

Wilfredo Calderon

From: Irena Lazic
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 5:55 PM
To: Laurel Schwab
Subject: RE: POPS LOS [WRTD.8BfH]

I don't recall this conversation with Andrew, especially our suggestions to lower any numbers so some facilities are not rated low- it could be that we did not understand how this was applied and that he was actually suggesting a different PIR threshold? As an example, diamond fields are rated low in the LOS, so I am not sure if I understand Andrew's explanation. Wouldn't it make more sense just to use the same PIR in both LOS and the survey or it makes send to use different thresholds? Thanks.

From: Laurel Schwab [mailto:LSchwab@wrtdesign.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 3:04 PM
To: Irena Lazic <ilazic@arlingtonva.us>
Subject: RE: POPS LOS [WRTD.8BfH]

Says Andrew: (he's referencing page numbers in the survey findings report, which I have attached)

Hey Laurel,

Irena is right that we used a different categorization in the plan than in the survey report, and you are on the right track with your assumptions.

The actual PIR scores for Arlington were used to determine the cutoffs we used in the report. If you look at the bar graph on p. 59, you'll see there's a clear break between multi-use trails and parks & plazas in corridors. Whether the cutoff is 120 or 125 doesn't matter, except if you then look at the programs and activities values on p. 65, where 120 starts to make more sense for a cutoff. I remember having a conversation with Irena about this because for the other cutoff, I originally suggested something around 45. While the outdoor facilities has less of a clear break in the lower 2/3, the programs and amenities did, between early childhood and aquatic teams (see the chart on p. 65). If we used 69 and below, as described in the survey report, 13 of the 18 outdoor facilities would be rated low. If we used 45, diamond fields and basketball courts would be rated low. The County didn't like either, so we lowered the cutoff to 30. This is where your assumptions come in. They didn't want to imply that 13 of 18 facilities, or that diamond fields and basketball courts, were low priorities and deserved lower standards.

I hope that helps!

LAUREL SCHWAB
PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
lschwab@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5070

Pulp Nonfiction

The truth about paper recycling.
<http://www.wrtdesign.com/offsite/pulp-nonfiction>

From: Irena Lazic [<mailto:ilazic@arlingtonva.us>]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 10:50 AM
To: Laurel Schwab <LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>
Subject: RE: POPS LOS [WRTD.8BfH]

Hi Laurel,

Please let me know when you get a response from Andrew, I need to figure this out ASAP.

Thanks a lot,
Irena

From: Laurel Schwab [<mailto:LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 3:15 PM
To: Irena Lazic <ilazic@arlingtonva.us>
Subject: RE: POPS LOS [WRTD.8BfH]

Okay, I reached out. Will let you know what he says.

Laurel

LAUREL SCHWAB
PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
lschwab@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5070

From: Irena Lazic [<mailto:ilazic@arlingtonva.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 2:49 PM
To: Laurel Schwab <LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>
Subject: RE: POPS LOS [WRTD.8BfH]

Could you please try to reach out to him, we need to resolve this ASAP, and I don't recall any discussions on this. Thanks!

From: Laurel Schwab [<mailto:LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 2:28 PM
To: Irena Lazic <ilazic@arlingtonva.us>
Subject: RE: POPS LOS [WRTD.8BfH]

Hmmm... it looks like the major difference between the thresholds in the survey and those in the draft plan is that the threshold between low and medium priority was lowered from 69 to 30. Is it possible that Andrew and/or others decided to lower the threshold so as to be able to include more amenities in the medium category (which leads to a recommendation of leaving current standard unchanged, whereas a low priority ranking leads to a recommendation of lowering the standard)? I wasn't involved in any discussion like that, so I leave it to you to try to recall if you and Andrew discussed that at any point. The difference in the threshold between medium and high seems insignificant enough that perhaps Andrew just rounded down to 120 to make it a nice round number? I can try to reach out to Andrew for a fuller explanation if you want.

Laurel

LAUREL SCHWAB

PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
lschwab@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5070

From: Irena Lazic [<mailto:ilazic@arlingtonva.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 2:01 PM
To: Laurel Schwab <LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>
Subject: RE: POPS LOS [WRTD.8BfH]

Why are then these thresholds different from what was used on the POPS survey report (page attached)? Thanks!

