Landscape Journal
Design, Planning and Management of the Land

Editorial Report to CELA Board
CELA Annual Meeting, October 29, 2011
Lance M. Neckar and David G. Pitt, Editors
Vincent deBritto, Managing Editor

INTRODUCTION

This biennial report of the editorial team to the CELA Board discusses the team's activities since assuming the editorship of *Landscape Journal* in January of 2009. The team assisted the (now) Consulting Editor, Professor M. Elen Deming in final preparation of 28(2) (Fall 2009), has produced 29(1) (Spring 2010), 29(2) (Fall 2010), 30(1) (Spring 2011), and 30(2) (Fall 2011), On-line of 30(2) is anticipated momentarily . Seven (??) manuscripts for the 31(1/2) double issue on the works and thinking of Lawrence Halprin and their influence on the discipline and profession of landscape architecture are in review or being prepared for review. Final author preparation of an addition five (??) manuscript submissions is underway. We are preparing eight manuscripts for the 32(1) (Spring 2013) omnibus issue. We are soliciting manuscript submissions for the 32(2) (Fall 2013) special issue on Multifinctional Landscapes. A call for this issue will appear in the 30(2) issue (see Appendix 1).

- updates the status of current and most recent manuscript review process,
- presents a précis the upcoming 30(2) issue as well as the Halprin special issue,

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW UPDATE

We have received a total of 20 manuscript submissions thus far in the 2011 calendar year. Not including manuscripts received for the Halprin issue, there are an additional three manuscripts in active stages of review or revision, two of which were initially received in 2010 and the other in 2007.

Thirty-three authors have contributed to the 20 manuscripts received in 2011, of which 17 are international. Positions held by the 33 contributors include:

Position	Number
Professor/Emeritus	6
Associate Professor	5
Assistant Professor	7
Lecturer	3
Reader	1
Research Assistant	4
PhD Student	4
Professional	3
TOTAL	**33**

Seven of these submissions were not reviewed for the following reasons:

Reason for non-review	Number
Language deficiency	1
Inappropriate content (project description)	1
Author withdrawal	4
In press at other publication	1
Editor suggestions for revise/resubmit	1
Total	**8**

For the 13 manuscripts in 2011 that received full peer and editorial reviews, the length of time between author submission of a manuscript and sending an editorial decision letter varies from 71 to 222 days with a standard deviation of 52.4 days. The mean and median lengths of time between author submission and editorial decision letter are 139 and 126 days.

Timeliness of reviewer performance remains an issue. In 2010, we sent 13 manuscripts to 37 referees[1] and received 29 responses (78%, up from previously reported 68% response rate). Mean and median lengths of response time among the 29 reviewers were 42 and 30 days with a range from 4 to 124. Previously reported average reviewer response times range from 47 days (October 2010) to 33 days (March 2011).

PRECIS OF CURRENT AND UPCOMING CONTENTS

The current issue *(30:2, Fall 2011)* is an omnibus containing the following articles:

Authors	Article title
Diane Jones	The City of the Dead: The Place of Cultural Identity and Environmental Sustainability in the African American Cemetery
Terry Clements and Sarah Dorminey	Spectrum Matrix: Landscape Design and Landscape Experience
Sven Stremke and Jusuck Koh	Integration of Ecological and Thermodynamic Concepts in the Design of Sustainable Energy Landscapes
Aaron W. Thompson, Linda Stalker Prokopy, Kristin Floress, Denise C. Weinkauf	A Method for Incorporating Community Priorities Into GIS: Challenges, Choices, and Directions for Landscape Planners
Mark Francis and Lucas Griffith	Designing Farmers' Markets as Public Space
Masayoshi Oka	Toward Designing an Environment to Promote Physical Activity
Jacky Bowring	Melancholy Landscapes of Modernity: London and Passaic
MaryCarol R. Hunter	Using Ecological Theory to Guide Urban Planting Design: An Adaption Strategy for Climate Change

[1] Two 2011 manuscript resubmissions were previously reviewed as accept with major revisions and were each sent to only one of the original three reviewers.

