



Planners - Engineers - Program Managers

January 23, 2012

Mr. D. Jesse Hegemier, P.E.
Fort Bend County Engineer
1124 Blume Road
Rosenberg, Texas 77471


Re: Billing Period No. 21
IDC Invoice No. 9850
Services Through December 2011
Purchase Order No.: 40386
Project No.
Crabb River Road from South of US59 to South of LCISD New HS/JHS Complex.

Dear Mr. Hegemier:

Enclosed is IDC's invoice for services performed through December 2011 in the amount of \$ 2,877.00 for your consideration and further handling. Two copies of the following documents are attached:

- Invoice No. 9850
- Progress Report No. 21

Sincerely,
IDC Inc.


Larry F. Janak, P.E.
Executive Vice President

INVOICE
IDC, INC.
Fort Bend County - Crabb River Road

Bill To:
 Mr. D. Jesse Hegemier, P.E.
 County Engineer
 Fort Bend County
 1124 Blume Road
 Rosenberg, Texas 77471

P.O. #: 40386
 Project #:
 Contract Number:
 Invoice Number: 9850
 Invoice Date: January 23, 2012
 Billing Period: December 2011

Original Contract Amount:	Tiger Grant Application	\$	25,000.00
	PE Phase	\$	575,000.00
Changes:	Mod No. 1	\$	93,224.00
	Total Contract:	\$	693,224.00

Fee Earned:	Tiger Grant Application	\$	25,000.00
	PE Phase	\$	606,327.00
	Total Amount Earned:	\$	631,327.00

Less Previously Invoiced:	Tiger Grant Application		25,000.00
	PE Phase		603,450.00
			<u>628,450.00</u>

Total Invoice Amount: **\$ 2,877.00**

Contract Remaining: \$ 61,897.00

*REC
1/23/12
OK
DJA*

INVOICE No. 21
Crabb River Road
SCHEDULE OF VALUES

PE PHASE

SERVICES THROUGH:
12/31/2011

TASK DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT AMOUNT	PERCENT COMPLETE	INVOICED TO DATE	PREVIOUSLY INVOICED	AMOUNT THIS INVOICE
I. Project Management					
A. Develop & Maintain					
1. Project Schedules	\$4,525	94.0%	\$4,254	\$4,208	\$45
2. Budgets	\$3,216	94.0%	\$3,023	\$2,959	\$64
3. Mo Prog Reports/Inv	\$6,560	94.0%	\$6,166	\$6,101	\$66
B. Meet w/ Co Engr	\$7,647	94.0%	\$7,188	\$7,035	\$153
C. Coord w/ Co & TxDOT	\$7,647	94.0%	\$7,188	\$7,112	\$76
D. Field Reconnaissance	\$10,664	100.0%	\$10,664	\$10,664	\$0
E. QA/QC Plan	\$4,162	90.0%	\$3,746	\$3,746	\$0
SUBTOTAL TASK	\$44,421	95.1%	\$42,229	\$41,825	\$405
II. Public Involvement					
A. Small Group Meetings	\$3,134	25.0%	\$784	\$784	\$0
B. Public Meeting	\$20,552	100.0%	\$20,552	\$20,552	\$0
C. Public Hearing	\$18,932	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0
D. County Review	\$3,151	0.0%	\$3,151	\$3,151	\$0
SUBTOTAL TASK	\$45,769	53.5%	\$24,487	\$24,487	\$0
III. Preliminary Drainage Design					
A. Review Existing Studies	\$5,560	100.0%	\$5,560	\$5,560	\$0
B. Determine Drainage Areas	\$8,349	100.0%	\$8,349	\$8,349	\$0
C. Size Proposed Structures	\$9,091	100.0%	\$9,091	\$9,091	\$0
D. Size Roadside Ditches	\$7,706	100.0%	\$7,706	\$7,706	\$0
E. Determine Detention Storage	\$5,835	100.0%	\$5,835	\$5,835	\$0
F. Determine 100-yr WSE	\$7,600	100.0%	\$7,600	\$7,600	\$0
G. Prelim Drainage Report	\$9,722	100.0%	\$9,722	\$9,722	\$0
SUBTOTAL TASK	\$53,863	100.0%	\$53,863	\$53,863	\$0
IV. Line Diagrammatic					
A. Develop Alternative Align	\$17,393	100.0%	\$17,393	\$17,393	\$0
B. Analyze Alternatives	\$10,752	100.0%	\$10,752	\$10,214	\$538
C. Develop Prelim P/P	\$18,451	100.0%	\$18,451	\$17,528	\$923
D. Coord with BNSF RR	\$8,875	80.0%	\$7,100	\$7,100	\$0
E. Determine Prop ROW, Esmt	\$10,208	95.0%	\$9,698	\$9,698	\$0
F. Preliminary Typ Sections	\$17,183	95.0%	\$16,324	\$16,324	\$0
G. Prelim Earthwork Calcs	\$9,478	100.0%	\$9,478	\$9,478	\$0
H.1 Current/Proj Traffic Vol	\$856	100.0%	\$856	\$856	\$0
H.2 Turning Lane Study	\$3,000	\$1	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$0
I. Identify Potential Utility Conflicts	\$7,279	95.0%	\$6,915	\$6,915	\$0
J. Prelim Drainage Structures	\$7,238	95.0%	\$6,876	\$6,876	\$0
M. Prelim Const Cost Est	\$11,540	95.0%	\$10,963	\$10,963	\$0
N. Graphics File of Diagrammatic	\$535	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
O. Phase I Concept Drawing	\$1,286	\$1	\$1,286	\$1,286	\$0
P. Phase I Line Diagrammatic	\$7,729	\$1	\$7,729	\$7,729	\$0
Q. Phase I Coord Meetings	\$4,490	\$1	\$4,266	\$4,266	\$0
R. Phase I Const Cost Est	\$5,192	\$1	\$4,932	\$4,932	\$0
SUBTOTAL TASK	\$141,485	96.1%	\$136,019	\$134,558	\$1,460
V. Environmental Assess					
A. Proj Mngt (PB)	\$35,152	99.3%	\$34,896	\$34,896	\$0
B. Purpose & Need (PB)	\$3,064	100.0%	\$3,064	\$3,064	\$0
C. Constraints Map (PBSJ)	\$8,915	100.0%	\$8,915	\$8,915	\$0
D. Alternative Analysis (PB)	\$2,882	100.0%	\$2,794	\$2,794	\$0
E. Agency Coord (PB)	\$3,731	100.0%	\$3,731	\$3,731	\$0
F. Env Document Prep (PB/PBSJ)	\$86,730	97.6%	\$84,665	\$84,665	\$0
G. Noise Impacts (PB)	\$23,312	100.0%	\$23,312	\$23,312	\$0
H. Wetland Delineation (PBSJ)	\$26,021	67.94%	\$17,680	\$17,680	\$0
I. Architectural Survey (PB)	\$18,483	100.00%	\$18,483	\$18,483	\$0
J. Archeology Survey (PBSJ)	\$32,599	92.51%	\$30,157	\$30,157	\$0
K. QA/QC (PB/PBSJ)	\$23,078	91.5%	\$21,107	\$21,107	\$0
L. Prepare Draft EA (PB)	\$24,634	100.0%	\$24,634	\$24,634	\$0