From: Laurel Schwab [<mailto:LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 12:35 PM
To: Irena Lazic <ilazic@arlingtonva.us>
Subject: RE: POPS LOS [WRTD.8BfH]

Hi Irena, yes that is correct. Here is the paragraph from the draft plan that explains how the survey data was incorporated (page 244, in Appendix E):

Statistically Valid Survey Priority

The statistically valid survey conducted as part of the 2017 POPS process asked people whether they or their households have a need for various outdoor and indoor amenities, and how well those needs are currently being met. Combining these metrics into a Priority Investment Rating (PIR), the survey report indicates the relative priorities for investing in these amenities.

Those amenities with a PIR of 30 or under were considered to be low priorities. Those with a PIR greater than 30 but less than or equal to 120 were considered to be medium priorities. Those with a PIR greater than 120 were considered to be high priorities.

Laurel

LAUREL SCHWAB

PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
lschwab@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5070

From: Irena Lazic [<mailto:ilazic@arlingtonva.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 12:01 PM
To: Laurel Schwab <LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>
Subject: POPS LOS

Hi Laurel,

A quick question on the Level of Service: I just want to confirm that for the survey part of the LOS, we used the Priority Investment Rating as described in our survey report (attached)?

Thanks,
Irena

Irena Lazic
Long Range Planning Team Supervisor
Arlington County, Department of Parks and Recreation
Planning + Comprehensive Projects Studio

2100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 414
Arlington, VA, 22201
703.228.3206
ilazic@arlingtonva.us



Wilfredo Calderon

From: Irena Lazic
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 12:01 PM
To: Laurel Schwab
Subject: POPS LOS
Attachments: Pages from Arlington County Parks Rec Survey Findings Report - May 9 2016.pdf

Hi Laurel,

A quick question on the Level of Service: I just want to confirm that for the survey part of the LOS, we used the Priority Investment Rating as described in our survey report (attached)?

Thanks,
Irena

Irena Lazic
Long Range Planning Team Supervisor
Arlington County, Department of Parks and Recreation
Planning + Comprehensive Projects Studio

2100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 414
Arlington, VA, 22201
703.228.3206
ilazic@arlingtonva.us



Wilfredo Calderon

From: Irena Lazic
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2018 5:42 PM
To: Laurel Schwab
Subject: RE: LOS Conversion [WRTD.8BfH]

This is very helpful, but I will try to call you tomorrow, because what I am trying to do is a slightly different approach than Andrew's.

Thanks,
Irena

From: Laurel Schwab [mailto:LSchwab@wrtdesign.com]
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2018 3:40 PM
To: Irena Lazic <ilazic@arlingtonva.us>
Subject: RE: LOS Conversion [WRTD.8BfH]

Hi Irena,

The part of the spreadsheet I think you're looking at is actually dealing with only *adding* fields in order to get you to your LOS goal for 2035.

If you *added* 11 additional rectangular fields in the ratios shown in row 13, that would be equivalent of adding 16.7 grass non-lit fields to your inventory (this number is shown in cell M13).

If you *added* 2 additional diamond fields in the ratios shown in row 14, that would be the equivalent of adding 2.4 grass non-lit fields to your inventory (this number is shown in cell M14).

Keep in mind rows 12-15 are depicting the incremental number of fields of different types you would need to *add* (grass non-light, grass lit, synthetic non-lit, synthetic lit) in the same ratios as you currently have. Given that the ultimate goal is to convert certain fields so as to avoid building new ones, the scenarios further down the chart (B, C, and D) show options for *converting* different types of fields into synthetic lit fields. The negative numbers in scenarios B, C, and D indicate the number of each type of field that would be converted into a synthetic lit field.

If you want to talk to go over the chart more fully please give me a call.

Best,
Laurel

LAUREL SCHWAB
PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
lschwab@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5070

Alphabet Soup

Leave it to the professionals. But, how do we know who is a professional?
<http://www.wrtdesign.com/offsite/alphabet-soup>

From: Irena Lazic [<mailto:ilazic@arlingtonva.us>]
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2018 2:12 PM
To: Laurel Schwab <LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>
Subject: FW: LOS Conversion [WRTD.8BfH]

Hi Laurel,

Could you please help me figure this chart out. If we say that we need additional 11 rectangular and 2 diamond fields by 2035, is it accurate to say that we would need to convert approx. 16.6 rect. grass fields (no lights) to synthetic fields (no lights), or 16.6 synthetic fields with no lights to synthetic fields with lights, or 8.3 grass fields with no lights to synthetic fields with lights?

