar of his successful completion of the University of Saskatchewan, College of Engineering course "CE 321 — Structural Systems and Materials" (or equivalent as approved by the Registrar), the Registrar shall amend the terms of the restricted licence to permit supervised practice of structural engineering;

ii. Upon amendment to the restricted licence by the Registrar to permit supervised practice of structural engineering, Mr. Olson may practice structural engineering under the supervision of a professional engineer approved by the Registrar of APEGS subject to the following conditions:

1. When working under supervision, professional work product completed by Mr. Olson must be reviewed and authenticated by the supervisor;

2. When working under supervision, recommendations or advice by Mr. Olson relating to structural engineering must be in the form of professional work product directly supervised by the supervisor;

3. The supervisor will provide a report to the Registrar each quarter respecting all structural engineering projects undertaken by Mr. Olson in that quarter. Reports from the supervisor shall include for each project a summary of the project, a description of Mr. Olson's role and responsibilities on the project, and a list of all professional work product related to the project where Mr. Olson was the primary contributor, and the supervisor's assessment of Mr. Olson's work on the project;

4. An approved supervisor must undertake with APEGS to provide the required direct supervision, control, and reporting; and

5. All costs related to the supervision and required reporting shall be at the expense of Mr. Olson.

d. Upon Mr. Olson providing:

i. Proof satisfactory to the Registrar he has completed 1000 hours of supervised work in the area of structural engineering;

ii. Confirmation from the supervisor that Mr. Olson has completed the requisite hours; and

iii. Endorsement from the supervisor that he or she opines Mr. Olson has demonstrated competency in structural engineering

Mr. Olson may request that his licence restrictions be removed by the Registrar, which will be subject to the Registrar being satisfied Mr. Olson has demonstrated sufficient competency to practice structural engineering without supervision.

e. Mr. Olson's restricted status shall be reflected in APEGS' Member Directory.

f. If Mr. Olson breaches any timelines of any requirement set out in the Order Mr. Olson shall be suspended from the practice of engineering until the requirements are met. Mr. Olson may apply to the Registrar for an extension prior to any noted deadline.

g. A fine of $5,000.

h. The written decision of the Discipline Committee will be published on the APEGS website, in *The Professional Edge*, and otherwise as deemed appropriate by APEGS, with Mr. Olson identified by name.

15. In support of the Joint Submissions, counsel for the Investigation Committee and Mr. Olson made submissions respecting the law that binds the Discipline Committee when considering a joint submission and the various factors that support the reasonableness of this Joint Submission.

16. After reviewing the Joint Submission and hearing from counsel, the Discipline Committee posed questions to counsel for the Investigation Committee and Mr. Olson in regard to the suitability and rationale of the proposed penalty. The Discipline Committee had several questions arising out of the Joint Submissions. The Discipline Committee permitted counsel to respond to these questions in writing when the hearing had to be adjourned due to the unavailability of counsel. Counsel subsequently provided these responses to the Discipline Committee by email. The Discipline Committee thanks counsel for their cooperation in providing these responses and for their provision of written submissions and cases to support the Joint Submission at the hearing.

17. The Discipline Committee then considered the Joint Submission in view of the law. The Discipline Committee noted the decision in *Camgoz v College of Physicians and Surgeons (Sask)*, 1993 CanLII 8952 (Sask QB), which outlines factors to be taken into consideration when implementing a penalty.

18. The Discipline Committee also considered the legal effect of the Joint Submission. It determined that the law allows it to depart from a joint submission only where the proposed sanction would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or whether it is not otherwise in the public interest. In *Investigation Committee of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan v Varma* (11 July 2024) [*Varma*], this Committee previously summarized the law on this point as follows (at para 14):

> 14. The Discipline Committee also considered the legal effect of the Joint Submission. At law, joint submissions should not be disregarded unless there are good or cogent reasons for doing so: *Rault v Law Society of Saskatchewan*, 2009 SKCA 81. In the criminal context, the Supreme Court has explained the high bar that must be met in *R v Anthony-Cook*, 2016 SCC 43, which was recently summarized by the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in *Xiao-Phillips v Law Society of Saskatchewan*, 2024 SKCA 44 as follows:
>
> > [146] Under the *Anthony-Cook* framework, a sentencing judge cannot depart from a joint submission unless the proposed sentence would bring the administration of justice into disrepute or it is otherwise not in the public interest. This threshold means that the sentence must be so "markedly out of line with the expectations of reasonable persons aware of the circumstances of the case that they would view it as a break down in the proper functioning of the criminal justice system" (at para 33, quoting from *R v Druken*, 2006 NLCA 67 at para 29, 215 CCC (3d) 394). Further, when assessing a joint submission, the sentencing judge should "avoid rendering a decision that causes an informed and reasonable public to lose confidence in the institution of the courts" (*Anthony-Cook* at para 33, quoting from *R v O.(B.J.)*, 2010 NLCA 19 at para 56, 252 CCC (3d) 498).

