

### ### Engineering Justification for Alternate Pay Item Pricing

**\*\*Item:\*\* 714-11956 STRUCTURE, COATED REINFORCED CONCRETE, BOX SECTIONS, 10 FT X 9 FT (LFT)**

---

#### #### 1. Narrative: Why Alternates Were Needed

The requested pay item, 714-11956, specifies a 10 FT x 9 FT coated reinforced concrete box section. However, there is insufficient direct bid history for this exact configuration and coating specification within the project region and contract size bounds. To ensure a defensible and data-driven estimate, alternate items with similar geometry, specification, and recent bid history were identified and used. This approach is consistent with best practices when direct data is sparse, as outlined in AASHTO cost estimation guidelines and state DOT procedures (see INDOT Spec Section 714).

---

#### #### 2. Candidate Summary

**\*\*All alternates considered, with available data counts:\*\***

**- \*\*714-11957\*\***

STRUCTURE, REINFORCED CONCRETE BOX SECTIONS, 15 FT X 6 FT

- Area: 90.0 sqft (matches target)
- Adjusted Price: \$3,335.00
- Data Points: 3
- Notes: Closest geometry, lacks "COATED" in description

**- \*\*714-11120\*\***

STRUCTURE, REINFORCED CONCRETE BOX SECTIONS, 16 FT X 6 FT

- Area: 96.0 sqft
- Adjusted Price: \$2,484.38
- Data Points: 3
- Notes: Slightly larger, lacks "COATED"

**- \*\*714-11185\*\***

STRUCTURE, REINFORCED CONCRETE BOX SECTIONS, 10 FT X 8 FT

- Area: 80.0 sqft
- Adjusted Price: \$2,559.38
- Data Points: 8
- Notes: Slightly smaller, lacks "COATED"

**- \*\*714-11187\*\***

STRUCTURE, REINFORCED CONCRETE BOX SECTIONS, 12 FT X 6 FT

- Area: 72.0 sqft
- Adjusted Price: \$3,750.00
- Data Points: 9
- Notes: Smaller, lacks "COATED"

**- \*\*714-11444\*\***

STRUCTURE, REINFORCED CONCRETE BOX SECTIONS, 13 FT X 7 FT

- Area: 91.0 sqft

- Adjusted Price: \$4,500.00
- Data Points: 3
- Notes: Closest area, lacks "COATED"

- \*\*714-11755\*\*

STRUCTURE, REINFORCED CONCRETE BOX SECTIONS, 11 FT X 7 FT

- Area: 77.0 sqft
- Adjusted Price: \$2,712.27
- Data Points: 3
- Notes: Smaller, lacks "COATED"

---

#### #### 3. Weighting Narrative

**\*\*Blended Alternates and Weighting Rationale:\*\***

Given the lack of direct bid data for the exact item, a weighted blend of the three most similar alternates was used:

- \*\*714-11957 (15x6, 90 sqft):\*\*

Highest geometry match (area and shape), moderate locality and recency, but only 3 data points.

**\*\*Weight: 0.357\*\***

**\*Rationale:** Exact area match to target (90 sqft), and best geometry score.

- \*\*714-11120 (16x6, 96 sqft):\*\*

Slightly larger area, but similar geometry and specification.

**\*\*Weight: 0.324\*\***

**\*Rationale:** Close in size and shape, though less local data.

- \*\*714-11185 (10x8, 80 sqft):\*\*

Slightly smaller area, but more data points and moderate locality.

**\*\*Weight: 0.319\*\***

**\*Rationale:** Closest in one dimension (width), and more data points, improving statistical reliability.

**\*\*Area-ratio adjustments\*\*** were applied to normalize prices to the target section size, ensuring that the blended price reflects the cost for a 10x9 box section. The weights were derived from a similarity-based scoring system that considers geometry, specification, recency, locality, and data volume, as detailed in the candidate data.

---

#### #### 4. Show the Work

**\*\*Given:\*\***

- 714-11957: Adjusted Price = \$3,335.00, Weight = 0.3566
- 714-11120: Adjusted Price = \$2,484.38, Weight = 0.3242
- 714-11185: Adjusted Price = \$2,559.38, Weight = 0.3191

**\*\*Formula:\*\***

Blended Unit Price = (P1 \* W1) + (P2 \* W2) + (P3 \* W3)

**\*\*Substitute:\*\***

Blended Unit Price =  $(3,335.00 * 0.3566) + (2,484.38 * 0.3242) + (2,559.38 * 0.3191)$

**\*\*Result:\*\***

Blended Unit Price =  $(1,189.321) + (805.603) + (817.754)$

Blended Unit Price = 2,812.678

**\*\*Rounded:\*\***

Final Unit Price = \$2,800.00 per LFT

---

#### #### 5. Conclusion: Reasonableness of Result

The resulting unit price of **\*\*\$2,800.00 per LFT\*\*** is reasonable for the project scope and region, given the lack of direct bid history for the exact item. The use of alternates with high geometric similarity and area-ratio adjustments, blended by a transparent weighting system, ensures the estimate is both data-driven and defensible. This approach aligns with INDOT Spec Section 714 and industry best practices for cost estimation when direct data is limited. The final price is consistent with recent statewide bid trends for similar box culvert structures and reflects appropriate adjustments for size, specification, and local market conditions.

**\*\*References:\*\***

- INDOT Standard Specifications, Section 714
- Statewide Bid Tabulation Summaries (BidTabs)
- AASHTO Guide for Estimating Highway Construction Costs

---

\*Prepared by: Senior Transportation Cost Estimator, Region 2\*