I have another Advisory Committee meeting early tomorrow morning, so it would be great if you could respond today, if possible? Is not, let's talk about this before Wednesday afternoon.

Thanks,
Irena

From: Andrew Dobshinsky [<mailto:ADobshinsky@wrtdesign.com>]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 12:03 PM
To: Irena Lazic <ilazic@arlingtonva.us>
Subject: LOS Conversion [WRTD.8BfH]

Hi Irena,

I got your message. Laurel and I will give you a call around 2, if that's okay? Also, there was a mistake in the previous file I sent. Please use this one instead.

ANDREW DOBSHINSKY AICP CUD
SENIOR ASSOCIATE | URBAN DESIGNER + PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
adobshinsky@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5067

Wilfredo Calderon

From: Jane Rudolph
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 4:19 PM
To: Irena Lazic; Lisa Grandle; Erik Beach
Subject: RE: Arlington County Analysis

I'll take it from here. More soon.

From: Irena Lazic
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 4:17 PM
To: Jane Rudolph <Jrudolph@arlingtonva.us>; Lisa Grandle <Lgrand@arlingtonva.us>; Erik Beach <Ebeach@arlingtonva.us>
Subject: FW: Arlington County Analysis

FYI

From: Austin Hochstetler [<mailto:austin.hochstetler@proconsulting.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 4:16 PM
To: Irena Lazic <ilazic@arlingtonva.us>
Subject: FW: Arlington County Analysis

Hi Irena,

█ called me again this afternoon and wanted to ask me more detailed questions. I had to step into a meeting so I asked her to email me. She emailed me the questions below. On the phone she said that the answer to the public data request was vague so she wanted to follow up.

What would you like me to do?

Thanks,
Austin

Austin L. Hochstetler, CPRP
Senior Project Manager
PROS Consulting Inc.
201 S. Capitol Avenue
Suite 505
Indianapolis, IN 46225
C: 574.209.0687
F: 877.242.7761
austin.hochstetler@proconsulting.com
www.proconsulting.com



From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 7, 2018 4:06 PM
To: Austin Hochstetler <austin.hochstetler@proconsulting.com>
Subject: Re: Arlington County Analysis

1. Hi Austin:

Thank you for assisting me on understanding better a few items.

1. Can you please explain the methodology behind the three areas of Level of Service? The current inventory, the peer cities and the typical are all given a numerical value. The resident survey was not given a numerical value. How was it weighted?
2. What were the variables and methodology used to compare peer cities and national averages? Was total parkland used to calculate ratios of facility recommendations? If so, what was the result? If not, why not?
3. Following on the analysis that was provided to Dept. of Parks and Rec in Arlington County, NRPA was used for national averages. In many cases like playgrounds, basketball courts, and tennis courts the Arlington County provided "Typical" LOS was nearly the same as the NRPA average. But in some cases I couldn't come up with the same LOS as shown in the NRPA.

For instance diamond and rectangular fields weren't nearly as close as the "typical" LOS provided to Arlington as seen in the NRPA typical. Can you please explain further?

NRPA typical LOS was approximately:

adult softball fields 1/ 12,500

baseball youth 1/ 6,500

baseball adult 1/20,000

softball youth 1/8,500.

The Arlington County figure given for "Typical" or "National Average" for diamond field was 1/6000. How was that LOS derived given the numbers above of other "typical" diamond field LOS?

4. Apparently, ~ 36%- 50% localities Americans have 0 access to diamond fields, which if averaged into a true national average of a common facility would produce a lower LOS. Why is a 100% calculation not provided for access to common facilities? I understand for specialized facilities like ice skating rinks, the average for access to those specialty items makes more sense because they are so few—but fields are really common.

Thanks for your assistance on this!

[REDACTED]
On 12/28/2017 2:48 PM, Austin Hochstetler wrote:

Hi [REDACTED]

It was nice speaking with you as well! I passed along your information to the project prime and we'll be in touch with the data request submissions they put together last week and this week.

Thanks,
Austin

Austin L. Hochstetler, CPRP
Senior Project Manager
PROS Consulting Inc.
201 S. Capitol Avenue
Suite 505
Indianapolis, IN 46225
C: 574.209.0687
F: 877.242.7761
austin.hochstetler@prosconsulting.com
www.prosconsulting.com

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]@aol.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@aol.com)]
Sent: Thursday, December 28, 2017 1:53 PM
To: Austin Hochstetler <austin.hochstetler@prosconsulting.com>
Subject: Arlington County Analysis

Hi Austin:

Great speaking with you. Please send me over whatever material you are able to regarding the analysis for Arlington County, VA.

