

PDH Academy

Ethical Practice for Florida Professional Engineers

Course Material and Final Exam

Ethical Practice for Florida Professional Engineers

Objectives of the Course:

1. Review the importance of continued education in ethics.
2. Identify the Fundamental Canons of the NSPE *Code of Ethics for Engineers*.
3. Examine case studies in reference to violations of the Fundamental Canons.
4. Apply the Fundamental Canons to the daily practice of engineering.

I. Why Ethics?

The Florida Board of Professional Engineers requires all licensees to complete 1 hour of continuing education in ethics every license renewal biennium. Why does the Florida Board of Professional Engineers (FBPE) require this of its licensees? According to Florida rule 61G15-22.0105, the purpose of these courses is to provide the following:

- Code of ethics or other guidelines for ethical decision making as applied to the practice of engineering.
- The importance of ethics as a broad professional concern rather than a personal one.
- An engineer's obligations to society, clients, and the profession.
- Ethical dilemmas encountered in engineering practice.
- The application of professional ethics to decision making through hypothetical or illustrative examples.

From this list it is clear that the FBPE places high importance on licensees maintaining not only a solid understanding of ethics in their profession, but also incorporating these ethical standards in their daily practice.

This course will present essential principles from the 2018 Publication of the National Society of Professional Engineers' (NSPE) *Code of Ethics for Engineers*. The NSPE *Code of Ethics for Engineers* was selected for its broad scope which can be applied to all fields of engineering from electrical to mechanical to chemical. If licensees would like to read the full *Code of Ethics for Engineers*, this document can be found on the NSPE's website: <https://www.nspe.org/>

While this course will provide engineers with a proper review of ethical practice, it is ultimately the responsibility of every engineer who practices this profession to apply these principles to their daily work. Engineers must hold themselves to the highest ethical standard in order to protect their profession and do honor to themselves, Furthermore, abiding by a high standard of ethics does honor to their fellow engineers and protects the welfare of the general public. When an engineer violates the standards of ethical practice, there are consequences which go beyond tarnishing the engineer's reputation. The law also punishes those who do not abide by these principles.

The following pages include case studies concerning Florida Professional Engineers who did not adhere to ethical practice and were charged by the FBPE. These case studies will be examined in reference to the *Code of Ethics for Engineers* to highlight which behaviors violated ethical standards so that other engineers may learn from their colleagues' errors and not repeat the same mistakes. Each case study will demonstrate how the engineer in question broke away from one of the Fundamental Canons of the *Code of Ethics for Engineers*. In many of these case studies the engineer will have violated several, if not all, of the Fundamental Canons, but for the sake of simplicity this course will focus on one at a time. Below is the list of Fundamental Canons from the NSPE's *Code of Ethics for Engineers*:

I. Fundamental Canons

Engineers, in the fulfillment of their professional duties, shall:

- 1. Hold paramount the safety, health, and welfare of the public.*
- 2. Perform services only in areas of their competence.*
- 3. Issue public statements only in an objective and truthful manner.*
- 4. Act for each employer or client as faithful agents or trustees.*
- 5. Avoid deceptive acts.*
- 6. Conduct themselves honorably, responsibly, ethically, and lawfully so as to enhance the honor, reputation, and usefulness of the profession.*

II. Hold paramount the safety, health, and welfare of the public.

The first canon from the *Code of Ethics for Engineers* is broad in scale. It states: "Engineers shall hold paramount the safety, health, and welfare of the public." Due to its broadness, the NSPE provides subsections that elaborate on how this canon can be applied to the daily practice of engineering. The first subsection can be found below:

a. If engineers' judgment is overruled under circumstances that endanger life or property, they shall notify their employer or client and such other authority as may be appropriate.

In a situation where an engineer becomes aware that lives or property are in danger, he or she must speak out. Silence in these situations is far worse than whatever repercussions may come from the employer or client. It is the engineer's duty to make known any dangers that a project imposes. The following case study demonstrates this principle.

