TO: Lab, Marketing, and Administrative Staff in U.S. Offices
FROM: Janice Simmons, Benefits Manager
SUBJECT: Training Funds for Fiscal Year 2012
DATE: January 2, 2012

Happy New Year to all of you! I hope you had a good break. I'm writing to announce some guidelines for approved training for the next 12 months—including an increased reimbursement. Please read on to see how these changes affect all lab, marketing, and administrative staff.

1. **Lab Staff**
   Maximum Reimbursement: $3,000 (up from $2,000) Approval Process: Discuss with your manager 21 days before trip Trip Purpose: To improve lab procedures
2. **Marketing Staff**
   Maximum Reimbursement: $4,000 (up from $3,500) Approval Process: Discuss with your manager 21 days before trip Trip Purpose: To learn new sales techniques
3. **Administrative Staff**
   Maximum Reimbursement: $4,500 (up from $4,000) Approval Process: Discuss with your manager 21 days before trip Trip Purpose: To improve productivity of office procedures

In the past most employees have failed to make use of their maximum training allotment. I encourage all of you to seek training opportunities that fit the guidelines listed above.

Please note the required 21-day lead time in the approval process!

Just send me an e-mail if you have any questions about the procedure.

Janice

email

12 Post Street
Houston Texas 77000
713.555.9781

July 23, 2012

The Reverend Mr John C Davidson
Maxwell Street Church
Canyon Valley Texas 79195

Dear Reverend Davidson:

Thanks for your letter asking to reschedule the church project from mid-August to another, more convenient time. Yes, we'll be able to do the project on one of two possible dates in September, as explained below.

As you know, M-Global originally planned to fit your foundation investigation between two other projects planned for the Canyon Valley area. In making every effort to lessen church costs, we would be saving money by having a crew already on-site in your area—rather than having to charge you mobilization costs to and from Canyon Valley.

As it happens, we have just agreed to perform another large project in the Canyon Valley area beginning on September 18. We would be glad to schedule your project either before or after that job. Specifically, we could be at the church site for our one-day field investigation on either September 17 or September 25, whichever date you prefer.

Please call me by September 2 to let me know your scheduling preference for the project. In the meantime, have a productive and enjoyable conference at the church next month.

Sincerely,

Nancy Slade

Nancy Slade, P.E.
Project Manager

NS/mh
File #34678

Letter

Abstract Components

Brief Background	(optional)
Reason for writing	What is the importance of the research? Why would a reader be interested in the larger work?
Problem	(Optional) What problem does this work attempt to solve? What is the scope of the project? What is the main argument/thesis/claim?
Methodology	An abstract of a scientific work may include specific mode or approaches used in the larger study.
Results/ Findings/ Implementation	An abstract of a scientific work may include specific data that indicates the results of the project.
Conclusion and Implications	What changes should be implemented as a result of the findings of the work?

Sample Abstract

This study's **objective** was to determine the strangeness measurements for red, green, and blue quarks. The Britt-Cushman **method** for quark analysis exploded a quarkstream in a He gas cloud. **Results** indicate that both red and green quarks had a strangeness that differed by less than 0.453 x 10-17 Zabes/m2 for all measurements. Blue quarks remained immeasurable, since their particle traces bent into 7-tuple space. This study's **conclusions** indicate that red and green quarks can be used interchangeably in all He stream applications, and **further studies** must be done to measure the strangeness of blue quarks.

12 Post Street
Houston Texas 77000
(713) 555-9781

April 22, 2012

Big Muddy Oil Company Inc
12 Rankin St
Abilene TX 79224

ATTENTION: Mr. James Smith, Engineering Manager

SHARK PASS STUDY
BLOCK 15, AREA 43-B
GULF OF MEXICO

INTRODUCTORY SUMMARY

You recently asked our firm to complete a preliminary soils investigation at an off-shore rig site. This report presents the tentative results of our study, including major conclusions and recommendations. A longer, formal report will follow at the end of the project.