TASK DESCRIPTION	CONTRACT AMOUNT	PERCENT COMPLETE	INVOICED TO DATE	PREVIOUSLY INVOICED	AMOUNT THIS INVOICE
M. Prepare Final EA (PB)	\$15,376	47.3%	\$7,279	\$6,266	\$1,013
AA. Administer Contract (IDC)	\$3,572	93.0%	\$3,322	\$3,322	\$0
BB. Coord ENV Work (IDC)	\$8,559	93.0%	\$7,960	\$7,960	\$0
SUBTOTAL TASK	\$316,108	92.4%	\$291,999	\$290,987	\$1,013
VI. Field Surveying					
A. Vert/Horiz Control (WEC)	\$14,380	100.0%	\$14,380	\$14,380	\$0
B. Topo Survey (WEC)	\$19,700	100.0%	\$19,700	\$19,700	\$0
C. Property Evid Surv (WEC)	\$4,800	100.0%	\$4,800	\$4,800	\$0
AA. Administer Contract (IDC)	\$2,263	100.0%	\$2,263	\$2,263	\$0
BB. Coord Survey Work (IDC)	\$2,689	100.0%	\$2,689	\$2,689	\$0
SUBTOTAL TASK	\$43,832	100.0%	\$43,832	\$43,832	\$0
TOTAL LABOR ALL TASKS	\$645,478	91.8%	\$592,428	\$589,551	\$2,877
DIRECT COSTS					
IDC	\$5,842	64.0%	\$3,739	\$3,739	\$0
PB	\$13,508	61.1%	\$8,257	\$8,257	\$0
PBS&J	\$3,416	55.7%	\$1,903	\$1,903	\$0
HZI	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total All Firms	\$22,766	61.1%	\$13,899	\$13,899	\$0
TOTALS					
Labor	\$645,478	91.8%	\$592,428	\$589,551	\$2,877
Direct costs	\$22,766	61.1%	\$13,899	\$13,899	\$0
TOTAL CONTRACT	\$668,244	90.7%	\$606,327	\$603,450	\$2,877



Planners – Engineers – Program Managers

**CRABB RIVER ROAD
PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PHASE
PROGRESS REPORT NO. 21
May 2011 thru December 2011**

Activities During Current Reporting Period

Task I. Project Management

- Continued managing sub consultants performing environmental work and coordinating with comments from FHWA.
- Coordinated with County and TxDOT on project issues such as sidewalk requirements on bridges.
- Coordinated via e-mail with BNSF RR representative.
- Requested Traffic Volumes on project from TxDOT.
- Coordinated with TxDOT on previous Preliminary Engineering Study and schematic prepared by TxDOT on FM 762.
- Coordinated with County on environmental document approach to address FHWA comments. County to show environmental assessment as a single project, constructed in two phases.

Task II. Public Involvement

- No activity this period.

Task III. Preliminary Drainage Design

- No activity this period.

Task IV. Line Diagrammatic

- Continued with revisions to roadway plan to accommodate a shared used lane for bikes.
- Continued with re-aligning Crabb River Rd at Sansbury and at FM 762.
- Continued with determining prop row along project.
- Prepared diagram for traffic volume request from TxDOT.
- Looked at future traffic volumes on FM 762 schematic previously prepared by TxDOT.
- Continued with identifying potential utility conflicts on FM 762/ Crabb River Rd intersection.

Task V. Environmental Assessment

- Received and reviewed FHWA comments and drafted responses for those that could be readily addressed

- Prepared cost estimate for additional work necessary to address FHWA comments
- Conducted project management activities including conference calls, invoices, and progress reports.
- Continued to address comments from FHWA and coordinate with TxDOT.

Task VI. Field Surveying

- This task is finished.

Activities Anticipated Next Reporting Period

- Continue to address comments to draft EA from FHWA.
- Continue to refine plan layout and begin revising profile on Crabb River Rd and FM 762 intersection.
- Begin preparation for a Phase 1 layout that incorporates portions of ultimate schematic.
- Continue to coordinate with County and TxDOT on Traffic volumes and project overall.
- Continue to coordinate with BNSF RR on project.