Case No. 2015023764

Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes; negligence in the practice of engineering. Licensee signed, dated, and sealed Foundation Stabilization Reports for various residences in 2013 and 2014. The reports contained information within them that were virtually verbatim copies of data and conclusions found in signed and sealed engineering documents that had been prepared by other engineering firms and were also materially

deficient. Additionally, Licensee signed, dated, and sealed engineering certifications for these residences. The deficiencies include, but are not limited to: a) the structure will be stabilized by underpinning (However, this remediation ignores the effect of the underpinning upon an interior load-bearing structural wall.); b) the underpinning is materially inadequate in that it fails to acknowledge that the continuous strip foundation that was identified as supporting the original structure is a flexible foundation intended to be continuously earth supports; and c) does not possess sufficient section properties or reinforcement to function as a “pile cap” or “grade beam.” The deficiencies above are from one project — the complaint contained four projects all with material deficiencies within the reports which are similar.

The certifications also contained material deficiencies and do not comply with accepted standards of engineering practice applicable to sinkhole subsidence remediation. The deficiencies include, but are not limited to the fact that: a) contrary to Respondent’s explicit statement in the Foundation Stabilization Reports, the projects do not comply with accepted standards of engineering practice applicable to sinkhole subsidence remediation; and b) the statement “the foundation repairs are sufficient to prevent settlement of the structure” is materially inaccurate. The repairs as completed will only minimize settlement under some conditions, but will not prevent settlement as certified, etc.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board based upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed an Administrative Fine of \$1,000, costs of \$14,603.25, Appearance before the Board, a Reprimand, and two years’ Probation with terms. Terms include, a Board-approved course in Basic Engineering Professionalism and Ethics, the Board’s Study Guide, and project review at six and 18 months.

Violation: Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes

In another subsection of the first Fundamental Canon, it is explained that an engineer should not sign or seal any documents that are not up to date with current standards. An engineer that signs a document without checking for errors has committed an egregious error. You can read the subsection below:

b. Engineers shall approve only those engineering documents that are in conformity with applicable standards.

The case study below illustrates how a licensee can easily violate this principle.

Case No. 2015045621

Licensee was charged with a violation of Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes – negligence in the practice of engineering. Licensee signed, sealed, and dated six No-Rise Certifications. The No-Rise Certifications are materially deficient. The deficiencies include: no encroached floodway analyses were performed. By failing to address the encroachments in the analyses performed for the properties, Licensee ignored basic hydraulics and therefore materially failed to comply with accepted engineering principles and standards; in two of the No-Rise Certifications, Licensee mistakenly entered NFIP Base Flood Elevations as known water surface

elevations at multiple cross-sections. This action ensured that the model's results at those sections would reflect what was entered and negated the purpose of using the model as an independent calculating tool to identify potential differences for a sufficient distance from the proposed construction along the modeled water course. Using the methodology described to "force water surface elevations" is a material misuse of accepted engineering principles and standards.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed Administrative Costs of \$4,300, Appearance before the Board, a Basic Engineering Professionalism and Ethics Course, and the Board's Study Guide. Additionally, Licensee is RESTRICTED from producing No-Rise Certifications until such time that Licensee submits a request to the Board to amend the Final Order. Upon the Final Order being amended, Licensee will be subject to project review of No-Rise Certifications at six and 18 months.

Violation: Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes

III. Perform services only in areas of their competence

The second canon from the NSPE's *Code of Ethics for Engineers* states: "Engineers shall perform services only in the areas of their competence." Meaning that an engineer must not provide services in areas outside the scope of his or her own competence. If an engineer takes on a project in which he or she does not have the necessary education or experience, then he or she puts the health, safety, and welfare of their client and the general public at risk.

The *Code of Ethics* breaks this down further:

c. Engineers may accept assignments and assume responsibility for coordination of an entire project and sign and seal the engineering documents for the entire project, provided that each technical segment is signed and sealed only by the qualified engineers who prepared the segment.

In the case study below, the Florida Board of Professional Engineers determined that this engineer can only practice Electrical Engineering as he was not qualified to accept an assignment that went beyond that scope.

Case No. 2013009998

In case number 2013009998 the Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes and Rule 61G15-19.001(4), Florida Administrative Code; negligence and misconduct in the practice of engineering. Licensee was retained to investigate water intrusion and reported wind damage to the windows and sliding glass doors. A Final Report was issued. The Final Report was materially deficient. The deficiencies include, but are not limited to the calculations contained in the report are based upon ASCE 7 for an enclosed building, category II, exposure C and an importance factor 1.0. This is the incorrect reference to be used

for these calculations. The calculations assume that a ¼” shim is part of the single shear connection; however, the shim is not present in all locations. The calculations ignore the allowable stress increase permitted by the load duration factor CD, etc. Additionally, during a deposition, Licensee states that he was present at all times during the removal of windows and that he photo-documented the activities in the testing report; however, in that deposition Licensee admitted that in fact, he had not witnessed the removal of certain windows.

