GREATER BOISE AUDITORIUM DISTRICT

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

FACILITY TEST FIT STUDY

Comprehensive Facility Planning, Programming, and Site Test Fit for a Future District Facility

Item	Detail
Issue Date	10-23-26
Statements of Qualifications Due	Wednesday, December 9, 2026 at 3:00 PM MT
Submission Method	Anna Mills, Executive Administrative Assistant, amills@boisecentre.com / 850 W. Front St. Boise, ID 83702
Procurement Contact	Johnathon Caradonna, Executive Vice President, Paradigm of Idaho, Inc., johnathon@paradigm-ors.biz
Anticipated Study Period	Approximately five (5) months following selection, contracting, and Notice to Proceed
Owner's Representative	Paradigm of Idaho, Inc.
Contracting Entity	Greater Boise Auditorium District, a body politic and corporate of the State of Idaho

Contents

Section numbering is identical in both District Requests for Qualifications issued under this planning effort. Subsection numbering reflects study-specific scope.

Section	Section
1. Invitation and Notice	2. District and Project Background
3. Purpose and Objectives	4. Roles, Responsibility Boundaries, and Coordination
5. Detailed Scope of Services	6. Required Study Methodology and Process
7. Required Deliverables	8. Study Schedule and Milestones
9. Consultant and Team Qualifications	10. Statement of Qualifications Requirements
11. References	12. Evaluation and Scoring: Grading Rubric
13. Shortlisting, Interviews, and Selection	14. Procurement Timeline for Respondents
15. Questions and Communications	16. Submission Instructions
17. Terms, Reservations, and Conditions	18. Public Records and Confidential Information
19. Conflicts of Interest and Disclosures	20. Contract and Insurance Requirements
21. Addenda and Order of Precedence	

1. Invitation and Notice

The Greater Boise Auditorium District (the **District** or **GBAD**) invites Statements of Qualifications (**SOQs**) from qualified consultant teams to perform the Facility Test Fit Study.

The District intends to select a consultant on the basis of demonstrated qualifications, relevant experience, proposed methodology, team capability, and overall fit with the District's objectives, subject to applicable procurement requirements and successful contract negotiation.

Paradigm of Idaho, Inc. (Paradigm) is serving as the District's Owner's Representative and procurement manager. Paradigm will administer this solicitation, assist the District with evaluation and selection, and, if authorized by the District, provide Owner's Representative oversight during the study. Paradigm is not the consultant performing the study, is not a respondent to this solicitation, is not eligible for award under this solicitation, and does not assume the selected consultant's professional responsibilities.

Companion Solicitation. The District is procuring two related studies under a single planning effort: the Facility Test Fit Study and the Financial Advisory and Debt Capacity Analysis. This RFQ covers the Facility Test Fit Study. The companion solicitation is described in Section 2.5, including the information each study provides to the other. Respondents may respond to both solicitations; each will be evaluated independently on its own merits.

2. District and Project Background

Sourcing standard for this section. Every statement in Sections 2.1 through 2.3 is drawn either from a document the District has published, or from a study the District commissioned and released. Nothing in this section is inference, secondary reporting, or unverified information. Conditions the District has not published are identified in Section 2.3 as matters the selected consultant is to establish, and respondents shall not treat them as known.

2.1 The District

The District is a public entity of the State of Idaho. In 1959 the Idaho Legislature enacted legislation authorizing the creation of auditorium districts in Idaho (Idaho Code Title 67, Chapter 49), and a district was formed in Boise by voters for the purpose of building a civic facility for the community. The District is authorized by Idaho statute to build, operate, maintain, market, and manage public auditoriums, exhibit halls, convention centers, sports arenas, and similar facilities.

The District built Boise Centre, Idaho's largest convention center, in 1990, and completed a convention center expansion in 2017. Through a public-private partnership in 2021, the District invested $9.6 million to purchase the land and building for the Idaho Central Aquatic Center.

The District receives its revenue from a 5% room tax paid by travelers and collected by hotels, motels, and other lodging properties within the District's boundaries. Residents inside the District do not pay any tax or fee to fund the District and its entities unless they choose to stay at a lodging property. The District's audited financial statements

and budgets are published at boiseauditorium.com/finances. Respondents should rely on those published statements rather than on any figure summarized in this RFQ.

2.2 Boise Centre, Existing Facility

Boise Centre is located at 850 W. Front Street in downtown Boise and operates near full capacity. The District reports that in 2025, visitors attending events held at Boise Centre boosted the local economy by $51.2 million and supported 24,000 jobs, calculated using the Event Impact Calculator published by Destinations International.

The following facility metrics are drawn from the Boise Centre Expansion Scenario Analysis identified in Section 2.4.

Existing facility metric	Value
Opened	1990; convention center expansion completed 2017. Boise Centre operates as two buildings, East and West, connected by a skybridge.
Total event space	Approximately 86,000 square feet
Total function space	63,773 square feet, East and West combined
Ballroom space	42,161 square feet, East and West ballrooms combined, including the junior ballroom
Meeting room space	21,612 square feet, East and West combined
Largest single contiguous space	24,426 square feet
Events hosted, FY 2024	262

2.3 Land Assembled for Future Development

Between March and June 2026 the District's Board approved agreements securing three parcels in the River Street neighborhood of downtown Boise. The District has stated that collectively the three parcels provide 6.46 acres of contiguous space, and that the land is within walking distance of Boise Centre, a seven-minute walk south along 9th Street.

Parcel	Address	Size	Board approval
11th & River	1050 W. River Street (northeast corner of 11th & River)	4.13 acres / approx. 180,000 SF	Purchase and Sale Agreement approved at a Special Board Meeting, March 31, 2026
9th & River	970 W. River Street (northeast corner of 9th & River)	1.84 acres / 80,542 SF	Option Agreement and Purchase and Sale Agreement approved at a regular Board Meeting, April 28, 2026
9th & Lee	615 S. 9th Street	0.49 acres / 21,344 SF	Purchase and Sale Agreement approved at a regular Board Meeting, June 23, 2026

Acquisition structure and timing as published by the District. The District has stated that it is paying earnest monies, down payments, and broker fees for the parcels with cash reserves, and specifically that:

- For 11th & River, payment of the larger sum due at closing will be discussed closer to the time period in 2027.

- For 9th & River, the $2.5 million due at closing will be paid with cash reserves; the District may exercise the option to purchase in five years or later, and the larger sum due at closing will be discussed closer to that time.
- For 9th & Lee, a $100,000 earnest money deposit was paid at the time of signing the Purchase and Sale Agreement, with $3.5 million due at closing. The District has confirmed that this transaction has closed.
- As of June 2026, the District stated it had approximately $5.8 million available for future projects after all currently approved land acquisitions are completed. The District has further stated that approximately $12.5 million associated with the 9th & River parcel remains in District hands until the purchase option becomes exercisable in five years or later.

Respondents should note that land control and timing differ by parcel, and that one parcel is held under an option that may not be exercised for five years or more. Concepts and analyses shall be viable under more than one land-control assumption. See Section 5.8 of this RFQ where that subsection appears.

Conditions the District has not published. To be established by the consultant.

The District makes no representation in this RFQ, and respondents shall assume nothing, regarding the following. Establishing them is part of the scope of services, and respondents should reflect that effort in their proposed approach:

- Existing improvements on each parcel, their condition, occupancy, and the timing of any vacancy.
- The presence, jurisdiction, alignment, or vacation requirements of any public right-of-way lying within or bounding the assemblage.
- Ownership or control of any parcel within or adjacent to the assemblage that is not listed in the table above.
- Easements, title conditions, environmental or geotechnical conditions, floodplain status, and utility capacity.
- Urban renewal district status and the availability of tax increment financing.
- Zoning, entitlement, and permitting pathways applicable to a facility of the contemplated type and scale.

At kickoff the District will identify which of the above it can furnish as owner-furnished information, so the consultant does not duplicate work the District has already paid for. Furnishing information at kickoff is different from stating it in a public solicitation, and this RFQ deliberately does the former rather than the latter. Respondents shall assume nothing further in preparing an SOQ.

2.4 Prior Studies and Reference Documents

The following documents are incorporated as reference material. The Market and Feasibility Study and the Boise Centre Expansion Scenario Analysis are issued with this RFQ as attachments and are the controlling versions. The remaining items are publicly available at the links shown. The selected consultant will receive these and additional owner-furnished information at kickoff.