On the basis of what we have learned so far, it is our opinion that you can safely place an oil platform at the Shark Pass site. To limit the chance of a rig leg punching into the seafloor, however, we suggest you follow the recommendations in this report.

WORK AT THE PROJECT SITE

On April 15 and 16, 2012, M-Global's engineers and technicians worked at the Block 15 site in the Shark Pass region of the gulf. Using M-Global's leased drill ship, *Seeker II*, as a base of operations, our crew performed these main tasks:

- Seismic survey of the project study area
- Two soil borings of 40 feet each

Both seismic data and soil samples were brought to our Houston office the next day for laboratory analysis.

LABORATORY ANALYSIS

On April 17 and 18, our lab staff examined the soil samples, completed bearing capacity tests, and evaluated seismic data. Here are the results of that analysis.

Soil Layers

Our initial evaluation of the soil samples reveals a 7- to 9-foot layer of weak clay starting a few feet below the seafloor. Other than that layer, the composition of the soils seems fairly typical of other sites nearby.

Informal report (letter format)

Bearing Capacity

We used the most reliable procedure available, the XYZ method, to determine the soil's bearing capacity (i.e., its ability to withstand the weight of a loaded oil rig). That method required that we apply the following formula:

$Q = cNv + tY$, where

Q = ultimate bearing capacity
c = average cohesive shear strength
Nv = the dimensionless bearing capacity factor
t = footing displacement
Y = weight of the soil unit

The final bearing capacity figure will be submitted in the final report, after we repeat the tests.

Seafloor Surface

By pulling our underwater seismometer back and forth across the project site, we developed a seismic "map" of the seafloor surface. That map seems typical of the flat floor expected in that area of the gulf. The only exception is the presence of what appears to be a small sunken boat. This wreck, however, is not in the immediate area of the proposed platform site.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our analysis, we conclude that there is only a slight risk of instability at the site. Although unlikely, it is possible that a rig leg could punch through the seafloor, either during or after loading. We base this opinion on (1) the existence of the weak clay layer, noted earlier, and (2) the marginal bearing capacity.

Nevertheless, we believe you can still place your platform if you follow careful rig-loading procedures. Specifically, take these precautions to reduce your risk:

1. Load the rig in 10-ton increments, waiting 1 hour between loadings.
2. Allow the rig to stand 24 hours after the loading and before placement of workers on board.
3. Have a soils specialist observe the entire loading process to assist with any emergency decisions if problems arise.

As noted at the outset, these conclusions and recommendations are based on preliminary data and analysis. We will complete our final study in three weeks and submit a formal report shortly thereafter.

M-Global, Inc., enjoyed working once again for Big Muddy Oil at its Gulf of Mexico lease holdings. I will phone you this week to see if you have any questions about our study. If you need information before then, please give me a call.

Sincerely,

Bartley Hopkins

letter based report

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ralph Buzby, Manager of Engineering
FROM: Nancy Fairbanks, Project Manager *NF*
DATE: August 1, 2012
SUBJECT: Activity Report for July 2012

July has been a busy month in our group. Besides starting and finishing many smaller jobs, we completed the Jones Fill project. Also, the John Lewis Dam borings began just a week ago. Finally, I did some marketing work and several performance reviews.

SMALL PROJECTS

Last month, my group completed nine small projects, each with a budget under $20,000 and each lasting only a few days. These jobs were in three main areas:

1 Surveying subdivisions—five jobs
2 Taking samples from toxic sites—two jobs
3 Doing nearby soil borings—two jobs

All nine were completed within budget. Eight of the nine projects were completed on time. The Campbell County survey, however, was delayed for a day because of storms on July 10.

JONES FILL PROJECT

Our written report on this 12-month job was finally submitted to Trunk Engineering, Inc., on July 23. The delay was caused by Trunk's decision to change the scope of the project again. The firm wanted another soil boring, which we completed on July 22.

JOHN LEWIS DAM PROJECT

As you know, we had hoped to start work at the dam site last month. However, the client decided to make many design changes that had to be approved by sub-contractors. The final approval to start came just last week; thus our first day on-site was July 28.