The Halprin issue (31:1/31:2, Spring/Fall 2012) will be a collection of scholarly papers, some invited and some already submitted, investigating Halprin's, his wife Anna's, and his firm's reinventions of both the language and the process of design; the volume will also feature recollections of work on iconic projects by principals associated with their making. A specific aim of the project will be to publish previously unseen materials and critical assessment that frame the unique representation approaches and 'procedures' that Halprin used to reshape the idea and form of the city as a theatre of movement and nature. Guest editors for the special issue include John Beardsley, Director of Garden & Landscape Studies at Dumbarton Oaks and Judith Wasserman of the University of Georgia. We have made arrangements to secure access to selected images in the Halprin archives at the University of Pennsylvania. We have applied or will apply for supplemental funding to support more extensive color printing than is the norm for the *Journal* from sources including the Furthermore Foundation, the David Coffin Foundation, and other private/philanthropic sources. We have eight manuscripts in hand and are anticipating an additional eleven. Of the 19 manuscripts, 11 are or will be in various stages of review. A call for manuscript submission appeared in 30(1). Contributing authors currently include:

<u>Halprin scholars</u>
Kate John-Alder, Assistant Professor at Rutgers University
John Beardsley, Director of Garden & Landscape Studies at Dumbarton Oaks
Kenneth Helphand, Professor, University of Oregon
Randy Hester, Professor Emeritus, University of California-Berkeley
Alison Bick Hirsch, Ph.D. and MLA candidate, University of Pennsylvania
Ann Komara, Associate Professor, University of Colorado-Denver
Elizabeth Meyer, Professor Landscape Architecture, University of Virginia
Reuben Rainey, Professor Emeritus, University of Virginia
Iain Robertson, Professor, University of Washington
Marc Treib, Professor Emeritus, University of California-Berkeley
Judith Wasserman, Associate Professor, University of Georgia

<u>Former employees and associates of the Halprin firm</u>
Dean Abbott, Lecturer in Landscape Architecture, University of Minnesota
Shlomo Aronson, Principal Shlomo Aronson and Associates
Angela Danadjieva, Principal, Danadjieva Koenig Associates
Steven Koch, Principal, Koch Landscape Architecture, and co-Founder of Halprin landscape Conservancy
Peter Walker, Principal, PWP Landscape Architects

<u>Halprin colleagues and collaborators</u>
Charles Birnbaum, Founder + President, The Cultural Landscape Foundation
Laurie Olin, Principal, Olin John Parsons, former Associate Regional Director, U. S. National Park Service
Ed Westbrook, Principal, Quarryhouse

Future volumes *(32, 33 and 34)* are tentatively scheduled as follows:
32(1) will be an omnibus issue.
32(2) will be a special issue on Multifunctional Landscapes. We issued the attached call for manuscript submissions for this issue in 30(1) and we have included an elaborated call in 30(2).
Volumes 33 and 34 will contain four omnibus issues under our current program.

APPENDIX 1: MULTIFUNCTIONAL LANDSCAPES: A CALL FOR PAPERS FOR A FALL 2013 SPECIAL ISSUE (32:2)

Anticipating a Fall 2013 issue (32:2) on multifunctional landscapes, we have previously issued calls for submission of manuscripts relating to this topic. To produce a Fall 2013 publication, we will have to receive manuscript drafts from prospective authors by mid-July of 2012.

Multifunctional landscapes are multi-dimensional. The concept of multifunctional landscapes implies the implementation of more functions in a determined place over a determined period of time (Priemus 2001). Efficient use of land is engendered by sustainable spatial, ecological and cultural patterns; and for some theorists, greater overall resiliency(O'Farrell and Pippin 2010). Planners strive to meet various rubrics of performance that have emanated from principles articulated in broad policy declarations such as the Brundtland Commission (1987) mandate of meeting present societal needs without impairing ability of future generations to meet their own needs, and wrestle with the cyclical nature of many biophysical and socio-cultural processes. Designers increasingly see performance standards such as those in SITES™ or similar systems in local communities/some locales and across Europe as a regular part of practice.