Document	Date	Link and relevance
Market and Feasibility Study, Full Report (C.H. Johnson Consulting)	October 6, 2025	Full Report (PDF) Establishes market demand, competitive position, lost-

Document	Date	Link and relevance
		business analysis, and initial facility recommendations.
Market and Feasibility Study, Board Presentation	September 25, 2025	Board Presentation (PDF) Presentation of findings to the Board of Directors.
Market and Feasibility Study, Public Presentation	October 16, 2025	Public Presentation (PDF) Stakeholder presentation. Recorded session: video
Boise Centre Expansion Scenario Analysis (C.H. Johnson Consulting)	June 1, 2026	Scenario Analysis (PDF) Compares three development scenarios against the initial recommendation, including program, event demand, attendance, room nights, operating projections, and economic impact.
Johnson Consulting Scenario Analysis Scope Proposal	January 20, 2026	Scope Proposal (PDF) Defines the three scenarios analyzed.
District Strategic Plan Framework and Direction	Approved January 22, 2026	Strategic Plan Framework (PDF) Board-approved planning horizon 2026–2028.
Future of the District	Maintained	Project timeline and FAQ District's public record of the planning effort.
District Reports and Studies	Maintained	Reports index Additional District studies.
District Finances	Maintained	Financial reports Audited financial statements and budgets.
Board Meetings	Maintained	Meeting schedule and recordings Board deliberations on this effort are recorded and public.

How this study relates to the prior work.

The 2025 Market and Feasibility Study and the 2026 Expansion Scenario Analysis are the **analytical starting point** for this assignment, not material to be re-derived. The selected consultant is expected to test, validate, refine, and where the evidence requires, respectfully challenge the conclusions of that work. The consultant is not expected to repeat market and demand analysis already completed and paid for.

Program direction. The Board has not adopted a development design, program, or timeline, and no preferred scenario has been selected. All scenarios examined in the prior studies remain open. The 2025 Market and Feasibility Study and the 2026 Expansion Scenario Analysis inform the direction of this study; they do not constrain it. Respondents shall scope their approach accordingly.

2.5 The Two Companion Studies and Their Interface

The District has stated that it will issue Requests for Qualifications for a Site Test Fit Study and a Financial Affordability Study, and that it is working with Paradigm of Idaho to facilitate the RFQs and studies. They are separate solicitations with separate consultants and separate contracts, and each depends on the other. The durations shown below are planning estimates established for this procurement; they are not District commitments.

	Facility Test Fit Study	Financial Advisory and Debt Capacity Analysis
Question answered	What can physically and operationally be built on the assembled site, in what configurations, and at what order-of-magnitude cost?	What level of capital investment can the District prudently afford, under what financing structures, and with what effect on reserves and operations?
Anticipated duration	Approximately 5 months following Notice to Proceed	Approximately 4 months following Notice to Proceed
Provides to the companion study	Order-of-magnitude capital cost ranges by alternative; phasing and timing; projected operating cost and revenue implications of each configuration.	Affordability ceilings and thresholds that constrain which alternatives are worth carrying forward; timing constraints driven by financing.
Receives from the companion study	Affordability range and decision thresholds, which may eliminate or reshape alternatives.	Capital cost ranges and phasing assumptions to model against.

Sequencing. The District is procuring these studies **sequentially, not concurrently.** The Facility Test Fit Study is procured first. The Financial Advisory and Debt Capacity Analysis is issued approximately eight (8) weeks later, so that the financial consultant models against capital cost output actually produced by the Test Fit Study rather than against an assumed range.

The resulting program timing is shown below, measured in weeks from issuance of the Facility Test Fit Study RFQ. Procurement is assumed to require approximately ten weeks from issuance through Notice to Proceed.

Milestone	Program week	Dependency
Facility Test Fit Study RFQ issued	Week 0	None
Financial Advisory RFQ issued	**Week 8**	Offset by design; no dependency
Test Fit Notice to Proceed	Week 11	None
Financial Advisory Notice to Proceed	Week 19	None
Test Fit transmits preliminary capital cost ranges	**Week 24**	Test Fit study Week 13
Financial Advisory requires capital cost input	**Week 25**	Financial study Week 6, one week of float
Test Fit transmits refined capital and operating output	**Week 27**	Test Fit study Week 16
Financial Advisory refreshes model against refined input	**Week 29**	Financial study Week 10, two weeks of float
Test Fit final study and Board package	Week 33	None

Milestone	Program week	Dependency
Financial Advisory final report and Board package	Week 36	None

Two-stage cost handoff. Capital cost information passes from the Test Fit consultant to the Financial Advisory consultant in two stages: preliminary order-of-magnitude ranges sufficient to build and calibrate the financial model, followed by refined cost and operating output sufficient to support conclusions. The Financial Advisory consultant shall structure its model so the second transmittal can be substituted without rebuilding it. Neither consultant is responsible for the other's work product, and reliance shall be documented in accordance with Section 6.

The program weeks above are calculated from an eleven-week procurement running from issuance on October 23, 2026 through Notice to Proceed on January 11, 2027. The Week 24 to Week 25 handoff carries one week of float.

The selected consultant shall coordinate with the companion study consultant through the District and Paradigm. Neither consultant is responsible for the other's work product, and neither may rely on the other's output without documenting that reliance in accordance with Section 6.

3. Purpose and Objectives

The District seeks a comprehensive planning and test fit study for a significant public assembly, event, and convention facility on the land described in Section 2.3. **This is not an architectural blocking exercise.**

The selected multidisciplinary team shall integrate program, operations, event and user needs, site and facility constraints, circulation, front-of-house and back-of-house functions, loading and service, right-of-way and land-control conditions, expansion, phasing, and preliminary capital-planning implications into dimensionally credible concepts that inform future investment and project-development decisions.

Study objectives:

- Establish a defensible preliminary program and space requirements tied to anticipated uses, capacities, operating model, service levels, and stakeholder priorities, building on rather than repeating the market and demand work already completed.
- Evaluate site and facility constraints, access, adjacencies, logistics, infrastructure, right-of-way conditions, and code and life-safety planning factors at a test fit level.
- Determine what can actually be built on the assemblage under differing land-control and right-of-way assumptions, and what each assumption costs in program, operations, and feasibility.
- Develop and compare viable development alternatives, including operational consequences, tradeoffs, risks, phasing, and preliminary capital-planning implications.
- Define the operating relationship between any new facility and the existing Boise Centre, including the practical penalty of a two-building campus.
- Engage District leadership, staff, users, operators, and identified stakeholders through a structured and documented process.
- Recommend a preferred planning direction and practical next steps for due diligence, design, approvals, funding, and implementation.

What this study is not. This study does not include design, engineering, surveying or construction management services although those professionals may provide input into the study's conclusions. It is not schematic design. It does not produce construction documents, a guaranteed budget, or an entitlement application. It does not re-perform the market and demand analysis completed in 2025 and 2026. It does not determine what the District can afford. That is the subject of the companion study described in Section 2.5.

4. Roles, Responsibility Boundaries, and Coordination

The following table defines each party's role. It is included so that respondents can assess independence, coordination burden, and conflict exposure before responding.

Party	Role under this RFQ and the resulting contract
Greater Boise Auditorium District	Contracting public entity. Establishes objectives; supplies available information; identifies decision-makers and stakeholders; approves key assumptions and deliverables; makes all procurement and policy decisions. Final direction and acceptance rest with the District.
Board of Directors	Elected governing body. Receives presentations, gives direction, and makes investment decisions. Board Chair: Kristin Muchow Directors: Chase Erkins – Vice Chair Jim Walker - Director Tiam Rastegar -Director Sophie Sestero - Director
Executive Director	District staff lead for this planning effort: Cody Lund – Executive Director
Selected consultant	Independent professional responsible for study methodology, analyses, technical work, professional judgments, quality control, conclusions, recommendations, deliverables, schedule, and management of its subconsultants.
Paradigm of Idaho, Inc.	The District's procurement manager and Owner's Representative. Administers this solicitation and communications; coordinates meetings and inputs; monitors progress and milestones; reviews assumptions and deliverables from an owner-interest perspective; supports Board communications and decisions. Paradigm does not perform, certify, or assume responsibility for the consultant's technical study, and is not eligible for award under this solicitation.
Companion study consultant	The consultant selected under the companion solicitation described in Section 2.5. Coordination occurs through the District and Paradigm. Neither consultant supervises or certifies the other.
Municipal advisor	The District does not currently have a municipal advisor under contract for this planning effort. The District has previously engaged Piper Sandler & Co. for municipal advisory services and is currently in discussions with Piper Sandler regarding potential future services. As of the issuance date of this RFQ, no agreement has been executed for such services. The District may engage Piper Sandler or another qualified firm during the

Party	Role under this RFQ and the resulting contract
	course of this Study. Any municipal advisor engaged by the District will serve in an advisory capacity to the District and will not supervise, direct, or certify the work of the consultant selected under this RFQ.
Bond counsel / legal counsel	Legal conclusions regarding District authority, debt limitations, election requirements, procurement authority, and public records are reserved to counsel. Hawley Troxell - District Legal Counsel
Other advisors and stakeholders	Provide information or advice within their established disciplines. Their participation does not transfer the selected consultant's responsibility for an integrated, complete study. The District has identified the following stakeholder organizations for engagement under Section 5.2. Named contacts will be furnished to the selected consultant at kickoff. Several sessions combine multiple like organizations, for a total of eight external stakeholder engagements. Visit Boise Boise Metro Chamber Boise Valley Economic Partnership (BVEP) City of Boise Large downtown hoteliers, including Block 22, Inn at 500, AC and Element, Hotel Renegade, and Riverside PAC Yes Group Downtown Boise Association (DBA) Capital City Development Corporation (CCDC)

Coordination requirements. The consultant shall communicate through the designated District/Paradigm protocol; maintain a single integrated work plan; identify information and decisions needed from the District with lead time; document all reliance on third-party information; and promptly surface scope, schedule, budget, data-quality, or coordination risks in writing.