In case number 2014023033 the Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes and Rule 61G15-19.001(4), Florida Administrative Code; negligence in the practice of engineering. Licensee was retained to perform a 40-year recertification and was provided copies of a preliminary report regarding needed repairs. Licensee performed both the structural and electrical inspections. Licensee signed, sealed and dated a 40-year recertification report. After the recertification was issued, material deficiencies at the location were discovered. The deficiencies which Licensee failed to set out in the recertification report include, but are not limited to failure to illuminate parking lots, alleys and access thereto; failure to maintain building or structure or devices in safe condition, electrical installations on the roof that need replacement for corroded and broken conduits and disconnects, air condition compressors that are not secured and unit supports that are corroded, walls and roof that are leaning, etc.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board based upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed an Administrative Fine of \$6,000, Costs of \$7,346.58, a 90-day SUSPENSION which commences that date of the Final Order, Appearance before the Board, a Reprimand, RESTRICTION to the practice of Electrical Engineering only, Probation with conditions. The conditions include a Board-approved course in Advanced Engineering Professionalism and Ethics, Project Review at nine and twenty-one months, and the Board’s Study Guide.

Violation: Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes and Rule 61G15-19.001(4), Florida Administrative Code

In another subsection of the second canon, the *Code of Ethics* elaborates on the principle of not working on projects which are outside the realm of an engineer’s knowledge:

b. Engineers shall not affix their signatures to any plans or documents dealing with subject matter in which they lack competence, nor to any plan or document not prepared under their direction and control.

Case No. 2014031694 demonstrates how an engineer was found guilty of negligence because he did not have the knowledge necessary to prepare electrical or mechanical engineering documents. The FBPE determined this in their ruling by restricting his license from the ability to prepare those types of engineering documents for future projects.

Case No. 2014031694

Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.031(1)(g), Florida Statutes; negligence in the practice of engineering. Licensee sealed and signed electrical, plumbing, and structural engineering documents for construction of a remodeled single family residence. The documents contained deficiencies. The deficiencies include, but are not limited to: the electrical drawings contain an Electrical Riser Diagram but no short circuit values and no voltage drop calculations for the feeders and customer-owned service, no surge protection devices are shown on the drawings, and the drawing contains errors and conflicts, etc.; the mechanical engineering drawings contain fixture equipment to determine total fixture units, but complete equipment schedules are absent, potable water isometric diagrams are not shown on the drawings, and the drawings show sanitary piping layouts but no cold water, hot water nor storm drainage piping layouts, etc.; the structural drawings contain no demolition information as required, the roof information is missing, the drawings are mislabeled, and no calculations were submitted on the drawings as required, etc.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed Costs of \$5,957.95, an Administrative Fine of \$1,000, a Reprimand, Appearance, Licensee is RESTRICTED from creating, producing, or certifying any Electrical and/or Mechanical Engineering documents, Probation to include: Project Review at six and eighteen months for Electrical/Mechanical projects once Licensee has taken and passed the NCEES Exam, Structural Project Review at six and eighteen months following entry of the Final Order, Advanced Engineering Professionalism and Ethics and the Board's Study Guide.

Violation: Section 471.031(1)(g), Florida Statutes

IV. Issue public statements only in an objective and truthful manner.

The third canon from the *Code of for Engineers* states: "Engineers shall issue public statements only in an objective and truthful manner." This canon speaks for itself. Whenever publishing a report, statement, or testimony, the engineer must be both truthful and objective. This principle extends to documents which are submitted to state agencies for the certification of building projects.

Case studies 2017048443 and 2017030099 demonstrate how dishonesty when composing, signing, and submitting reports can hinder an engineer's career.

Case No. 2017048443

Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.031(1)(g), Florida Statutes; negligence in the practice of engineering. Licensee signed, dated, and sealed a set of engineering plans for carport parking that were approved and construction commenced. Licensee submitted an electronically signed and sealed Certification letter to the Building Department certifying that the project was constructed such that the design, intent and functionality of the project

conform to the approved construction plans. Contrary to the Certification letter, the work on the project had not been completed.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed an Administrative Fine of \$1,000, Administrative Costs of \$1,996.10, a Reprimand, Appearance before the Board, completion of a Board-approved Basic Engineering Professionalism and Ethics Course, and the Board's Study Guide.