In a multifunctional urbanized context, intensive and diverse land uses occupy land in functionally integrated, connective patterns. In such new places designers and planners often adapt, remediate, and repurpose existing sites with new programs and spaces. Such projects consider the sectional integration of systems (i.e. above, below and at grade) and temporal patterns of land use (Lagendijk and Wisserhof 1999a, Rodenburg and Nijkamp 2004)). Park projects, for example, on industrial brownfield sites, such as Westergasfabriek (Gustafson Porter) in Amsterdam (U. S. Environmental Protection Agency 2011) and Landschaftspark Duisburg Nord (Latz + Partner) in the Emscher Valley of Germany, demonstrate innovative design processes as they afford multiple human experiences and deliver mitigative and adaptive approaches to the provision of cultural, ecological and hydrological services. All of this occurs in new, and traditional, aesthetic forms and programs. Such combined regional and site-specific approaches can also seen in the East London GreenGrid (Design for London, UK), Sustainable Living Tring (m3project, UK), and other projects of various types and scales in several parts of Europe. In 2010, the Swiss National Science Foundation awarded Verzone Woods Associates' Food Urbanism Initiative a three-year research grant under the National Research Program "New Urban Quality." In the United States, the Landscape Architecture Foundation *Performance Series* has begun to collect case study examples of site-scaled projects, such as the Menomonee Valley Redevelopment Plan and Community Park (Wenk, Milwaukee, WI), Kroon Hall Quad, Yale (OLIN, New Haven, CT), and Taylor 28 (Mithun, Seattle, WA) (Landscape Architecture Foundation 2011). The designs of new communities and subdivisions in North America from Prairie Crossing (Applied Ecological Services, IL) to Southlands, an agricultural urbanism project (BC), and Sonoma Mountain Village (BioRegional, CA) have forefronted suburban and urban solutions. Similarly multifunctional projects of several types and scales in other parts of the world are in various stages of development.

The rural conceptualization of multifunctional landscapes evolved in Europe around the recognition that agriculture produces commodity outputs (e.g. food, fiber and fuel) as well as various non-commodity outputs (habitat, scenic values, recreational opportunity, jobs, regional identity). Both sets of outputs provide positive values for society. Multifunctional rural landscapes contain environmental structures and functions that provide multiple material and immaterial "goods" and

"services" capable of satisfying multiple societal needs (Wiggering et al. 2006, McCarthy 2005) or what have been termed "ecosystem services" (Millenium Ecosystem Assessment 2005). We can define such landscapes as "providing multiple environmental, social, and economic functions in a given area of land, taking into account the interests of landowners and users" (Lovell and Johnston 2009, p. 214). The design of multifunctional landscapes involves an explicit coupling of human and natural systems in the creation of self-organizing and non-equilibrium structures that evolve over time in non-linear, undetermined trajectories in response to the decisions and actions of society in a biophysical and socio-cultural context (Naveh 2001). Multifunctional landscapes must perform, even regenerate themselves on multiple trajectories. At its biophysical core, the expected multifunctional landscape is a new resilient armature of life; it is the natural and infrastructural systemically-integrated landscape.

Multifunctional landscape design and planning imply definitions of multiple targeted and composite (footprint) performance standards. Some of these standards are related to delivery of supporting ecosystem and other biophysical services (e.g. protecting and enhancing biodiversity as well as water quantity and quality), provisioning services (e.g. production of energy and other utilitarian resources), and regulating services (e.g. waste reduction and reuse). Others are related to cultural and social services (e.g. visual quality, beauty, human health, and recreational opportunity) (Lovell and Johnston 2009). The existence of standards demands metrics that can measure the performance of alternative scenarios of landscape pattern and process in delivering a specified set of services (McCarthy 2005). The Landscape Architecture Foundation's Landscape Performance Series Benefits Toolkit provides important guidance on the use of metrics to assess landscape performance relative to defined performance standards. SITES™ and various local systems such as 21st Century Parks for New York (City of New York Parks and Recreation 2011) have offered metrics frameworks that are primarily based on performance categories. SITES™ focuses on producing biodiversity, water quality and quantity, and human health services. 21st Century Parks similarly focuses on construction and maintenance best management practices and performance standards. Other metrics also exist to evaluate performance at the landscape and regional scale (Lovell and Johnston 2009).

The use of performance standards and metrics raises a host of issues related to socio-economic, cultural, geographic and temporal scales. Specifying the optimal range of composite services to be delivered by a multifunctional landscape presumes knowledge of the provisioning, regulating and cultural services that can be delivered in a defined landscape as well as those that are desired by end users of the landscape. Scale, culture, economies and governance matter. In the western world, the use of metrics presumes, then, the capacity to attain collective agreement on the balance between various ecosystem and other services in a particular locale as well as its regional and global setting (Slee 2009). In practice, for example, landscape architects are commonly asked to make designs, plans, and management protocols that enable people and other beings to inhabit places across scales that both conserve species biodiversity and water but also afford contemporary activities of human recreation across cultural, temporal and age- and health-sensitive checklists and metrics.