5. Detailed Scope of Services

The following is the minimum consultant scope. Respondents shall include every element unless proposing a clearly identified and justified alternative under Section 10.5.

5.1 Initiation, Existing Information, and Basis of Planning

- Conduct kickoff with the District and Paradigm. Confirm the decisions the study must inform, success criteria, study boundaries, planning horizon, stakeholder map, review and approval points, and communications protocol.
- Inventory and review owner-furnished drawings, surveys, title and easement documents, prior studies, operating information, event data, maintenance records, site records, agreements, and other relevant materials.
- Review and reconcile the prior work identified in Section 2.4. Identify explicitly where this study adopts, refines, or departs from prior conclusions, and state the basis for any departure.
- Conduct site and facility reconnaissance of both the assemblage and the existing Boise Centre. Document observable conditions relevant to planning and identify additional surveys, investigations, or specialty studies required beyond the test fit scope.

- Prepare a Basis of Planning summarizing source information, assumptions, space and area definitions, planning metrics, applicable owner criteria, constraints, and unresolved questions.

5.2 Stakeholder, User Group, and Operational Engagement

- Develop an engagement plan identifying District decision-makers, staff, operators, event and program representatives, facility users, service providers, community perspectives as directed by the District, and specialty stakeholders.
- Facilitate interviews and workshops documenting current and future event types, attendance and capacity, operational pain points, desired outcomes, service expectations, scheduling and turnover needs, accessibility, security, staffing, maintenance, and revenue-supporting functions.
- Maintain a requirements and stakeholder-input register linking each material requirement to its source, priority, rationale, concept response, status, and disposition.
- Reconcile competing requests against District objectives, operational feasibility, program and cost implications, and decision authority. Stakeholder input does not constitute approval unless confirmed by the District.

Stakeholder engagement. The stakeholder organizations identified for this effort are listed in Section 4. Confirmed contact details and any additional participants will be furnished to the selected consultant at kickoff. For the purpose of proposing level of effort, respondents shall assume eight (8) external stakeholder engagement sessions, several of which combine multiple like organizations in a single session, in addition to District and Boise Centre staff and operator interviews and the Board and work-session presentations identified in Section 7.

5.3 Facility Programming and Preliminary Space Requirements

- Define anticipated facility mission, event and use profiles, capacity ranges, performance criteria, operating assumptions, and shared or multipurpose strategies.
- Develop a detailed space program with quantities, net areas, grossing factors, gross areas, occupancy and capacity, primary users, functional requirements, adjacencies, and special considerations.
- Address, at minimum: exhibit hall and large contiguous assembly space; ballroom and banquet space; meeting and breakout rooms; prefunction and lobby; ticketing and guest services; concessions, catering, and full commercial kitchen; restrooms; VIP, sponsor, and media; administration; storage; building support; and other elements validated with the District.
- Test the program direction indicated by the 2026 Expansion Scenario Analysis, including a contiguous exhibit hall in the range of 100,000 square feet and a phased addition of ballroom and meeting space, and state whether that program fits the site and under what conditions.
- Identify space standards and benchmarks used, reconcile the program to concepts, and maintain an area summary showing net-to-gross efficiency and variance from program.

5.4 Event, Assembly, and Specialty Systems Planning

- Evaluate room capacities, seating and setup configurations, sightlines where applicable, stage and platform relationships, accessibility and companion seating, patron comfort, room turnover, acoustical intent, event production, and flexibility at a conceptual level.
- Address event technology, audiovisual, production lighting, rigging, broadcast and media, communications, event power, and acoustics through appropriately qualified specialty consultants at a test fit level.

- Identify major technical criteria, structural bay and column-spacing requirements for exhibit and assembly space, clear heights, floor loading, rigging concepts, control positions, equipment and storage needs, and acoustic separation that materially influence massing, area, cost, or feasibility.
- Clearly identify items requiring later detailed design, testing, modeling, or code review.

5.5 Front of House, Public Realm, and Guest Experience

- Plan arrival, entry, queuing, ticketing and screening, prefunction and lobby, vertical circulation, wayfinding, concessions, restrooms, coat and storage, accessibility, egress distribution, and post-event dispersal.
- Evaluate simultaneous and overlapping event operations and the separability of spaces, including controlled access and after-hours use.
- Consider guest experience, sponsor and VIP needs, media, merchandising, food and beverage, and other revenue or service functions identified by the District.
- Integrate universal access and inclusive planning principles. Final code compliance remains subject to future design and authority review.

5.6 Back of House, Loading, Service, and Operations

- Plan loading docks and bays, truck and bus movements, marshalling, service routes, freight movement, receiving, waste, catering, storage, event changeover, staff access, security, and separation from public circulation.
- Test equipment and exhibit movement paths, door and elevator capacities, turning and staging requirements, and horizontal and vertical adjacencies at a planning level. Address direct drive-in access to exhibit space.
- Address operational staffing zones, building management, maintenance access, custodial support, central storage, and resilience and continuity considerations.
- Identify conflicts between event logistics, public access, site circulation, neighboring uses, and phased construction alongside ongoing operations.

5.7 Site, Right of Way, Access, Infrastructure, and Constraints

This subsection addresses conditions specific to the assemblage described in Section 2.3 and is a required element of the scope.

5.7.1 Right-of-way vacation analysis, required

To the extent public rights-of-way lie within or bound the assemblage as confirmed by the District under Section 2.3, whether those rights-of-way can be vacated is a determinative variable for any large contiguous floor plate. The consultant shall:

- Independently verify and map each right-of-way segment within or bounding the assemblage, its jurisdiction, and the applicable vacation process, approval authority, and realistic timeline. Do not rely solely on District-furnished information for this item.
- Test each development alternative in both a with-vacation and a without-vacation configuration, and state plainly what program is achievable in each case.
- Identify utilities, easements, and infrastructure within the affected rights-of-way and the planning-level implications of relocation.

- Identify the risks, dependencies, and decision points associated with pursuing vacation, without representing agency approval as likely or obtained.

Agency communications. The District has not held formal discussions with the City of Boise or the Ada County Highway District regarding vacation of any right-of-way within or bounding the assemblage. Respondents shall not assume any agency position, and the selected consultant shall not initiate contact with any agency regarding vacation without prior written District authorization.

5.7.2 General site, access, and infrastructure

- Independently establish and document property boundaries, ownership and control of every parcel within and adjacent to the assemblage, existing improvements and their occupancy, easements, title conditions, rights-of-way, access, grading, drainage, utility capacity, environmental, geotechnical, floodplain and river-proximity, neighborhood interface, urban renewal status, zoning and entitlement pathway, and regulatory constraints. Use owner-furnished information where the District provides it, and identify clearly what remains unverified and what follow-on investigation is required.
- Do not rely on this RFQ as a source of site conditions. Section 2.3 identifies what the District has published and expressly declines to represent anything further.
- Evaluate pedestrian, bicycle, transit, rideshare, passenger drop-off, parking interface, bus, truck, emergency, service, and accessible routes at a planning level.
- Evaluate the pedestrian and vehicular connection between the assemblage and the existing Boise Centre, including crossings of the intervening arterials, wayfinding, weather exposure, and perceived distance.
- Consider site security, public space, queuing, event peaks, loading and service separation, fire access, and connections to surrounding destinations including the Greenbelt and nearby lodging.
- Identify utility and infrastructure demand implications and potential enabling work, without representing unverified capacity or agency approval as fact.

5.7.3 Parking, required program element

- Evaluate parking demand for the contemplated program, including peak, concurrent-event, and shared-use scenarios with existing downtown supply.
- Test a structured parking component on the assemblage in the range of approximately 700 stalls, including footprint, massing, access, queuing, cost implication, and its effect on the developable area available for the facility itself.
- Identify partnership, shared-use, or off-site alternatives to District-funded structured parking.