MARKETING

During July, my main marketing effort was to meet with some previous clients, acquainting them with some of our new services. I met with eight different clients at their offices, with two meetings occurring on each of these dates: July 15, 16, 22, and 23. There's a good possibility that several of these meetings will lead to additional waste-management work in the next few months.

memo based report

memo based report

PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

As we discussed last month, I fell behind on my staff's performance reviews in June. In July, I completed the three delayed reviews, as well as the four that were due in July. Copies of the paperwork were sent to your office and to the Personnel Department on July 18. This brings us up to date on all performance reviews.

CONCLUSION

July was a busy month in almost all phases of my job. Because of this pace, I haven't had time to work on the in-house training course you asked me to develop. In fact, I'm concerned that time I devote to that project will take me away from my ongoing client jobs. At our next meeting, perhaps we should brainstorm about some solutions to this problem.

Lays fo
next me

1523 River Lane
Worthville OH 43804
August 6, 2012

Mr Willard Yancy
Director, Automotive Systems
XYZ Motor Company, Product Development Division
Charlotte NC 28202

Dear Mr. Yancy:

Recently I have been researching the leading national companies in automotive computer systems. Your job ad in the July 6 *National Business Employment Weekly* caught my eye because of XYZ's innovations in computer-controlled safety systems. I would like to apply for the automotive computer engineer job.

Your advertisement notes that experience in computer systems for machinery or robotic systems would be a plus. I have had extensive experience in the military with computer systems, ranging from a digital communications computer to an air-traffic-control training simulator. In addition, my college experience includes courses in computer engineering that have broadened my experience. I am eager to apply what I have learned to your company.

My mechanical knowledge was gained from growing up on my family's dairy farm. After watching and learning from my father, I learned to repair internal combustion engines, diesel engines, and hydraulic systems. Then for five years I managed the entire dairy operation.

With my training and hands-on experience, I believe I can contribute to your company. Please contact me at 614/555-2731 if you wish to arrange an interview.

Sincerely,

James M. Sistrunk

James M. Sistrunk

Enclosure: Résumé

job letter

DATE: December 4, 2012
TO: Technical Staff
FROM: Ralph Simmons, Technical Manager **RS**
SUBJECT: New employee to help with technical editing

Last week we hired an editor to help you produce top-quality reports, proposals, and other documents. This memo gives you some background on this change, highlights the credentials of our new editor, and explains what the change will mean to you.

PROBLEM: TIME SPENT EDITING AND PROOFREADING

At September's staff meeting, many technical staff members noted the excessive time spent editing and proofreading. For example, some of you said that this final stage of writing takes from 15 to 30 percent of the billable time on an average report. Most important, editing often ends up being done by project managers—the employees with the highest billable time.

Despite these editing efforts, many errors still show up in documents that go out the door. Last month I asked a professional association, the Engineers Professional Society (EPS), to evaluate M-Global-Boston documents for editorial correctness. (EPS performs this service for members on a confidential basis.) The resulting report showed that our final reports and proposals need considerable editing work. Given your comments at September's meeting and the results of the EPS peer review, I began searching for a solution.

SOLUTION: IN-HOUSE EDITOR

To come to grips with this editing problem, the office just hired Ron Perez, an experienced technical editor. He'll start work January 3. For the last six years, Ron has worked as an editor at Jones Technical Services, a Toronto firm that does work similar to ours. Before that he completed a master's degree in technical writing at Sage University in Buffalo.

At next week's staff meeting, we'll discuss the best way to use Ron's skills to help us out. For now, he will be getting to know our work by reviewing recent reports and proposals. Also, the attached list of possible activities can serve as a springboard for our discussion.

CONCLUSION

By working together with Ron, we'll be able to improve the editorial quality of our documents, free up more of our time for technical tasks, and save the client and ourselves some money.

I look forward to meeting with you next week to discuss the best use of Ron's services.