19. Following consideration of counsel's joint response to its questions, the Discipline Committee determined that it was prepared to accept the Joint Submission. In doing so, the Discipline Committee specifically considered the Joint Submission, the Agreed Statement of Facts, the oral submissions of counsel and the written responses to its questions. It also considered the nature and gravity of Mr. Olson's conduct, the need for specific and general deterrence, the possibility of rehabilitation of Mr. Olson, and the cases jointly referenced by the Investigation Committee and Mr. Olson at pages 6-11 of the Joint Submissions. Those included:

a. *Varma*;
b. *Investigation Committee of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan v Torkan* (6 December 2018);

c. *Investigation Committee of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan v Ma* (23 May 2022);
d. *Engineers & Geoscientists of British Columbia v Wensel*, File No. T21-012 (19 May 2025);
e. *Investigation Committee of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta v Bonder*, Case 23-004 (15 March 2023);
f. *The Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario (PEO) v Schor and M.A. Steelcon Engineering ltd.*, 2018 ONAPE 3; and
g. *The Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario (PEO) v Tessler*, 2019 ONAPE 11.

20. Ultimately, the Discipline Committee concluded that the Joint Submission was not unfit, unreasonable or contrary to the public interest.

21. That said, and while the Discipline Committee has determined that the proposed sanction does not bring the administration of justice into disrepute and is not contrary to public policy, this penalty is at the low end of the acceptable range in view of the factual circumstances. In accepting the Joint Submission, the Discipline Committee has placed significant weight on Mr. Olson's acceptance and admission of guilt and his cooperation in the investigatory and disciplinary processes. It has also placed significant weight on (a) his agreement to an Undertaking restricting him from practicing Limit States Design on November 12, 2024; and (b) and the inclusion of the mandatory education and structured pathway that must be followed before Mr. Olson can practice structural engineering unsupervised.

22. Finally, the Discipline Committee observes that practicing outside one's area of competence presents a serious risk of harm and can give rise to significant adverse consequences for the public and the profession. Such conduct cannot be undertaken lightly. Members cannot assume that competence in a given practice area can be established by the completion of a single course. Depending on the complexity and nature of the area in question, it may be both reasonable and necessary to require substantially greater training, experience, and supervision before a practitioner can properly hold themselves out as competent.

V. Order

23. Upon consideration of the evidence and the submissions of both counsel respecting the Joint Submission, the Discipline Committee issued the following order for professional misconduct and professional incompetence committed by Mr. Olson:

a. That Mr. Olson, P. Eng., will receive a written reprimand for professional incompetence, professional misconduct, and breaches of the Code of Ethics.

b. That Mr. Olson, P. Eng. shall successfully complete the APEGS “Annual Ethics Refresher” modules 1-6 and "The Law and Professional Practice in Engineering and Geoscience” courses within 6 months of approval of the Order by the Discipline Committee.

c. That Mr. Olson, P. Eng. shall practice under a licence restriction wherein he is not permitted to practice structural engineering other than conducting field reviews and stamping as-built drawings. Subject to the following conditions:

   i. After advising the Registrar of his successful completion of the University of Saskatchewan, College of Engineering course “CE 321 — Structural Systems and Materials’ (or equivalent as approved by the Registrar), the Registrar shall amend the terms of the restricted licence to permit supervised practice of structural engineering;

   ii. Upon amendment to the restricted licence by the Registrar to permit supervised practice of structural engineering, Mr. Olson may practice structural engineering under the supervision of a professional engineer approved by the Registrar of APEGS subject to the following conditions:

      1. When working under supervision, professional work product completed by Mr. Olson must be reviewed and authenticated by the supervisor;

      2. When working under supervision, recommendations or advice by Mr. Olson relating to structural engineering must be in the form of professional work product directly supervised by the supervisor;

      3. The supervisor will provide a report to the Registrar each quarter respecting all structural engineering projects undertaken by Mr. Olson in that quarter. Reports from the supervisor shall include for each project a summary of the project, a description of Mr. Olson’s role and responsibilities on the project, and a list of all professional work product related to the project where Mr. Olson was the primary contributor, and the supervisor’s assessment of Mr. Olson’s work on the project;

      4. An approved supervisor must undertake with APEGS to provide the required direct supervision, control, and reporting; and

      5. All costs related to the supervision and required reporting shall be at the expense of Mr. Olson.

d. That upon Mr. Olson providing:

   i. Proof satisfactory to the Registrar he has completed 1000 hours of supervised work in the area of structural engineering;

   ii. Confirmation from the supervisor that Mr. Olson has completed the requisite hours; and

   iii. Endorsement from the supervisor that he or she opines Mr. Olson has demonstrated competency in structural engineering

   Mr. Olson may request that his licence restrictions be removed by the Registrar, which will be subject to the Registrar being satisfied Mr. Olson has demonstrated sufficient competency to practice structural engineering without supervision.

e. That Mr. Olson's restricted status shall be reflected in APEGS' Member Directory.

f. That if Mr. Olson breaches any timelines of any requirement set out in the Order Mr. Olson shall be suspended from the practice of engineering until the requirements are met. Mr. Olson may apply to the Registrar for an extension prior to any noted deadline.

g. That Mr. Olson pay a fine of $5,000.

h. That this decision of the Discipline Committee will be published on the APEGS website and in The *Professional Edge*, with Mr. Olson identified by name.

Respectfully submitted and ordered on behalf of the Discipline Committee at Regina, Saskatchewan, this 19th day of June, 2026.

**Original signed by panel*

_____
Dan Bonnet, P.Eng., Chair, Hearing Panel

_____
John Breakey, Public Appointee, Hearing Panel

_____
Daryl Andrew, P.Eng, Member, Hearing Panel

_____
Robert Court, P.Eng, Member, Hearing Panel

_____
Ian Fleming, P.Eng. Member, Hearing Panel