5.8 Development Alternatives, Land Control, Expansion, and Phasing

The consultant shall develop at least four materially distinct viable alternatives. Regardless of the number, the alternatives shall collectively test the following conditions, which reflect the District's actual land position:

#	Required condition to be tested	Why it must be tested
A	Full assemblage available, rights-of-way vacated	The maximum-program case. Establishes the ceiling of what the site can deliver.
B	Full assemblage available, rights-of-way NOT vacated	Vacation is not assured. The District must know what it owns if the answer is no.
C	Optioned parcel NOT exercised	The option may not be exercised for five years or more

#	Required condition to be tested	Why it must be tested
		and the parcel remains in active third-party use. A concept that requires it is not currently buildable.
D	Phased delivery	An initial phase delivering the largest contiguous assembly space, with a later phase adding ballroom and meeting space, consistent with the phased approach examined in the 2026 Scenario Analysis.
E	Uncontrolled interior parcel not acquired	The District does not control every parcel within the block. Concepts must not assume availability.

- For each alternative, provide program fit; site plan; test fit floor plans; key sections, elevations, or massing sufficient to test feasibility; circulation and operational concepts; front-of-house and back-of-house and loading diagrams; expansion strategy; phasing; enabling work; key assumptions; constraints; risks; and unresolved diligence.
- Identify near-term and long-term expansion zones and protect critical circulation, structure, utilities, loading, and operations from foreseeable conflict.
- Address demolition of existing improvements on the parcels, including sequencing, abatement investigation needs, and cost implications, at a planning level.
- Refine a preferred alternative or hybrid following District review. Selection of a planning direction does not authorize design or construction.

5.9 Two-Facility Campus Operations, required

Any alternative that results in the District operating a new facility alongside the existing Boise Centre creates operational complexity that the study must address rather than assume away. The consultant shall:

- Define the operating relationship between the two facilities, including which event types are hosted where, and which events would be co-hosted across both buildings.
- Evaluate shared versus duplicated back-of-house functions, particularly commercial kitchen and catering capacity, central storage, and equipment inventory, and identify where duplication is unavoidable.
- Address staffing, event changeover, security, and management across two locations, and identify the incremental operating cost of the split.
- Evaluate the patron and event-planner experience of a two-building campus, including transfer between buildings, and state candidly the competitive penalty this imposes when bidding for events.
- Identify what physical, operational, or programmatic measures would most reduce that penalty.

[Note: the 2026 Scenario Analysis observes that co-hosting across two buildings would not be preferred by most meeting planners and may require rental rate concessions. The District expects this study to quantify that effect, not restate it.]

5.10 Preliminary Capital Planning Implications

- Develop comparative conceptual capital-planning information appropriate to the level of definition, including order-of-magnitude cost ranges, major allowances, escalation basis, phasing and enabling impacts, owner and soft costs, contingencies, and exclusions.

- Provide cost output in a format usable by the companion Financial Advisory and Debt Capacity Analysis consultant, including capital cost by alternative and by phase, and the projected annual operating cost and revenue implication of each alternative.
- Identify major schedule drivers, approvals, procurement and delivery considerations, long-lead or specialty systems, operational disruption, temporary facilities, and dependencies.
- Describe uncertainty and expected accuracy range explicitly. A test fit estimate shall not be presented as a budget, a guarantee, or a commitment, and shall carry that statement on the face of every cost exhibit.

Required capability: the consultant team shall include a qualified cost estimator with public assembly or convention facility experience, and planning and scheduling capability, or shall clearly describe how equivalent expertise will be provided.

5.11 Evaluation and Recommendation

- Use a transparent, District-approved evaluation framework addressing program, operations, event and user experience, site and logistics, land-control risk, expandability, implementation risk, schedule, preliminary capital implications, and alignment with District objectives.
- Document tradeoffs and explain why alternatives advance or do not advance. Do not weight criteria without District confirmation.
- Recommend a preferred direction, near-term due diligence, the next planning or design phase, stakeholder decisions, procurement considerations, and decision gates.
- Support Board and work-session presentations with clear graphics and decision-focused summaries suitable for a public meeting.

6. Required Study Methodology and Process

The consultant shall refine its approach with the District and Paradigm at kickoff while preserving the following minimum process. Respondents may recommend enhancements; any proposed deviation shall be clearly identified and justified in the SOQ.

- Kickoff; site and facility reconnaissance; document review; information request; stakeholder map; work plan; Basis of Planning outline.
- Operational and user discovery interviews and workshops; event and use profiles; requirements register; preliminary planning criteria.
- Draft facility program; adjacency and flow diagrams; site and constraint framework including right-of-way analysis; specialty criteria workshop.
- Alternative concept development integrating site, massing, program, front-of-house and back-of-house, loading and service, circulation, infrastructure, parking, phasing, expansion, land-control conditions, and operations.
- Comparative evaluation and preliminary capital-planning analysis; District and Paradigm alternative review and direction.
- Preferred concept refinement; program reconciliation; risk and due-diligence roadmap; draft report.
- Consolidated review and comment resolution; final study, editable files, executive presentation, and Board decision support.

6.1 Project Management and Quality Control

- Prepare and maintain a work plan showing tasks, dependencies, meetings, owner inputs, review periods, decision points, deliverables, and critical path.
- Maintain an information-request and decision log, assumptions log, risk and issues log, meeting-action log, and deliverable register in formats approved by the District and Paradigm.
- Apply an internal quality-control process led by personnel independent of day-to-day production. Identify the responsible QC reviewer by name in the SOQ.
- Provide concise written status reporting at an agreed cadence, including work completed, upcoming activities, decisions needed, risks, mitigation actions, and schedule status.
- Use accessible, decision-oriented communication suitable for District staff, stakeholders, and public Board discussion while preserving adequate technical support.

6.2 Communications and Publicity

This project is the subject of ongoing public and media interest. The consultant shall not issue any press release, publish any image, rendering, plan, or project description, or discuss the assignment with media, in marketing material, in award submissions, or on social media, without prior written District approval. All media inquiries shall be referred to the District. This restriction survives completion of the study for two (2) years.

Public-facing materials and media support. The consultant shall prepare public-facing materials suitable for release by the District, and shall support District media briefings and a public presentation of findings in a format similar to the public presentation of the 2025 Market and Feasibility Study. The consultant is not expected to attend public meetings other than the Board meetings and work sessions identified in Section 7, Deliverable 12.

7. Required Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Minimum content and acceptance expectation
1	**Project management package**	Work plan and schedule; engagement plan; information and decision, assumption, requirement, risk, action, and deliverable logs; meeting documentation; status reporting at the agreed cadence.
2	**Existing conditions and Basis of Planning**	Source inventory; reconnaissance documentation for both the assemblage and Boise Centre; constraints and opportunities; planning metrics; space definitions; use and event profiles; assumptions; data gaps; required follow-on studies; reconciliation with prior studies.
3	**Stakeholder and operational findings**	Engagement summary; workshop materials; validated functional and operational needs; requirements register; unresolved conflicts and District decisions needed.
4	**Facility program**	Editable room and space data and summary; quantities, areas, grossing, capacities, users, adjacencies, functional and specialty criteria, and reconciliation to concepts.
5	**Right-of-way and land-control analysis**	Right-of-way segments, jurisdictions, vacation process and timeline; with-vacation and without-vacation implications; land-control matrix by parcel; effect of each condition on achievable program.
6	**Alternatives package**	For each alternative: site plan; test fit floor plans; key sections, elevations, or massing; program fit; front-of-house, back-of-house, loading and

#	Deliverable	Minimum content and acceptance expectation
		service diagrams; circulation; operations; parking; expansion; phasing; constraints; risks; and assumptions, at a scale suitable for independent review.
7	**Two-facility campus operations analysis**	Operating relationship; shared versus duplicated functions; incremental operating cost of the split; patron and planner experience; quantified competitive penalty; mitigation measures.
8	**Comparative evaluation and capital planning package**	District-approved evaluation matrix; order-of-magnitude cost ranges and basis; cost and operating output formatted for use by the companion financial study; schedule and phasing implications; enabling work; operational disruption; stated uncertainty, exclusions, and follow-on diligence.
9	**Preferred concept package**	Refined viable test fit concept; reconciled area program; key architectural, site, and operational diagrams; specialty criteria; expansion and phasing strategy; principal decisions and risks. Not construction documents.
10	**Draft and final study report**	Executive summary; process; engagement; basis of planning; program; constraints; alternatives; evaluation; preferred direction; capital-planning implications; limitations; implementation roadmap; appendices and source references.
11	**Native and presentation files**	Accessible PDF; editable report, presentation, program, evaluation, cost, and schedule files; native CAD, BIM, or GIS files with referenced files and plotting standards. Specific software and version requirements will be confirmed with the District at kickoff. Native files shall be deliverable and usable in a standard Windows environment without specialty licensing.
12	**Meetings and presentations**	Kickoff; user and stakeholder interviews and workshops; recurring progress meetings; program and alternatives workshops; draft review; and up to 4 Board or work-session presentations.

