

Editor's Introduction

IN MEMORIAM: JANET SINGER

We are saddened to relate the untimely passing of Janet Marie Crum Singer, long time Executive Director for both the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (CELA) and the Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA), on April 17, 2010 after a battle with pancreatic cancer. As CELA Executive Director since 2001, Janet's direction of day-to-day operations and the planning and management of CELA conferences has been integral to the organization's success. Her outstanding service to the two organizations she so capably managed was recognized by her posthumous receipt of the CELA President's Award at the 2010 Annual Meetings of CELA in Maastricht, The Netherlands as well as her September, 2009 receipt of the EDRA Service Award. Her significant contributions to CELA and EDRA will be sorely missed.

TOWARD AUTHOR MENTORSHIP

We have begun to establish a new component of the *Landscape Journal* editorial apparatus. We have constituted *Expert Advisory Panels* around nine subject areas: landscape perception; representation; design innovation; sustainable sites, performance and technology; ecology of cities; landscape ecology and planning; participatory design and planning; art and design; and design practices. These panels will assist the Editorial Staff to identify, develop, and mentor new authors who are advancing the field in these critical areas. The expert panels will help steward manuscripts that offer promise for or provocation of new kinds of discourse or reinvention of knowledge across disciplinary and professional boundaries.

The chair of each panel will, in a sense, "adopt" these manuscripts and their authors by providing connections to scholarly and professional feedback. Part of this mentorship advisory function may be to provide direction on the substance or research processes that give promise to the work. For less well-developed

manuscripts—whether because of the early state of emergence of the issue or the relative inexperience of the author (or both)—we anticipate a more activist engagement. For particularly well-developed papers, on the other hand, we will ask the Chair and panelists to be part of the regular double blind peer review process for the *Journal*. As available time and interest warrant, the chair and the panel may also be asked to sponsor specific calls for papers for CELA or ASLA meetings. These calls will be related to emerging issues around the panel's focus in both academia and the profession and matched with the existing tracks of these conferences if possible.

In addition, this summer we intend to roll out *GENIUS LOCI*, a nearly real-time publishing venue for manuscripts and projects that have intellectual or professional promise, but are not ready or are not intended for peer review. This edited, but not peer-reviewed, blog will provide opportunity for more timely discourse around critical topics relating to the design, planning, and management of land. We will engage Expert Advisory Panel members to assist us in identifying and developing content for the blog. At CELA and ASLA meetings, we hope to encourage more frequent and reflective discourse that may receive further commentary in *GENIUS LOCI* and also nurture potential manuscripts for submission to the *Journal*.

Another more fundamental group of issues has emerged to sharpen the need for engaged mentorship. Having taken two issues (29:1 and 29:2) through the entire editorial and production process, it is evident that while we are receiving and publishing quality contributions toward scholarship about design, planning, and management of the land, there are some challenges yet to be met. A journal that is as much about a profession as it is about a discipline must expect to receive manuscripts having great promise yet needing work to ready them for publication. Much of the education of a landscape architect focuses on readiness for practice that involves application of current and new knowledge, but not necessarily its production or critique.

While many of the manuscripts we receive treat breakout ideas and offer promise for or provocation of new kinds of discourse or reinvention of knowledge, they often lack context relative either to existing literature in the field or to understanding of historical or contemporary societal/environmental conditions. In some instances, the manuscripts attempt too broad a discussion for a 7500 word article while the ideas presented in others may include a tangled web of confused logic. Some contain presentation flaws attempting a rhetorical voice inappropriate for a scholarly journal or the topic at hand or containing flaws in basic grammatical structure.

We recognize that it remains our responsibility as editors to assist authors of manuscripts that, upon external review, exhibit promise for publication. We consistently provide detailed critique and suggestions for best use of reviewers' comments in preparing revisions. Over multiple drafts, we have assisted several authors in crafting the optimal construction and presentation of their work. This assistance may suggest additional literature for consideration, help establish conceptual or societal context, suggest alternative rhetorical strategies for presentation of the article's narrative or in some instances provide editorial suggestions for more appropriate grammatical construction. We provide this guidance as we believe it is critical to maintaining the *Journal's* high standards for both content and presentation of scholarship relating to design, planning and management of the land.

This work can be dramatically foreshortened and improved, we feel, with more active mentorship. And so, while we have established new avenues to authorship, we count more than ever, on the global professorate of landscape architecture for *constructive and critical* commentary on preparation and review of manuscript submissions. In this regard, we call on senior faculty to devote themselves to mentor their more junior cohorts in developing and presenting ideas for manuscript submission to the *Journal* whether as part of the submission or the review process.

EDITORIAL BOARD APPOINTMENTS

We will engage a slightly reconstituted Editorial Board in our thrusts to continue existing and to bring new paths of authorship to the pages of *Landscape Journal*. During our short tenure, we have continued previous editorial policies of involving Board members as active participants in the pursuance of the most tangible form of the *Journal's* mission, the peer review of manuscripts. The Board will also continue to assist the editorial staff in recruiting new manuscripts. As is evident in this issue, Board members will likely continue to submit manuscripts or book/conference reviews for publication. In addition, we hope to engage the Editorial Board as well as the Expert Advisory Panels in identifying and developing content for *GENIUS LOCI*. It is also our intention to have the Board weigh in more aggressively on internal and external challenges that the discipline and profession face and to be active participants in future dialogue regarding the shape of *Landscape Journal* as a medium.

