

## TECHNOLOGIST AND TECHNICIAN CASE SUMMARIES 2020

### **CASE #19-11**

#### **STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:**

That the Respondent, an Applied Science Technologist in the Mechanical discipline, and an Eng.L., was uncooperative, obtuse and failed to communicate or conduct themselves in a timely or professional manner when requested to provide previously agreed engineering services to their client, represented by the Complainant.

#### **INVESTIGATION:**

The investigation found that the primary factor contributing to this complaint was the absence of clear communication between both parties in this complaint. The Respondent was justified in insisting that deficiencies in the installation be corrected before agreeing to sign the Schedule C-B. Further, when they agreed to return to the site the following day to accommodate the Complainant's request to conclude the required inspection and testing, the Complainant should have made arrangements to attend the site to assist in the line pressure and sump leak tests. They should not have assumed the tests were completed satisfactorily before back filling and continuing with the project.

The investigation also found that the Respondent was cooperative and conducted themselves in a professional manner in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. However, increased communication and written instructions describing the Respondent's expectations of the Complainant during the construction, inspection and testing of the rebuild project may have alleviated the need for this complaint.

#### **PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The PRB reviewed the complaint and found no evidence to substantiate a violation of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines on the part of the Respondent. Nonetheless, the PRB required the Registrar to write a letter to the Complainant and the Respondent reminding them of the importance of clearly communicating their actions and expectations on any project.

#### **OUTCOME:**

No further action was required and the file was closed.

### **CASE #20-03**

#### **STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:**

That the Respondent, an Applied Science Technologist in the Building Engineering discipline, prepared and stamped a report on the conditions of the gutters of a residence without attending the site and conducting any investigation. They subsequently visited the site again and prepared a second report where the conclusions contradicted those of their first report.

#### **INVESTIGATION:**

The investigation found that the Respondent's initial report made several statements emphasizing their knowledge and expertise, indicating they could draw reliable conclusions from information provided to them by another party rather than an independent investigation of their own. However, the fact that they provided a professional opinion in a written report relying on third party information and photos without doing a site visit to the building was considered a breach of ASTTBC Code of Ethics principle 3. Conducting a site visit later and preparing a revised report further supported the breach of ASTTBC Code of Ethics principle 3.

**PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The PRB reviewed the complaint and, as the Respondent had breached Principle 3 of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics, levied a fine of \$250, as a deterrent to future violations of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics.

**OUTCOME:**

The Respondent was advised regarding the PRB decision and shortly thereafter paid the fine. The PRB was updated accordingly and determined that the Respondent had complied with its requirements. No further action was required and the file was closed.