Graphics standard. Graphics shall clearly distinguish existing, proposed, future expansion, phased, and unresolved conditions. Plans shall show scale, north arrow where applicable, key dimensions and capacities, area reconciliation, and assumptions sufficient for independent review. Renderings may support communication but shall not substitute for dimensionally credible plans and analytical diagrams. The District will rely on these documents in a public setting; they must withstand scrutiny.

8. Study Schedule and Milestones

The anticipated study period is approximately five (5) months following selection, contracting, and Notice to Proceed. Respondents shall propose a detailed schedule with realistic stakeholder engagement, concept development, specialty coordination, and owner review durations. The duration is a planning estimate, not a guaranteed completion period.

Study milestone	Target timing	District input required
Notice to Proceed and kickoff	Week 1	Owner-furnished information delivered; stakeholder roster confirmed
Existing conditions, data review, stakeholder discovery	Weeks 1–4	Staff and stakeholder availability
Basis of Planning and preliminary program	Weeks 4–7	Confirmation of planning assumptions
Program validation and concept criteria	Weeks 7–9	Program approval
Development alternatives	Weeks 9–14	Mid-point workshop attendance
Comparative evaluation and capital implications	Weeks 13–16	Evaluation criteria approval
Preliminary capital cost ranges transmitted to companion financial study	**Week 13**	Coordinated through District and Paradigm. A contractual milestone, not a courtesy. The companion study cannot proceed without it.
Refined capital and operating output transmitted to companion financial study	**Week 16**	Coordinated through District and Paradigm
Preferred concept and draft report	Weeks 16–19	Direction on preferred alternative
Consolidated review and comment resolution	Weeks 19–20	Single consolidated comment set
Final study and Board decision package	Weeks 20–22	Board meeting calendar

Companion study dependency. This study is the first of two procured sequentially under the District's planning effort. The Week 13 and Week 16 transmittals identified above feed the Financial Advisory and Debt Capacity Analysis, which is procured approximately eight weeks after this solicitation. See Section 2.5. Slippage in this study's schedule propagates directly to the companion study, and respondents shall treat those two transmittal dates as fixed commitments in their proposed schedule.

Public timeline. The District has publicly indicated that study results were anticipated in late fall to winter 2026. Under the sequential approach described in Section 2.5, the Test Fit final Board package lands at approximately program Week 33 and the companion study at approximately Week 36. The District will publicly adjust the timeline at its September 2026 Board meeting, before this RFQ is issued.

9. Consultant and Team Qualifications

The District is seeking an integrated multidisciplinary team, not a single-discipline firm with unnamed support. Respondents shall demonstrate:

- **Prime consultant leadership** of planning or test fit studies for major convention centers, exhibit halls, arenas, performing arts or event venues, or similarly complex public assembly facilities.
- **Integrated multidisciplinary capability** appropriate to the assignment, including: architecture and planning; venue programming; event and facility operations; acoustics; event and theater planning; audiovisual and technology; production lighting and rigging; accessibility; code and life-safety planning; civil, site, and transportation engineering including loading logistics; structural and MEP planning; security; cost estimating; and scheduling and phasing. A respondent may explain why a discipline is unnecessary or appropriately deferred.
- **Named team** including principal-in-charge, project manager, lead architect or planner, venue programmer, operations and event specialist, specialty venue systems leads, site and logistics lead, cost estimator, scheduling and phasing resource, and independent quality-control reviewer.
- **Public-sector experience** working with an elected governing board in an open-meeting environment, including preparing materials for public deliberation.
- **Demonstrated ability** to translate stakeholder needs into traceable requirements, credible programs, dimensionally viable concepts, comparative alternatives, and Board-ready decision materials.
- Registration must be in place before contract execution and before performing any service in Idaho that requires it. Registration is not required at the time of SOQ submission.
- **Capacity and availability** to complete the anticipated five-month effort and maintain the proposed key personnel through completion.
- This RFQ is open to joint ventures. A joint venture may submit as a single respondent and will be evaluated on the combined qualifications of its members. See Section 9.1.

9.1 Joint Ventures, Teaming, and Prime–Subconsultant Arrangements

The District recognizes that no single firm may hold every discipline this assignment requires. **Joint ventures are expressly permitted and encouraged.** A respondent may submit as:

- A single prime consultant with subconsultants;
- A joint venture, partnership, or other formal association of two or more firms submitting as a single respondent; or
- A formally documented team or association in which one member is identified as the responsible lead.

The District will evaluate a joint venture on the combined qualifications of its members. A joint venture is not disadvantaged relative to a single firm, and the District will not infer weakness from the joint venture structure itself. The District will, however, assess integration risk, and a joint venture whose members have not previously worked together should address that directly in the SOQ.

Requirements applicable to a joint venture. A joint venture respondent shall:

- Identify every member firm by legal name, the office performing the work, and its ownership or participation interest in the joint venture.
- Designate a single member, and a single individual within that member, as the point of contact with authority to bind the joint venture for the duration of the procurement and the resulting contract.

- Submit an executed joint venture agreement, or if not yet executed, a signed letter of intent together with the material terms. The submission shall identify the legal structure; scope allocation by member; management and decision-making structure; dispute resolution among members; financial responsibility; and insurance arrangements.
- Confirm that each member is jointly and severally liable to the District for full performance of the contract. The District will not accept a structure in which liability is limited to a member's allocated scope.
- Demonstrate that each member holds the professional licensure and registration applicable to the services that member will perform, in the required jurisdiction.
- Provide, for each member, the firm qualifications, relevant experience, key personnel, references, and disclosures required by Sections 10 and 19. Disclosure obligations under Section 19 apply to every member individually.
- Provide an organization chart showing which member performs which scope element, and how the members will function as one team rather than as parallel efforts.

Composition changes. The composition of a joint venture, and the identity of any member firm or subconsultant identified in the SOQ, shall not change after submission without prior written District approval. An unapproved change may result in rejection of the SOQ or termination of negotiations. A request to substitute shall identify the reason and demonstrate that the replacement is equally or better qualified.

A firm that violates this limit may have each affected SOQ rejected.

Contracting. If a joint venture is selected, the District will contract with the joint venture as a single entity, or with each member jointly and severally, at the District's election. Insurance shall be provided in the name of the joint venture, or by each member with evidence acceptable to the District under Section 20.

10. Statement of Qualifications Requirements

Submit a clear, concise SOQ organized in the order below. Marketing material not responsive to the requested information may be disregarded and does not earn evaluation points.

Format requirement	Instruction
Maximum page count	30 pages, excluding cover, dividers, table of contents, and resumes.
Page size and orientation	8.5" x 11" portrait; 11" x 17" foldouts permitted for graphics and schedules and count as one page.
Minimum font size	10 point body text; 8 point minimum in tables and graphics.
File format	Single searchable PDF, bookmarked by section.
File naming convention	Firmname_GBAD _Facility-Test-Fit-Study-SOQ.pdf
Maximum file size	The SOQ shall be submitted as one searchable PDF file not exceeding 25 MB. Respondents are responsible for optimizing graphics and images as necessary to comply with the file-size limitation. Links to externally hosted SOQ content shall not be accepted as a substitute for required submission materials.
Copies required	Six (6) bound hard copies, plus one searchable PDF.

Format requirement	Instruction
Signature	Letter of Interest signed by an individual authorized to bind the respondent.

Required SOQ organization. Each subsection below corresponds to the evaluation criteria in Section 12. Respondents are advised to address them in this order.

10.1 Letter of Interest (2 pages maximum)

Identify the respondent's legal name, the office that will perform the work, the primary contact, and the authorized representative. Confirm acceptance of the anticipated five-month study period, commitment to the proposed team and key personnel, receipt of all addenda, and availability of the named key personnel for the anticipated interview dates of December 15 and 16, 2026.

10.2 Executive Summary and Understanding

Demonstrate understanding of the District's objectives, the specific complexity of this assignment, the principal risks, and the decisions the study must enable. Generic statements of enthusiasm are not responsive. The evaluation committee is looking for evidence that the respondent has read the reference documents in Section 2.4 and understands the actual conditions described in Section 2.3.

10.3 Firm and Team Qualifications

Describe firm history, ownership, office locations, applicable professional registrations, organizational structure, subconsultants and prior collaboration among them, independence, and quality-control structure. Provide an organization chart identifying which entity performs which scope. If responding as a joint venture or formal association, comply additionally with Section 9.1 where that subsection appears in this RFQ.

10.4 Relevant Experience

Provide up to five detailed project examples meeting the criteria in Section 9. For each, identify: client and contact; project scale and complexity; the respondent's actual role; which proposed personnel worked on it; the deliverables produced; and the decision the client made as a result. Examples in which the proposed personnel did not participate carry substantially reduced weight.