Violation: Section 471.031(1)(g), Florida Statutes

Case No. 2017030099

Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes; negligence in the practice of engineering as a Special Inspector. Licensee was tasked with performing the duties of a Special Inspector for a threshold building project in the City of Port St. Lucie. In performing those duties, Licensee was to assure that all field inspections were performed in accordance with the Threshold Inspection Plan. The plan required that that Licensee or Licensee's authorized representative be present at all concrete pours. Licensee signed, sealed and dated a Floor Flatness/Levelness Testing Report and another report for another level, even though, neither Licensee nor Licensee's authorized representative were present for these pours.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed an Administrative Fine of \$1,000, Costs of \$2,113.40, an Appearance before the Board, and Probation for 2 years with conditions. The conditions include successful completion of a Board-Approved Basic Engineering Professionalism and Ethics Course and the Board's Study Guide.

Violations: Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes

V. Act for each employer or client as faithful agents or trustees.

The fourth canon states: "Engineers shall act for each employer or client as faithful agents or trustees". The actions of employed engineers must not contradict the interests of their employers. Under the most basic interpretation of this canon, employees should understand that they must not steal the property of their employers. The engineers in the following two case studies demonstrate the consequences of disrespecting the employer-employee relationship.

Case No. 2017040296

Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.033(1)(c) and (d), Florida Statutes; having a license to practice engineering revoked... by the licensing authority of another state; being convicted or found guilty of... a crime in any jurisdiction which directly relates to the practice of engineering or the ability to practice engineering. Licensee pleaded guilty to criminal charges of accessing a computer and obtaining information. These charges stemmed from Licensee having

accessed a computer without authorization and thereby obtained information from a protected computer, which was valued to exceed \$5,000. The computer, which was unlawfully accessed, belonged to Licensee's previous employer.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a voluntary relinquishment of license. The Board accepted the relinquishment of license with Licensee's agreement to never reapply for licensure as a Professional Engineer in Florida.

Violation: Section 471.033(1)(c) and (d), Florida Statutes

Case No. 2013000391

Licensee was charged with negligence in the practice of engineering, a violation of Section 455.227(1)(c), and Section 471.033(1)(d), Florida Statutes. Licensee entered a plea of guilty to criminal charges relating to fraud and civil theft from Licensee's employer – a contractor. Since the criminal actions occurred while performing services which, when performed by a PE, involved the use of engineering skills and the actions showed a lack of good moral character, the facts underlying the guilty plea involved the practice of and ability to practice engineering.

Ruling: Pursuant to Settlement Stipulation, the Board imposed a Fine of \$1,000, Costs of \$159, a Reprimand, One Year Suspension (this Suspension is STAYED and will not take effect so long as Licensee is not convicted of any crimes for a period of five years), Two years' Probation which includes completion of the Study Guide, and a Board Approved course in Advanced Engineering Professionalism and Ethics, and Appearance before the Board to discuss how the situation occurred, what improvements and quality control measure he plans to implement to improve his work product, and how he intends to prevent the circumstances from occurring in the future.

Violation: Section 455.227(1)(c), and Section 471.033(1)(d), Florida Statutes
A subsection of the fourth canon reads:

c. Engineers shall not solicit or accept financial or other valuable consideration, directly or indirectly, from outside agents in connection with the work for which they are responsible.

Bribery in and of itself is an unethical practice. This subsection makes clear that engineers are not to accept any type of compensation from an outside agent, and does not makes exceptions for public servants. The engineer in this case study violated this principal and the Florida Board of Professional Engineers disciplined him accordingly:

Case No. 2014037527

Licensee was charged with violating Section 455.227(1)(c), and Section 471.033(1)(d), Florida Statutes – being adjudicated guilty of a crime which directly relates to the practice of

engineering or the ability to practice engineering. Licensee was found Guilty by a jury and adjudicated Guilty of the charge of bribery (solicitation or request) by a public servant.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed Costs of \$378.49, a Reprimand, license SUSPENSION while incarcerated. Upon release from incarceration or upon being placed on a work/supervised release, if Licensee seeks to reinstate his license, he must petition for reinstatement of the license and must Appear at the Board Meeting at which the Petition shall be considered, a Board-approved course in Advanced Engineering Professionalism and Ethics, and the Board's Study Guide.