Thanks again,

[REDACTED]

Wilfredo Calderon

From: Laurel Schwab <LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 11:36 AM
To: Joann McCloud; Irena Lazic
Subject: RE: WRT Invoice 20 [WRTD.8BfH]

Hi Irena,

Looking at Andrew's records it seems the costs you are wondering about were incurred under the "synthetic turf fields" line item, which falls under the community needs assessment portion of his spreadsheet. Does that clear things up?

Best,

Laurel

LAUREL SCHWAB
PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
lschwab@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5070

From: Joann McCloud
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 10:40 AM
To: Laurel Schwab <LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>
Subject: FW: WRT Invoice 20 [WRTD.QdLI]

Laurel, can you provide Irena the information she requested?

Thanks

JOANN MC CLOUD
ACCOUNTANT



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
jmccloud@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5049

From: Irena Lazic [mailto:ilazic@arlingtonva.us]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 10:15 AM
To: Joann McCloud <JMccloud@wrtdesign.com>
Cc: Laurel Schwab <LSchwab@wrtdesign.com>
Subject: RE: WRT Invoice 20 [WRTD.QdLI]

Hi Joann/Laurel,

Can you please provide more details about this invoice, since I am trying to understand what was done as part of the "needs assessment" for this phase of the project?

Wilfredo Calderon

From: Andrew Dobshinsky <ADobshinsky@wrtdesign.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 11:37 AM
To: Irena Lazic
Subject: Updated Chart for Call
Attachments: Conversion Chart (for LOS) 20180125.xlsx

ANDREW DOBSHINSKY AICP CUD
SENIOR ASSOCIATE | URBAN DESIGNER + PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
adobshinsky@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5067

Wilfredo Calderon

From: Andrew Dobshinsky <ADobshinsky@wrtdesign.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 11:22 AM
To: Irena Lazic
Subject: RE: LOS Conversion [WRTD.8BfH]

Irena,

Laurel is going to be on the call too so she's aware of the LOS changes. We'll call you from a conference room.

ANDREW DOBSHINSKY AICP CUD
SENIOR ASSOCIATE | URBAN DESIGNER + PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
adobshinsky@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5067

From: Irena Lazic [<mailto:ilazic@arlingtonva.us>]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 11:24 AM
To: Andrew Dobshinsky <ADobshinsky@wrtdesign.com>
Subject: RE: LOS Conversion [WRTD.8BfH]

Great! Thanks a lot.

From: Andrew Dobshinsky [<mailto:ADobshinsky@wrtdesign.com>]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Irena Lazic <ilazic@arlingtonva.us>
Subject: RE: LOS Conversion [WRTD.8BfH]

No problem. I leave for class around 1 today, but I can talk tomorrow at 11:30.

ANDREW DOBSHINSKY AICP CUD
SENIOR ASSOCIATE | URBAN DESIGNER + PLANNER



1700 Market Street, Suite 2800
Philadelphia, PA 19103
adobshinsky@wrtdesign.com
215.430.5067

From: Irena Lazic [<mailto:ilazic@arlingtonva.us>]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 11:20 AM
To: Andrew Dobshinsky <ADobshinsky@wrtdesign.com>
Subject: LOS Conversion

I've already realized that I can't figure this out. Are you available for a short call either later today (between 1-2) or tomorrow around 11:30?

Thanks,
Irena

Irena Lazic

Long Range Planning Team Supervisor
Arlington County, Department of Parks and Recreation
Planning + Comprehensive Projects Studio

2100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 414
Arlington, VA, 22201
703.228.3206
ilazic@arlingtonva.us



Wilfredo Calderon

From: Irena Lazic
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 11:20 AM
To: Andrew Dobshinsky
Subject: LOS Conversion

I've already realized that I can't figure this out. Are you available for a short call either later today (between 1-2) or tomorrow around 11:30?

Thanks,
Irena

Irena Lazic
Long Range Planning Team Supervisor
Arlington County, Department of Parks and Recreation
Planning + Comprehensive Projects Studio

2100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 414
Arlington, VA, 22201
703.228.3206
ilazic@arlingtonva.us