Many forms of natural resource management now require flexibility allowing the adaptation of management policy to fluctuations in the delivery of desired ecosystem services as recorded by on-going ecosystem monitoring (Williams, Szaro, and Shapiro. 2009). An adaptive design analogy would enable landscape designers and planners to adjust design thinking based on ecosystem modeling performance estimates using technologies similar to those advocated in the Landscape Architecture Foundation's *Landscape Performance Series* Benefits Toolkit (Landscape Architecture Foundation

2011), the Soil Water Assessment Tool (Neitsch, et al. 2010) as well as performance modeling and landscape visualization software (e.g. CommunityViz™ and Index Plan Builder™). Such an adaptive approach will enable multifunctional landscape design to "try on" alternative scenarios (Jordan et al. 2011) moving interactively between the "proposing" and "disposing" of alternative scenarios (Lyle 1985) based on reliable and accurate estimates of landscape performance integrated across desired levels of ecosystem services (Nassauer and Opdam 2008).

Over the past 10 years, as the citations above demonstrate, multifunctional landscapes have been the focus of special issues in allied journals, such as *Landscape and Urban Planning* (Tress et al. 2001), *Built Environment* (Priemus, Rodenburg, and Nijkamp 2004), *Journal of Environmental Management* (Lange 2008) and *Landscape Ecology* (Otte, Simmering, and Wolters 2007 as well as Musacchio 2009). Discussion of multifunctional landscape issues has appeared in the literature in allied disciplines such as geography (McCarthy 2005), rural sociology (Klein and Wolf 2007) and resource economics (Slee 2009). Why then would the *Landscape Journal* want to publish a special issue on multifunctional landscapes?

Professional Challenges Linked to Scholarship Challenges

Implementing an adaptive design strategy requires new adaptive frameworks on many fronts. New professional practices will require collaboration among the allied disciplines and professions. Often, realization of multifunctional objectives requires overcoming legal, economic, financial, and political barriers to the meshing of legacy and transformative infrastructures. In the western world, the necessity of engaging multiple publics in defining desired services and multiple disciplines in specifying and measuring performance requires a design and planning approach that is collaborative and transdisciplinary (Nevah 2001). Creating and sustaining necessary transdisciplinary perspectives among project and planning players will require corresponding transformations in institutional processes and structures.

The multifunctional landscape challenge to develop new knowledge frames scholarly questions that in turn, will also hypothesize the fundamental frameworks and processes of landscape architecture. A central question is, what is the landscape architectural 'project,' both literally and writ large? What are the implications for the practice of landscape architecture across its increasingly broad professional bandwidth? What are the new spatio-temporal, cultural, scientific, engineering, political, economic pathways to realization of multifunctional landscapes? How will knowledge provide capacity to meet new, larger and more complex challenges and at what speed?

Among some of the more specific questions of our field that might spawn articles for the *Journal* are:

What has been the history of landscape architecture in regard to the creation of multifunctional landscape theory, and design and planning projects and processes?

What are the critical disciplinary and professional integrations needed to address emerging systems across performance rubrics that will have demonstrable effects? Do we have the right metrics, e.g., in SITES™, and other footprint metrics? Moreover, are these set at appropriate levels to be practically effective in their intent when adjusted to specific regions, settings and sites?

How will Geographic Information Systems technology in its geodesign (spatio-temporal scenario modeling) incarnation become more interactive in support of design, planning and management decisions rendered in diverse social, biophysical, spatial and temporal contexts?

What must be done to re-design governance and policy structures to address complex, related problems as trajectories evolve toward integrative solutions in and of the landscape? What role will research in our field and related fields have in innovation, integration and measurement of landscape performance? What role will monetary cost have in the accounting of the usefulness and risk factors of application of these ideas? What promises lie in integrative trajectories of design process and representation?

How will massive and rapid change impel or inflect landscape solutions across the spectra of processes of cross/cultural and ecological adaptation and mitigation? Will, for example, the broad and local effects of climate change induce more integrative and faster responses to these problems?

Finally, and this charge must be central to whatever we do, as no one else has this responsibility: what place can or must the beauty and sublimity of landscape - their composition/juxtaposition in the layering of systems that occurs in design and its media have in the considerations of resiliency, sustainability and multifunctionality? And what are the promises of compelling representation to make these cases to multiple constituencies?

Lance Neckar
David Pitt
Editors
Landscape Journal

REFERENCES

Brundtland Commission. 1987. Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. Accessed from http://www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm on April 19. 2011.

City of New York Parks and Recreation. 2011. *High Performance Landscape Guidelines: 21st Century Parks for NYC*. New York: City of New York Parks and Recreation.

Jordan, Nicholas R., Carissa Schively Slotterback, K. Valentine Cadieus, David J. Mulla, DavidG. Pitt, Laura D. Olabisi and Jin-Oh Kim. 2011. TMDL implementation in agricultural landscapes: A communicative and systemic approach. *Environmental Management*. (in press).

