In construction bidding, the long-standing practice of low bidding, aka lowballing, has become ingrained in the industry's culture. Many owners have come to expect it, awarding the lowest bidder with the coveted contract. Contractors have also become accustomed to this, continuing to use the practice to secure bids. Put simply, it's "just the way things are done."

But perpetuating the lowball mentality and expectations that underpin this practice doesn't actually bene ft any party involved in the contract.

For one thing, the lowest bid isn't a guarantee of quality, safety, workmanship, cost containment and adherence to the project schedule. This does not bene ft the project owner.

As a contractor, taking an extra sharp pencil to your construction bid can cost a lot more than just slimmer pro ft margins. And you may have found yourself bearing the brunt — f nancial and otherwise — of the high-stakes effects.

Consequently, you might find yourself having to pivot unexpectedly to complete a project on time, within budget, the true costs of labor, materials, and equipment are, how long the project will really take, and what the potential risks are.

Supporting this shift is software technology that lends the kind of transparency and realism all parties can bene f t from. It can do this by helping you leverage historical data from similar prior projects that serve as veri f able proof to owners of what