10.5 Approach, Methodology, and Work Plan

Address every scope element in Section 5 and every deliverable in Section 7. Include the proposed process, quality control, meeting cadence, owner review durations, and a schedule consistent with Section 8. Identify any element of the stated scope the respondent believes should be modified, and explain why. This subsection carries the highest single weight in Section 12.

10.6 Key Personnel and Availability

Provide roles, resumes, relevant experience, registrations, office location, anticipated percentage commitment to this assignment, current workload, availability during the anticipated study period, and a continuity plan. Identify the principal-in-charge, the day-to-day project manager, each discipline lead, and the independent quality-control reviewer by name.

10.7 Disclosures and Contract Exceptions

Provide all disclosures required by Section 19 and list any requested exception to this RFQ or to the anticipated contract terms in Section 20. Silence may be treated as taking no exception, subject to the final solicitation language. Exceptions raised for the first time during negotiation may result in discontinuation of negotiation.

10.8 Additional Recommended Services

Separately identify any optional survey, investigation, analysis, visualization, or later-phase service the respondent recommends, with rationale, schedule implication, and a clear statement of whether it is included in the base approach. Do not obscure compliance with the base scope. Optional services are not scored but may inform contract negotiation.

10.9 Fee Information

Do not submit fee or pricing information with the Statement of Qualifications. This is a qualifications-based procurement. The District will evaluate and rank respondents solely on the criteria published in Section 12. Fee is not an evaluation criterion, carries no points, and will play no part in ranking.

Respondents shall exclude from the SOQ and its appendices all hourly rates, rate schedules, lump-sum or not-to-exceed amounts, estimated hours, unit pricing, discount offers, and any other statement of cost. Marketing material referencing prior project fees is likewise excluded. Respondents shall not communicate fee expectations to the District, Paradigm, Board members, or evaluation committee members at any point before selection; Section 15 governs all communications. If a Respondent submits pricing information, that information will be disregarded in the evaluation process but may affect Respondent's ranking for its demonstrated inability to follow the directions contained in this RFQ.

Fee negotiation following selection. After qualifications-based ranking is complete, the District will proceed as follows:

- The District will notify the highest-ranked firm and request a detailed fee proposal covering the scope in Section 5, the deliverables in Section 7, and the schedule in Section 8.
- The fee proposal shall include, at minimum: estimated labor hours by task and by named individual; billing rates by classification; subconsultant fees at the same level of detail; reimbursable expenses and the basis for each; all assumptions, exclusions, and owner-furnished items relied upon; and a separately stated price for each optional service offered under Section 10.8.
- The District and Paradigm will negotiate scope, level of effort, deliverables, schedule, contract terms, and compensation. Scope may be adjusted during negotiation; the qualifications ranking will not be revisited.
- If the District and the highest-ranked firm cannot reach agreement, the District will terminate negotiations in writing and may commence negotiations with the next-ranked firm. *The District may resume negotiations with a firm whose negotiations were previously terminated*.
- No work is authorized, and the District incurs no obligation, until a written contract is executed and any required Notice to Proceed is issued.
- The District reserves the right to reject any fee proposal, to request clarification or revision of a fee proposal, to adjust scope and level of effort in order to reach an acceptable fee, to terminate negotiations at any time and proceed to the next ranked firm, and to cancel the procurement without award.

Why fee is excluded. The District is procuring analysis that will inform a capital decision far larger than the cost of the study itself. Ranking on qualifications first, then negotiating scope and fee with the best-qualified firm, protects the District against a low fee purchased with reduced effort and keeps the negotiation focused on what the study must actually deliver. Respondents should scope their proposed approach to what the assignment genuinely requires rather than to an assumed budget.

11. References

Provide at least three references for comparable work completed or substantially completed within the past seven years. For each reference, provide:

- Client organization and project name
- Reference contact name, title, current telephone number, and current email address
- Project description and the respondent's specific role
- Original and actual schedule, with explanation of any variance
- Completion status and relevance to this assignment

The District may contact any listed reference and any reference it identifies independently, subject to applicable requirements. Failure to provide current, working contact information may reduce the score under Section 12.

12. Evaluation and Scoring: Grading Rubric

SOQs will be scored out of 100 points using the criteria and rubric below. This rubric is published so that respondents understand exactly how their submission will be assessed. Respondents are advised to organize Section 10.2 through 10.6 of the SOQ to address these criteria directly.

Fee is not scored. This is a qualifications-based procurement. No points are available for price, and no pricing information is to be submitted. Fee is negotiated with the highest-ranked firm after ranking is complete, in accordance with Section 10.9.

12.1 Criteria and Weighting

Criterion	Points	What the evaluation committee will assess
A. Firm and team qualifications; multidisciplinary venue expertise	**20**	Depth, integration, and relevance of architecture and planning, convention and event operations, specialty venue systems, site and logistics, cost, and implementation expertise. Whether the team is genuinely integrated or assembled for this pursuit.
B. Relevant project experience	**25**	Comparable convention, exhibit hall, arena, performing arts, or complex public assembly planning studies. Scale, complexity, stakeholder setting, treatment of site and land-control constraints, quality of alternatives, and what the client actually did with the work.
C. Proposed methodology and understanding	**25**	Understanding that this is comprehensive planning, not blocking. Completeness across program, engagement, operations, front-of-house and back-of-house, loading, site and right-of-way, parking,

Criterion	Points	What the evaluation committee will assess
		alternatives, two-campus operations, expansion, capital implications, and quality control. Evidence the respondent has read the reference documents and understands the actual site conditions.
D. Key personnel, availability, and team integration	**15**	Qualifications and direct involvement of the project manager, venue programmer, lead architect, operations specialist, technical specialists, cost and schedule resources, and QC lead. Realistic availability against stated current workload. Team cohesion and prior collaboration.
E. Stakeholder engagement, communication, and decision support	**10**	Ability to facilitate diverse users, reconcile competing requirements, communicate visually, coordinate with the District, Paradigm, and the companion consultant, and support decisions by an elected board in a public setting.
F. References and past performance	**5**	Responsiveness, creativity grounded in feasibility, schedule and budget discipline, collaboration, and the demonstrated usefulness of prior study deliverables to the client's decision.
TOTAL	**100**	

12.2 Scoring Bands

Each criterion is scored against the following bands. The percentage is applied to the points available for that criterion.

Band	% of points	Definition
Exceptional	90–100%	Fully responsive and materially better than expected. Demonstrates specific understanding of this project rather than general capability. Provides evidence, not assertion. The committee would be confident placing this work with the respondent without reservation.
Strong	75–89%	Fully responsive with clear, relevant evidence. Minor gaps that would not affect outcome. A capable, low-risk choice.
Acceptable	60–74%	Responsive but generic, or evidence is thin in one or more areas. Would require active District and Owner's Representative management to produce the required outcome.
Marginal	40–59%	Partially responsive. Material gaps in capability, evidence, availability, or understanding. Meaningful risk to schedule or deliverable quality.
Deficient	0–39%	Not responsive, or the response does not demonstrate the required capability. Includes responses that substitute marketing material for the requested information.

12.3 What Earns and What Loses Points

The following is provided to make the committee's expectations explicit. It is guidance, not an exhaustive list.

Earns points	Loses points
Naming the specific site conditions in Section 2.3 and explaining how the approach addresses them	A methodology that could be submitted unchanged to any convention center client in any city
A clear position on how right-of-way vacation risk will be handled analytically	Treating the assemblage as a single unconstrained site
Project examples where the proposed personnel personally performed the work	Firm-wide project lists with no connection to the named team
Realistic availability stated against actual current workload	Key personnel committed at percentages inconsistent with disclosed workload
Candid identification of risk, uncertainty, and what the study cannot resolve	Assurances of certainty at a test fit level of definition
Sample deliverables or excerpts demonstrating dimensionally credible planning graphics	Renderings presented in place of analytical plans and diagrams
A named, independent quality-control reviewer with defined authority	Quality control described as a process with no individual accountable
Clear treatment of how cost output will be made usable by the companion financial study	Silence on the interface between the two studies
A joint venture with an executed agreement, scope allocated by member, and evidence of prior collaboration	A joint venture assembled for this pursuit with scope allocation and management structure left to be determined
Identifying elements of the stated scope the respondent would change, with reasons	Uncritical acceptance of the entire scope with no professional observation

12.4 Scoring Method

Scoring method. The District receives all Statements of Qualifications and distributes them to the evaluation committee. Each evaluation committee member scores every responsive SOQ independently using the rubric in Section 12.1. The committee then meets in a structured consensus discussion facilitated by Paradigm. Following that discussion, each evaluator may adjust his or her individual scores and submits a final individual score sheet. Paradigm averages the final individual scores to produce the ranking used for shortlisting. Interviews, if held, are scored separately and weighted 25 percent of the final ranking, with the averaged SOQ score weighted 75 percent. The District then negotiates with the highest-ranked firm in accordance with Section 10.9. Independent score sheets, the facilitated discussion, any score adjustment, and the final averages are documented in the selection record.

