Facts:
Engineer A is a professional engineer and a registered architect with extensive design and forensic engineering experience. In performing a forensic engineering investigation for an insurance company, Engineer A is asked to look at a beam that had been burned, as a result of arson in a residence that was at the time of the arson under construction. Following the initial arson investigation, Engineer A learns that the construction contractor determined that the beam could be reused on the project. Engineer A examines the 15-foot long beam and determines that the beam was slightly charred and was located next to a dining room with a 2-story ceiling. On the other side, the beam supported a second-floor bedroom, a wall, and (on both sides of the beam) a significant amount of roof of the residence. Engineer A initially observed that aside from the slight fire damage, the beam looked too light to provide adequate structural support. Engineer A measured the tributary area of roof, floor, and wall bearing on the beam and ran a series of structural calculations. Following his review, Engineer A determined that the beam was seriously under-designed. Engineer A observed that since the house was a tract home, there were other identical designs in the subdivision. Engineer A wrote his report and identified the design defect, and expressed his larger concern regarding the possibility that an inadequate structural member was used in other houses in the subdivision. Engineer A submitted his report to the insurance company that retained Engineer A. Engineer A, still concerned with his obligation to the public beyond just informing the insurance company, called the State Board of Professional Engineers, apprised them of the situation, and asked what more could and should Engineer A do about this situation. The Board’s response was that Engineer A had fulfilled his professional obligation by notifying the insurance company, in writing, of the defect.

Question:
Did Engineer A fulfill his ethical obligations by providing the report to the insurance company that retained Engineer A under the NSPE Code of Ethics?

NSPE CODE REFERENCES
To be submitted by the contestant. Use NSPE Code of Ethics references only.

DISCUSSION
To be submitted by the contestant.

CONCLUSIONS
To be submitted by the contestant.

NOTE: In order to maintain anonymity for purposes of judging, the actual body of the entry should not include any reference to the state society, chapter, member, student, university, or any other individual group who submitted the entry. NSPE reserves the right to edit any submission to comply with copyright, privacy, and other rights. However, be sure to provide the name, address, email address, phone number, and current NSPE member number of (1) your NSPE chapter or state society, and (2) each of the individuals responsible for submitting the entry, on a separate cover sheet accompanying your entry. Submissions failing to include this information will be returned to submitter and will not be eligible for the contest.