Klein, Jeffrey A. and Steven A. Wolf. 2007 Toward multifunctional landscapes: Cross-sectional analysis of management priorities in New York's northern forest. *Rural Sociology* 72(3), 2007, pp. 391–417.

Lagendijk, A. and J. Wisserhof. 1999a. *Meer ruimte voor kennis. Verkenning van de kennisinfrastructuur voor Meervoudig Ruimtegebruik.* (Give knowledge to space, give space to knowledge, part 1:

Exploration of knowledge infrastructure for multifunctional land use)*Series, Part 1,* RMNO Report 136. Den Haag: NLRO.

Lange, Eckhart. 2008. Our shared landscape: Design, planning and management of multifunctional landscapes. *Journal of Environmental Management* 89 (2008) 143–145.

Lovell, Sarah T and Douglas M Johnston. 2009. Creating multifunctional landscapes: how can the field of ecology inform the design of the landscape? *Frontiers in Ecology and Environment 7(4): 212–220.*

Landscape Architecture Foundation, 2011. The *Landscape Performance Series* Benefits Toolkit. Accessed from http://lafoundation.org/research/landscape-performance-series/toolkit/ on April 18, 2011.

Lyle, John T. 1985. The alternating current of design process. *Landscape Journal* 4(1): 7-13.

McCarthy, James. *2005* .Rural geography: multifunctional rural geographies - reactionary or radical? *Progress in Human Geography* 29: 773-782.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. 2005. *Living beyond Our Means: Natural Assets and Human Well-being. Statement* of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Board of Directors. Accessed from http://www.maweb.org/documents/document.429.aspx.pdf on April 18, 2011

Musacchio, Laura R . 2009. The ecology and culture of landscape sustainability: emerging knowledge and innovation in landscape research and practice. *Landscape Ecology* 24:989-992.

Nassauer, Joan.I. and Paul Opdam. 2008. Design in science: extending the landscape ecology paradigm. *Landscape Ecology* 23: 633-644.

Naveh, Zed. 2001. Ten major premises for a holistic conception of multifunctional landscapes. *Landscape and Urban Planning.* 57:269-284

Neitsch, S.L., J. G. Arnold, J. R. Kiniry and J. R. Williams. 2010. Soil and Water Assessment Tool Input/Output File Documentation Version 2009. Texas Water Resources Institute Technical Report No, 365. College Station, TX: Texas Water Resources Institute, Texas A&M University System.

O' Farrell, Patrick, Pippin M. L. Anderson, 2010. Sustainable multifunctional landscapes: a review to implementation. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability.* 2:59-65

Otte, Annette, Dietmar Simmering and Volkmar Wolters. 2007. Biodiversity at the landscape level: recent concepts and perspectives for multifunctional land use. *Landscape Ecology* 22:639-642.

Priemus, Hugo. (2001) Multiple space use: stimulants and obstacles. *Open House International, 26, No.*4, pp. 24–28.

Priemus, Hugo Caroline A. Rodenburg and Peter Nijkamp. 2004. Multifunctional Urban Land Use: A New Phenomenon? A New Planning Challenge? *Built Environment* 30(4): 269-273.

Rodenburg, Caroline A. and Peter Nijkamp. 2004. Multifunctional Land Use in the City: A Typological Overview. *Built Environment* 30(4): 274-288.

Slee, Bill. 2009.. Re-imagining forests as multifunctional and sustainable resources for a low carbon rural economy: the potential for forest-based rural development. Paper presented at conference entitled Developing Rural Policies to Meet the Needs of a Changing World. Conference was sponsored by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)..Quebec, Canada. October 13-15th 2009.

Tress, Barbel , Gunther Tress, Henri Décamps, Anne-Marie d'Hauteserre. 2001. Bridging human and natural sciences in landscape research. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 57:137–141.

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency 2011. Brownfields and Land Revitalization. Accessed from http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/partners/emscher.html on April 30, 2011.

Wiggering, Hubert, Claus Dalchowa, Michael Glemnitz, Katharina Helming, Klaus Mu¨ller, Alfred Schultz, Ulrich Stachowa and Peter Zander. 2006. Indicators for multifunctional land use—Linking socio-economic requirements with landscape potentials. *Ecological Indicators* 6:238-239.

Williams, B. K., R. C. Szaro, and C. D. Shapiro. 2009. *Adaptive Management: The U.S. Department of the Interior Technical Guide.* Adaptive Management Working Group. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior.