

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 the Fall 2025 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 SHEET¹

1. Page 73, the last paragraph, 3 lines from the bottom of the page, a sentence starts, "Headline after headline have broadcast the finding, ..." There is a singular plural conflict to correct.
- 2.

¹ All errata items in red have been corrected in the revised manuscript for future semesters. Each change is preserved here for completeness of this record. All items whether red or black are items identified subsequent to the August 1, 2024, 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) Page 40, the first paragraph of the JAMES vs. DE GEORGE section heading says, "James does not agree with the De George criteria, taking issue with the first, third, fourth and fifth criteria and disputing the idea that there could be moral permission without a moral duty to blow the whistle." This single sentence paragraph should be developed more fully by adding, "James has said that "mere suspicion" rather than actual knowledge is sufficient to satisfy criterion 1. Therefore, James is effectively saying, "If an employee suspects company wrongdoing and his supervisor does not agree, the employee has a duty to blow the whistle on the company." Such a short trigger will produce many more whistleblowing actions without any responsibility for the whistleblower to have specific knowledge, facts, or data that show the wrongdoing. Regardless, De George's first criterion requires knowledge of the wrongdoing."
- b) Page 50, the second paragraph under the KOREAN SHOPPING CENTER heading addresses who was making design decisions on the project. Even though the owner may have employed design professionals, the owner was acting as a the design professional because he was making the critical design decisions, and the hired design professionals seemed to readily "rubber stamp" what Sampoong Group demanded. Suggest reviewing this paragraph to improve the central message strength, with the suggested rewrite below:

Make no mistake that in the Korean shopping center case, a greedy owner is the central party driving this facility to its demise. In essence, the owner functioned as the designer and the builder of the facility making critical design decisions. Finally, the owner bribed the governmental building inspection officials to build the deficient structure. It appears that design and construction professionals in Sampoong's employment complied with the owner's greedy demands every step along the 5-year path to calamity.

- c)