A high score does not create a right to award. The District may consider responsiveness, responsibility, conflicts of interest, references, interviews, clarifications, and successful negotiation as described in this RFQ.

Minimum threshold. *A minimum total score of 70 of 100 is required for shortlist consideration. No minimum is set on any individual criterion.*

13. Shortlisting, Interviews, and Selection

#	Step	What happens
1	**Responsiveness review**	The District and Paradigm review timely submissions for compliance with the requirements of this RFQ. The District may request clarification as provided in this RFQ.
2	**Qualifications evaluation**	An evaluation committee scores SOQs using the published rubric in Section 12. Committee composition: Five-Member Committee: • Cody Lund – Greater Boise Auditorium District • Kristin Muchow – Greater Boise Auditorium District • Chase Erkins – Greater Boise Auditorium District • Julie Rising – Boise Centre • Nick Souba – Boise Centre
3	**Shortlist**	The District may shortlist the most qualified firms, or proceed directly to selection if permitted and determined appropriate. Shortlisted and non-shortlisted respondents will be notified.
4	**Interviews**	Anticipated interview dates are published in Section 14 and respondents are expected to hold them at the time of submission. Shortlisted firms are notified Monday, December 7 and receive written instructions describing format, required attendees, topics, time limits, and scoring. Interviews are scored separately and weighted 25 percent of the final ranking, with the averaged SOQ score weighted 75 percent, in accordance with Section 12.4.
5	**References and due diligence**	The District may verify references, team availability, licenses, registrations, disclosures, and any representation made in the SOQ.
6	**Selection and negotiation**	The District will request a detailed fee proposal from the highest-ranked firm and negotiate final scope, schedule, deliverables, contract terms, and compensation in accordance with Section 10.9. If agreement cannot be reached, the District will terminate negotiations in writing and may proceed to the next-ranked firm as permitted.
7	**Notice and contracting**	Selection is not final and no work is authorized until the District executes a written contract and issues any required Notice to Proceed.

Debriefing. Unsuccessful respondents may request a debriefing within five business days of the notice of intended selection. *The District will offer a debriefing to any unsuccessful respondent that requests one within that period.*

Protest procedure. A respondent that submits an SOQ in response to this RFQ may protest the award of the contract resulting from this RFQ. A Notice of Intent to Protest must be made in writing to the District, attention Executive Director, with a copy to Paradigm of Idaho, Inc., and must be received no later than two (2) business days from the notice of intended selection. If no such Notice of Intent to Protest is timely filed, the respondent forgoes its ability to pursue a protest.

Following a timely Notice of Intent to Protest, a separate Protest Notification must be made in writing to the District and Paradigm and must be received no later than seven (7) business days from the notice of intended selection. The Protest Notification must contain the specific grounds for the protest, and supporting documentation must be included with it. A protest must state all grounds upon which the protesting party asserts that the solicitation or award was improper. Issues not raised in the protest are deemed waived. A protest that is incomplete or not submitted within the prescribed time limits will be summarily dismissed. Thereafter, staying the award of the

contract to addressing the contentions raised by the protesting party, the GBAD board shall review the decision and determine whether to affirm its prior award, modify the award, or choose to re-open the RFQ, setting forth its reason or reasons therefor.

Only the following are acceptable grounds for protest:

- Failure to follow District procedures established in this RFQ or under Idaho law
- Errors in computing scores which contributed to the incorrect selection of a respondent
- Bias, discrimination, or conflict of interest on the part of an evaluator

For clarification, but without any limitation, the following are not acceptable grounds for protest:

- Evaluator qualifications to serve on the evaluation committee
- The professional judgment of the evaluation committee
- The District's assessment of its own needs regarding the RFQ

Protests are heard by the Board of Directors.

14. Procurement Timeline for Respondents

The following schedule governs this solicitation. It is preliminary and may be revised only by written addendum. Respondent obligations are stated so that firms can assess whether they can meet the schedule before committing resources.

#	Milestone	Date	What the respondent must do
1	**RFQ issued**	Friday, October 23, 2026	Register as a planholder with the procurement contact to ensure receipt of addenda. Unregistered firms may not receive addenda.
2	**Optional pre-submittal meeting and site visit**	Wednesday, November 4, 2026	Attendance optional but recommended. Confirm attendance in advance. The site is in active third-party use; unescorted access is not permitted.
3	**Deadline for questions**	Wednesday, November 11, 2026, 5:00 PM MT	Submit all questions in writing to the designated contact only, using the required subject line. Questions received after this deadline will not be answered.
4	**Responses and addenda issued**	Wednesday, November 18, 2026	Review all addenda. Acknowledge each addendum in the SOQ. Failure to acknowledge may render the SOQ nonresponsive.
5	**Statements of Qualifications due**	Wednesday, December 9, 2026, 3:00 PM MT	Submit by the stated method. Confirm receipt. Late submissions are treated in accordance with Section 16.

#	Milestone	Date	What the respondent must do
6	**Evaluation period**	December 10 to December 14, 2026	Remain available to respond to written clarification requests within two business days.
7	**Shortlist notice**	Monday, December 14, 2026	Shortlisted and non-shortlisted respondents notified in writing.
8	**Interviews, if held**	December 15 and December 16, 2026, anticipated	Interview dates are anticipated. Hold December 15 and 16 at the time of submission. Shortlisted firms are notified Monday, December 14 and the District will confirm scheduling in that notice. Named key personnel must attend in person unless the District permits otherwise. Substitution of personnel at interview may reduce the score.
9	**Notice of intended selection**	Wednesday, December 16, 2026, anticipated	Debriefing and protest rights per Section 13 apply from this date.
10	**District Board approval**	Monday, December 21, 2026, 2:00 PM	Award is subject to Board action at a public meeting.
11	**Contract negotiation**	December 22, 2026 to January 8, 2027	Highest-ranked firm to be available to negotiate scope, schedule, deliverables, and compensation. Exceptions not raised under Section 10.7 may not be entertained.
12	**Anticipated Notice to Proceed**	Monday, January 11, 2027	Study period of approximately five months begins. See Section 8.

Dates are set against the published Board meeting of Monday, December 21, 2026 at 2:00 PM. Statements of Qualifications are received by the District at the location stated in Section 16 and distributed to the evaluation committee. Interview dates and the date of the notice of intended selection are anticipated and may be adjusted by written addendum or in the shortlist notice. Respondents shall hold the anticipated interview dates. Because the interval between the notice of intended selection and the Board meeting is short, a protest filed under Section 13 may be heard by the Board at a later meeting.

15. Questions and Communications

All communications regarding this RFQ shall be directed only to the designated procurement contact identified below. Respondents shall not contact District Board members, evaluation committee members, District employees, Paradigm personnel other than the designated contact, or identified stakeholders regarding this procurement except as expressly authorized in writing. For violations of this provision, the District reserves the right to reject that respondent's SOQ.

Inadvertent contact with any person other than the designated procurement contact shall be reported in writing to the procurement contact within one business day. The District will determine whether the contact affected the integrity of the procurement and may permit the respondent to continue, require corrective measures, or reject the SOQ.

Item	Information
Procurement contact	Johnathon Caradonna, Executive Vice President, Paradigm of Idaho, Inc.
Email	johnathon@paradigm-ors.biz
Question deadline	Wednesday, November 11, 2026
Required subject line	GBAD RFQ TEST FIT QUESTIONS
Official responses	Only written responses issued by the District through an addendum or other designated official channel modify or clarify this RFQ. Oral statements by any person are not binding.

16. Submission Instructions

Requirement	Instruction
Deadline	SOQ must be received by Wednesday, December 9, 2026 by 3:00 PM MT
Delivery method	Anna Mills, Executive Administrative Assistant, amills@boisecentre.com / 850 W. Front St. Boise, ID 83702
Confirmation of receipt	The District will confirm receipt within 10 business hours. Respondents are responsible for confirming receipt before the deadline.
File and copy requirements	Submit one (1) electronic copy of the complete SOQ as a single, searchable PDF file not exceeding 25 MB. The file shall be named FirmName_GBAD_Facility-Test-Fit-SOQ.pdf. The PDF should be bookmarked by major section and optimized for electronic review. Bound hard copies are required in the quantity stated in Section 10. Required forms, acknowledgments, and certifications shall be included within the single PDF. Electronic signatures are acceptable where signatures are required.
Acknowledgments	Include Form A, Addendum Acknowledgment; Form B, Reference Form for each reference; and Form C, Conflict of Interest and Disclosure. A separate Form C is required from each joint venture member.
Late submissions	Late, Incomplete, or Misdirected Submissions: SOQs must be received by the District at the designated submission location no later than the date and time stated in this RFQ. Respondents are solely responsible for ensuring that their complete submission is received before the deadline. Submissions received after the deadline will not be considered, except where the District determines that the delay resulted solely from a documented failure of the District's designated electronic submission system and acceptance is permitted by applicable law. Submissions delivered to an email address, location, or system other than the one designated in this RFQ may be considered late if they are not received at the designated submission location before the deadline. The District is not responsible for transmission delays, file-size limitations, internet or email failures, or other technical issues outside the District's control. Respondents are responsible for ensuring that submitted files are complete, readable, and accessible. A corrupted, password-protected, or otherwise inaccessible file may be deemed nonresponsive, subject to any clarification or cure

Requirement	Instruction
	permitted by applicable law.
Withdrawal or modification	A respondent may withdraw or modify its SOQ at any time prior to the submission deadline by providing written notice to the District's designated procurement contact. Any modification must be submitted in the same manner required for the original SOQ and must clearly identify the respondent and the RFQ. If a respondent submits a revised SOQ prior to the deadline, the revised submission shall clearly indicate that it replaces the respondent's previously submitted SOQ in its entirety. The District will evaluate only the respondent's latest complete SOQ received prior to the submission deadline. After the submission deadline, an SOQ may not be withdrawn or modified except as permitted by applicable law or upon written request or authorization of the District as part of a permitted clarification, correction, or procurement process.