Enclosure
Copy: Ron Perez

memo

M-Global Inc | 127 Rainbow Lane | Baltimore MD 21202 | 410.555.8175

Memo

To: Jack Conners
From: Walker Smith
Date: July 17, 2012
Subject: Construction Site Safety Training

Several of the crew supervisors have mentioned that the accident rate at our job sites seems to be increasing. When I checked our records to see if their impressions were correct, I learned that over the past six months we have had a troubling increase in accidents over previous six-month periods. (See the table below.) That record is unacceptable.

Time period covered	Minor accidents (first aid at job site)	Major accidents (emergency room visit)
July 2010–Dec. 2010	10	0
Jan. 2011–June 2011	12	1
July 2011–Dec. 2011	14	0
Jan. 2012–June 2012	26	4

Although the accidents were generally minor, clearly we need to improve job site safety before someone is seriously hurt. Of course, we want to avoid the costs related to these injuries, but we also owe it to our employees to provide a safe work environment. We want to continue to be proud of our safety record.

Construction site safety problems

As the table above shows, a review of our job site accident reports indicates that accidents have been increasing, although the number of employees working at our construction sites has not increased. The only conclusion is that safety practices are not being followed appropriately.

I considered several possibilities for the increase in the number of accidents we have been experiencing:

Equipment failure? Our equipment is in good shape. We have a clear schedule for maintaining equipment, and the process for repairing and replacing equipment seems to be working well. Faulty equipment is not the cause of most accidents.

Low-quality materials? Although some of our clients have tried to cut costs by using lower-grade materials, we have generally been able to convince them that using higher-quality building materials is a long-term investment. Even if we were using lower-grade materials, none of the accident reports suggest that materials were to blame.

Shortcuts to save time? This may be a contributing factor. We have been trying to complete jobs more quickly to save money for our clients, or to avoid paying fines for missing deadlines. Although we may want to revisit our schedule

■ **Model 12–1** ■ Unsolicited informal proposal

unsolicited proposal

plans, there are other considerations. Crew supervisors need to make sure that safety is not sacrificed for time savings. Also, to save time, we have adopted some new techniques and equipment that our employees are not familiar with. We have relied on on-the-job learning, which is clearly not working.

Unskilled employees? During the past six months, we have hired 21 new employees to work construction. Many of these are recent high school or trade school graduates we have hired as part of our program to encourage more people to enter the construction trades. That means that almost 30 percent of our on-site workers are new to our company, and most of them are new to construction. We have assumed that the employee handbook we give them, along with instruction from their unions and from our more experienced employees, would be enough. Clearly, that hasn't been the case.

Solution: Training program offered by M-Global

After considering several options, including requiring attendance at safety seminars and developing our own safety training program, I think that the construction safety program offered by the local offices of M-Global is our best solution.

I am familiar with M-Global's program through its projects where we have worked as subcontractors. I have also asked people who have been through M-Global's construction safety program, and they recommend it. Their accident rates have dropped as much as 60 percent after the training.

Last week, I spoke to Lou Tia, who runs the M-Global construction safety program here in Cleveland. She said that they can offer a two-part program for us. The first part of the program includes job site visits to observe how we work, what safety precautions we have in place, and how well employees are following safety practices. The second part is a series of workshops. For 20 employees (the number we can comfortably fit into the break room at the main equipment lot), the cost would be $750 per session—a rate she can give us because we have a business relationship with M-Global. We can also negotiate for a contract at a yearly rate. This would cover regular safety training sessions and site safety audits. Because we have been hiring so many new employees, we might want to consider this option.

Conclusion

There are good business and ethical reasons for starting a formal safety program at Conners Construction. Keeping our accident rate low saves us money on workman's comp, and our good record in the past has kept our insurance rates low. We definitely don't want to let this accident trend continue, or we may be facing major medical costs, and even fines, at some point in the future. At the same time, Conners Construction has always been proud to be thought of as a great company to work for. This reputation has allowed us to hire reliable, top-quality employees, and our safety record has made us a leader in the industry.

If you would like to talk more about our proposal, just let me know. I will be happy to set up a meeting with Lou Tia of M-Global.