Violation: Section 455.227(1)(c), and Section 471.033(1)(d), Florida Statutes

VI. Avoid deceptive acts.

The fifth canon of the *Code of Ethics for Engineers* states: "Engineers shall avoid deceptive acts." The term 'deceptive acts' could constitute a multitude of actions, but the underlying principle is clear: engineers should not be deceitful in the practice of their profession. A subsection of the fifth canon elaborates:

- a. Engineers shall not falsify their qualifications or permit misrepresentation of their or their associates' qualifications...*

In the following two case studies, both licensees falsified documents. In the first, an engineering firm attempted to submit plans without the signature of a professional engineer. In the second, the licensee used his signature and seal on documents despite the fact that his license was suspended. The deceitful act of practicing without a license is an obvious ethical violation.

Case No. 2016050175

Licensee was charged with a violation of Section 471.033(1)(a), by violating the provisions of Section 471.023(1) and 471.031(1)(a), Florida Statutes. Engineering plans for an engineering project were submitted to the Building Department for public record using the title block of Licensee. The plans did not contain the seal and signature of a professional engineer, but instead contained only the name of Licensee, which constitutes the unlicensed practice of engineering.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed an Administrative Fine of \$1,000, Administrative Costs of \$66.30, Appearance before the Board by Licensee's designated officer (a licensed PE), a Basic Engineering Professionalism and Ethics Course, and the Board's Study Guide.

Violations: Section 471.033(1)(a), Florida Statutes; Section 471.023(1), F.S.; and Section 471.031(1)(a), F.S.

Case No. 2016028087

Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.031(1)(i), Florida Statutes; providing engineering services through signing, sealing, and dating engineering documents after licensee's license was suspended. By Final Order dated May 3, 2016, Licensee's Professional Engineering license was SUSPENDED for two years. On May 5, 2016, May 24, 2016 and May 26, 2016, Licensee signed, sealed, and dated engineering documents.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a Motion for determination that Respondent forfeited his right to an administrative hearing. The Board imposed Costs of \$960.60 and REVOKED the Professional Engineer license of Mr. Holt.

Violation: Section 471.031(1)(i), Florida Statutes

VII. Conduct themselves honorably, responsibly, ethically, and lawfully so as to enhance the honor, reputation, and usefulness of the profession.

The last canon of the *Code of Ethics for Engineers* is the most extensive. It states: "[Engineers shall] conduct themselves honorably, responsibly, ethically, and lawfully so as to enhance the honor, reputation, and usefulness of the profession." This canon calls engineers to hold themselves to the highest of standards in their professional work. It calls engineers to ask themselves: Am I performing the responsibilities of my work in such a way that I will do credit to my profession?

In the two case studies below, one could argue that these engineers were not asking themselves that question. The actions taken in these cases illustrate the consequences of performing work that does not enhance the honor, reputation, or usefulness of the engineering profession.

Case No. 2016000184

Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes – negligence in the practice of engineering. Licensee acted as the Structural, Electrical and Mechanical Engineer of Record for a renovation and addition to an existing residence. Licensee signed, sealed and dated drawings which contained deficiencies. The deficiencies include, but are not limited to: (Electrical) the drawings contain an electrical riser diagram, but no short circuit values and no voltage drop calculations for the feeders, no surge protective devices, the load computations on the panel schedules are replete with errors, the spacing of receptacles in the bedrooms is inadequate, there are no lighting fixture performance specifications, the lighting design drawings contain no calculated values to demonstrate compliance with the Florida Energy Code, etc.; (Mechanical-HVAC) the drawing does not contain adequate information for the reviewing agency to determine compliance with codes and ordinances, air condition equipment schedules are not shown for the new air handling unit and condensing unit, condensate

discharge piping is not shown on the drawing, the drawing does not contain all data require to complete the Florida Energy Code calculations, etc.; (Mechanical-Plumbing) there is no equipment schedule to specify all plumbing fixtures, potable water isometric diagrams are shown but total water fixture units are not shown, a sanitary waste isometric diagram is shown, however, total flow waste fixture units are not shown, no storm water riser diagrams are shown, etc.; (Structural) the alteration levels are incorrect as specified, no sizes of egress on the windows were included, the spiral stairs were not designed correctly, no calculations were submitted for the railing design, the plans do not show the correct elevations, etc.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed an Administrative Fine of \$1,000.00, Costs of \$4,566.67, and Probation for two (2) years, with terms. The terms include a Board-approved course in Advanced Engineering Professionalism and Ethics, the Board's Study Guide, project review at six and eighteen months to include all projects and must include electrical, mechanical, plumbing, HVAC and structural engineering projects, and Appearance.