17. Terms, Reservations, and Procurement Conditions

Procurement authority. This RFQ is conducted under the District’s own procurement practice. The process published in this document is the process the District will follow, and the District will apply it consistently to every respondent.

Subject to the process stated in this RFQ, the District reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to:

- Reject any or all responses; waive, permit cure of, or decline to waive informalities or minor irregularities where lawful; and determine responsiveness and responsibility.
- Cancel, suspend, revise, reissue, or extend this procurement at any time; modify the schedule; issue addenda; or elect not to proceed with the study.
- Disqualify any respondent on the basis of any real or apparent collusion or conflict of interest.
- Disqualify any respondent on the basis of past performance on other projects, being in arrears on an existing contract with the District or any other Idaho public agency, or having defaulted on a previous contract with the District or any other Idaho public agency.
- Negotiate with any respondent to this RFQ and, subject to Section 10.9, determine the combination of qualifications and negotiated fee that best serves the District.
- Waive any minor irregularity in any SOQ.
- Request written clarifications, supplemental information, presentations, interviews, references, or verification of any representation.
- Investigate qualifications and past performance and consider information from sources other than the SOQ.
- Shortlist firms; negotiate scope, schedule, deliverables, compensation, and contract terms; and discontinue or resume negotiations.
- Award all, part, or none of the contemplated work, and add, delete, sequence, or defer services through the final negotiated contract.
- Select one, none, or several respondents to provide the Services, or portions thereof, as described in this RFQ.
- Use information submitted for evaluation and public-business purposes, subject to applicable law and properly identified confidential information.

The District is not liable for costs incurred in preparing or presenting an SOQ, participating in interviews, providing clarifications, negotiating, or otherwise responding to this RFQ. Issuance of this RFQ does not obligate the District to award or execute a contract. No respondent is entitled to reimbursement unless expressly authorized in a written contract signed by the District. By responding to this RFQ, each respondent agrees that any finding by the District regarding any fact in dispute as to this RFQ or the SOQs shall be final and conclusive except as provided in the protest procedure in Section 13.

18. Public Records and Confidential Information

Responses may be subject to disclosure under applicable public-records requirements. Respondents shall not mark an entire SOQ confidential; doing so may result in the entire submission being treated as public. Any claimed protected information shall be narrowly identified page by page, accompanied by the legal basis for protection, and accompanied by a redacted copy if requested. The District will provide notice to any respondent whose documents are designated as confidential records and which are the subject of a public records request. The respondent can take whatever action it deems appropriate to protect its interests. The District cannot guarantee confidentiality and will handle records as required by law. The District may consider withholding records if the Respondent can make a colorable claim that the records are exempt from disclosure and an appropriate indemnity agreement is entered into with the Respondent whose records are the subject of the request.

The District will handle all records in accordance with Idaho public records law.

19. Conflicts of Interest and Disclosures

Each respondent shall disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest involving:

- The District, its Board members, officers, or employees
- Paradigm of Idaho, Inc.
- The District's municipal advisor, placement agent, or underwriter *[identify once Section 4 is confirmed]*
- Bond counsel and general counsel
- Current or former owners of, or parties holding an interest in, any parcel identified in Section 2.3, or any adjacent property
- Prospective financing participants, developers, venue operators, event promoters, vendors, or facility users known to be interested in the project
- Any party that responded or intends to respond to the companion solicitation described in Section 2.5

Respondents shall also disclose current or recent engagements that could impair independence or create divided loyalties, including work for counterparties whose interests may be affected by the study; identify any proposed mitigation, information barrier, recusal, or limitation; and promptly update disclosures if circumstances change during procurement or contract performance. The District determines whether a conflict is acceptable and may require additional measures or reject a team where permitted.

The District will issue a conflict of interest and disclosure form with this RFQ. The lookback period is ten (10) years.

20. Contract and Insurance Requirements

The selected consultant will execute the District's Independent Contractor Agreement, attached to this RFQ as Exhibit A. The Agreement addresses scope and deliverables; schedule; compensation and reimbursables; ownership and permitted use of work product; record retention; public records; confidentiality; conflicts; audit and access to records; changes; suspension and termination; indemnity; insurance; dispute resolution; governing law and venue; compliance with law; nondiscrimination; and other public-entity requirements. Respondents shall review Exhibit A before responding and shall list any requested exception under Section 10.7. Exceptions raised for the first time during negotiation may result in discontinuation of negotiation.

Work product and future engagements. Selection under this RFQ neither entitles nor disqualifies the selected consultant from responding to any future District solicitation for design, engineering, or related services arising from this study. Any future procurement will be conducted separately, on its own merits, and under its own evaluation criteria. Participation in this study confers no preference, no right of first refusal, and no presumption of award in any subsequent engagement.

Because the selected consultant may compete for future work arising from its own study, the following conditions are material terms of the resulting contract:

- The consultant shall not include in any deliverable a recommendation, specification, criterion, or procurement structure that would give the consultant, its affiliates, or its subconsultants an unfair advantage in a future District procurement.
- Deliverables shall be written so that any qualified firm can carry the work forward. Proprietary methods, systems, or software shall be identified as such and shall not be embedded in a recommendation without a stated non-proprietary alternative.
- All work product delivered under this contract becomes the property of the District, with full rights of use, modification, and distribution to future consultants, and the consultant shall deliver editable native files in accordance with Section 7.
- The consultant shall promptly disclose in writing any interest it develops during the study in performing future work arising from it, including any teaming discussion with a party likely to compete for that work.
- The District may, in a future solicitation, require the consultant to disclose its role in this study and may weigh any resulting advantage or conflict at its discretion.

Why the District chose this approach. Excluding the study author from future design work maximizes procurement distance but narrows the field: the strongest venue architecture and planning teams frequently decline study-only commissions, and the District would likely pay more for a terminal engagement. Keeping the door open attracts a deeper pool. The safeguards above are what make that choice defensible. They are not optional courtesies, and respondents should assume they will be enforced.

Insurance. The selected consultant shall procure and maintain, at its sole cost, the coverage required by Exhibit 1 to the Independent Contractor Agreement, for the duration of the engagement and for three (3) years thereafter. Minimum coverage is:

- Commercial general liability, not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence and $2,000,000 aggregate, including bodily injury, property damage, products and completed operations, advertising liability, and contractual liability covering the consultant's indemnification obligations.
- Business interruption insurance, not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence and $3,000,000 aggregate, if applicable.
- Workers' compensation at not less than statutory limits, with waiver of subrogation in favor of the District.
- Professional liability, errors and omissions, not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence and $3,000,000 aggregate.
- Data breach and cyber liability, not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence and $3,000,000 aggregate.
- Umbrella follow-form coverage over the above, not less than $5,000,000.
- Each policy shall name the District and its board members, officers, employees, contractors, volunteers, and agents as additional insureds except where the insurer refuses; shall be primary and non-contributory; and shall be issued by a carrier with an A.M. Best rating of A- or better. The consultant waives all rights of subrogation against the District. Certificates of insurance and policy endorsements are required before Notice to Proceed. Subconsultants shall carry coverage appropriate to their scope, evidenced to the District on request.

21. Addenda and Order of Precedence

Respondents are responsible for obtaining and acknowledging all addenda. Only a written addendum issued through the District's designated channel may modify this RFQ. Addenda will be posted to the District's RFP and RFQ page and distributed to all recorded planholders.

Order of precedence. In the event of conflict, the executed Independent Contractor Agreement controls, then the selected respondent's fee proposal and SOQ, then this RFQ as modified by its addenda, then any written clarification. This order follows Section 1 of the Independent Contractor Agreement attached as Exhibit A.