

A Civil Engineer's Risky Non-Technical Journey Through Ethics, Law, and Business  
A Text for Civil Engineering Seminar At the University of Kentucky College of Engineering  
by J. Richard Cheeks, PE JD

Much to my chagrin, as I continue reading the manuscript of the text in preparation for class, I discover errors that remain after multiple attempts to identify and eliminate them from the text. I will update this ERRATA SHEET as I discover additional errors over the course of this semester.

One of the obstacles that all writers face is finding errors in the writer's own writing. The writer knows what the writer intended to write, and the writer's eyes (and brain) tend to see what should be there rather than what is there. For this reason, fresh eyes can often identify these types of errors more effectively.

Each of you have a set of such fresh eyes, and each of you will be reading this material.

I will award 5 bonus points to any student this semester who identifies an error in the current manuscript that is not already cited on this ERRATA SHEET. A student may submit a potential error to me by email citing the location of the error and describing what the error is. In response, I will review the submitted error, and I will notify the submitting student of the outcome of my investigation by return email. If it is an error that has not been previously added to this ERRATA SHEET, I will add the error to the ERRATA SHEET with a notation of the student who identified it and the date of the addition to the ERRATA SHEET, and I will add 5 bonus points to that student's point total for the semester.

Each time I modify this ERRATA SHEET, I will upload the updated version to CANVAS, and students can track the status of identified errors by downloading this PDF from time to time either via CANVAS or from the CE-401 webpage.

---

#### ERRATA SHEET<sup>1</sup>

1. Page 50, the second full sentence says, "When the owner demanded changes in the facility's use, size, and weight, Sampoong Group fired Woosung Construction and gave its own construction company the construction contract to build the facility." This sentence may be confusing on the use of the pronoun, "its" and suggest revising to, "When the Sampoong Group demanded changes in the facility's use, size, and weight, it fired the uncooperative Woosung Construction. Then Sampoong gave its own construction company the contract to build the modified facility."
2. Page 85, at the top of the page, there is a reference to a figure on the previous page. It says, "documents, and figure on the previous page illustrates Josephson's eight most common rationalizations." Suggest adding "the" prior to the word "figure."
- 3.

---

<sup>1</sup> All errata items in red have been corrected in the current manuscript. Each change is preserved here for completeness of this record. The items in black are items identified subsequent to the November 24, 2023 revisions.

A Civil Engineer's Risky Non-Technical Journey Through Ethics, Law, and Business  
A Text for Civil Engineering Seminar At the University of Kentucky College of Engineering  
by J. Richard Cheeks, PE JD

Substantive Issues for consideration

- a) Update Chapter 1 to reflect the 2021 ASCE Infrastructure Report Card.
- b) Page 18, References to the ASCE Code of Ethics may be out of date and require updating. Submitted by Ryan Kodura on January 8, 2024. See <https://www.asce.org/career-growth/ethics/code-of-ethics> Update footnote but no changes in the text are required.
- c) Chapter 3 discusses the Korean shopping center collapse, and Page 52 includes a discussion about the design team and the design team's role on the Korean project. This may be confusing readers about the design team's contributions to this failure. Revisit this discussion for clarity of the message. In addition, There has been great confusion about who designed this facility, and other details about the events. Do additional research and consider a rewrite. Start with a review the special handout on this failure and see: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sampoong\\_Department\\_Store\\_collapse](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sampoong_Department_Store_collapse)
- d) Page 69, there is a reference to the ABET requirement that says, "Any ethical decision-making process must consider how decisions and actions impact stakeholders in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts." Revisit this and modify as appropriate, perhaps, "In addition, the ethical decision-making process should consider how decisions and actions may impact stakeholders in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts."
- e) Page 72, the text discusses the Hyatt Regency Whistleblower, and applies a De George analysis to the technician that had concerns during shop drawing review. With respect to De George Criterion #1, it says in part, "... had reason to believe ..." and this should be modified to say "... knew ..." instead.
- f) Page 83, the text currently says, "Since this is among the most complex decisions a person may face, easier said than done, third parties should defer to the decision maker's conscience and judgement." Consider a revision to say, "Since this is among the most complex decisions a person may face, easier said than done, third parties should defer to the decision maker's conscience and judgement absent compelling evidence to the contrary."
- g) Chapter 4 discusses rationalizations. Need to consider whether the text is confusing in its definitions as cited below. On one hand rationalizations are used by the person to justify wrongful action and on the other hand, "The goal of rationalizing is to get others off one's case more than to reconcile one's conduct with one's own conscious." which seems to contradict. Identified by Ryan Kodura on January 29, 2024.
- h) In Chapters 5 and 6, the Trueteel Affair addresses why Robert Williams could not ethically resign and move away without either fixing the trusses or blowing the whistle on Carter. Be sure that this discussion accounts for the following, **"In addition, we saw that Robert's duty to blow the whistle can only be resolved two ways, Fix the Trusses, or Blow the Whistle. Therefore, leaving town without doing either is not ethically viable."**
- i) In Chapter 6, a student raised a question about whether David Jackson was acting like an IDI. Review the entire analysis of Gilbane Gold through the IDI prism.
- j) Chapters 7 and 8 address the Testing Water case study, and questions have arisen about my agreement with the IPP ethics case. I need to review how the text treats the IPP Testing Water case.
- k)