Violation: Section 471.033(1)(g), Florida Statutes

Case No. 2017016715

Licensee was charged with violating Section 471.031(1)(g), Florida Statutes; negligence in the practice of engineering. Licensee signed, dated, and sealed a set of engineering design documents that included Structural, Electrical and Mechanical (Plumbing). The documents contained material deficiencies. The Electrical deficiencies include, but are not limited to, no surge protective devices are shown on the drawings, no outdoor receptacle outlets are shown, there are no lighting fixture performance specifications, etc. The Mechanical (Plumbing) deficiencies include, but are not limited to, the drawings contain no plumbing equipment schedules, the total water fixture units are omitted, no storm riser diagram, no piping layouts, etc. The Structural deficiencies include, but are not limited to, there are no live loads or dead loads indicated on the plans, there is no strength of materials' listed for the wood, reinforcing steel, concrete or grout, etc.

Ruling: The case was presented to the full Board upon a Settlement Stipulation. The Board imposed an Administrative Fine of \$1,000, Administrative Costs of \$11,611.30, Appearance before the Board, Probation with terms that include completion of a Board-approved Basic Engineering Professionalism and Ethics Course, project review at six and 18 months, and the Board's Study Guide.

Violation: Section 471.031(1)(g), Florida Statutes

Final Exam Questions

1. Which of the following are included in the *Fundamental Canons*?

- (a) Perform services only in areas of their competence.
- (b) Issue public statements only in an objective and truthful manner.
- (c) Act for each employer or client as faithful agents or trustees
- (d) All of the above

2. Engineers must conduct themselves _____ so as to enhance the honor, reputation, and usefulness of the profession.

- (a) honorably
- (b) responsibly
- (c) ethically
- (d) All of the above

3. In case No. 2015023764, the licensee was fined costs of \$_____ for negligence in the practice of engineering.

- (a) \$500
- (b) \$14,603.25
- (c) \$4,300
- (d) \$7,346.58

4. Engineers shall approve only those engineering documents that are in conformity with _____.

- (a) their employer's requests
- (b) the standards of the NSPE
- (c) applicable standards
- (d) the 2014 NEC

5. Engineers may accept assignments and sign and seal the engineering documents for the entire project, provided that _____.

- (a) each technical segment is signed and sealed only by the qualified engineers who prepared the segment.
- (b) each technical segment is kept confidential.
- (c) there is no conflict of interest amongst the engineers preparing each segment.
- (d) the FBPE signs off on each segment of the project.

6. In Case No. 2013009998, which of the following penalties was NOT imposed upon the engineer:

- (a) An Administrative Fine of \$6,000
- (b) RESTRICTION from creating, producing, or certifying any Mechanical Engineering documents
- (c) Costs of \$7,346.58
- (d) A 90-day SUSPENSION

7. In Case No. 2014037527 the licensee was found guilty of which of the following?

- (a) Bribery by a public servant
- (b) Negligence in the practice of engineering as a Special Inspector
- (c) Misrepresentation of the licensee's credentials
- (d) The licensee was found innocent

8. In Case No. 2016028087, the licensee was found guilty of providing engineering services despite having a suspended license. Which action did the Board take?

- (a) The license was revoked
- (b) The license was suspended for additional two years
- (c) The licensee was fined \$4,566.67
- (d) The licensee was assigned additional continuing education

9. In case Case No. 2016000184 the Board imposed an Administrative Fine of \$1,000.00, Costs of \$4,566.67, and _____.

- (a) 24 hours of continuing education.
- (b) revoked the license
- (c) suspended the license for two years
- (d) Probation for two years, with terms

10. All rulings cited in this course (except Case No. 2016028087) included the condition that the licensee do which of the following:

- (a) A course in professionalism and ethics
- (b) 18 hours of additional continuing education
- (c) A course in truthfulness and objectivity
- (d) Pay a fine of \$500