Appointment to the Board requires a significant commitment of time and we are grateful to those past and present members who have served. We wish to express our appreciation and that of CELA to the outgoing members, Ian Bishop, Carl Steinitz, Niall Kirkwood, Paul Gobster, Donna Erickson, and Laurie Olin, for their leadership in guiding the development of scholarship in design, planning and management of land. The bestowing of the 2008 ASLA Honor Award for Communications upon the *Journal* is in part testimonial to their significant contributions. New members of the Board bring long-standing excellence and additional international expertise from the perspectives of both the academic and professional practice of landscape architecture. We are excited to announce the names of those continuing and new Board members who have agreed to assist us as we pursue our editorial goals:

Lodewijk Baljon	Mark Francis
Patrick Condon	Peter Jacobs
M. Elen Deming	Douglas Johnston

Robert Melnick	Stephen R. Sheppard
Elizabeth Meyer	Anne Spirn
Daniel Nadenicek	Frederick Steiner
Joan Nassauer	Simon Swaffield
Linda Schneekloth	Marc Treib

ASSISTANT EDITOR APPOINTMENTS

With the change in Editorial staff, Dan Nadenicek stepped down as the *Journal's* Book Review Editor. We thank Dan for his excellent service as Book Review Editor and are grateful that he has accepted an appointment as a member of the Editorial Board. Hoping to encourage diverse discourse across disciplinary and professional boundaries, we are reconstituting the book review editorial responsibilities into four topical areas. Liat Margolis of the University of Toronto will handle the subject of *Innovative Design and Technology* and Charles Andrew Cole of The Pennsylvania State University will be responsible for *Landscape Ecology and Planning*. We hope to fill additional positions managing book reviews in *Visualization* and *History and Theory* shortly. Alan Tate of the University of Manitoba has graciously volunteered to continue his broad, inclusive, and timely service as Conference and Exhibits Editor. Please contact Liat, Andy, and Alan if you have interests or thoughts about reviews pertaining to their subjects. Please direct inquiries concerning other book reviews directly to us.

A CALL FOR PAPERS ON MULTI-FUNCTIONAL LANDSCAPES

In a session at the CELA/ISOMUL conference in Maastricht in May, the editors framed four questions about research and its relationship to emerging ideas, issues and practices in landscape architecture. At the core of the questions is an array of specific trends that focuses the field on a broad spectrum of academic and professional imperatives of sustainability, transdisciplinarity, and innovation:

1. How do definitions of research vary across academic and professional practices of landscape architecture? What are some of the resulting tensions—scholarly, disciplinary, curricular, economic, institutional, and other—in academe as well as in practice that complicate the realization of focused, integrated and synergistic efforts between the professional and academic practices of landscape architecture?
2. What current works, projects, or partnerships (academic or professional) illustrate potential reconciliations across academe and the profession? What new and/or current landscape architectural research or scholarly projects, processes or partnerships point toward innovative aesthetics and design processes in professional practice and illustrate potential for new syntheses of knowledge in landscape architecture? What role, if any, might experimental transdisciplinary work among disciplines and professions engaged in landscape design, planning, and management as well as between the professional and lay sectors play in the construction of new knowledge and understanding related to landscape architecture?
3. What specific issues need to be brought to the attention of academe as well as the profession as a way of engaging practice and practitioners in the development and expansion of knowledge related to landscape architecture?
4. Can research and outreach play a transformative role in the development and delivery of professional landscape architecture curricula? If so, how would we accomplish this in concert with the profession? Can we, for example, produce practitioners who are as interested in the development and application of new understandings as they are in the application of existing best design and management practices and ways of thinking?

We asked three distinguished landscape architects to address these questions and provide commentary on their approaches to the questions and the underlying issues: Lodewijk Baljon, author of *Designing Parks: An Examination of Contemporary Approaches to Design*

in *Landscape Architecture*, and principal of Lodewijk Baljon Landschapsarchitekten, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Gerrit-Jan Carsjens, professor of Landscape Planning and founder of the Werkstatt outreach program, University of Wageningen, The Netherlands; and Professor Joanne Westphal, PhD. and M.D., Michigan State University, a specialist in human health-related research.

These commentators responded to the questions with propositions ranging from the integration of transdisciplinary knowledge in transparent and collaborative decision-making and evaluation of landscape performance to innovation that influences public policy and design practice. One of the several foci of their comments, some of which will soon be available on *GENIUS LOCI*, pointed toward another organizing imperative that is inherent in both academic and professional practice in Europe, the concept of multi-functional landscapes. Broadly defined, this concept spans the scales of landscape architecture to include everything from the expanded programs and uses of the domestic landscape, public parks, and other landscapes of the civic realm to larger regional landscapes of biodiversity, energy production, and emissions, hydrologic, and water quality control. As suggested by the Windhager et al. article in this issue, multi-functionality implies consideration and effective use of the multiplicity of services afforded by natural ecosystems. *Duisburg Nord* in Germany and *Cultuurpark Westergasfabriek* in The Netherlands remind us, for example, that we can conserve and re-purpose our industrial heritage, remediate damaged soil and water resources and engage in both active and passive recreation all in the same space at the same time.

The ecological and socio-economic catastrophe occurring in the Gulf of Mexico also reminds us that there may be limits on the extent to which multi-functionality can push the limits of ecosystem resiliency. The integrative functions needed to accomplish multi-functionality within the limits of resiliency force us to think and act in all dimensions and across all systems of the landscape.

This necessitates new (and a mix of old) aesthetic propositions to reshape (and selectively retain) the value of landscape in the next millennium.

With these and other yet unvoiced imperatives, we call for paper submissions to a special issue of *Landscape Journal* focused on multifunctional landscapes. We also call for submissions of projects and speculations that address these issues to *GENIUS LOCI*.

ABOUT THIS ISSUE

This issue contains seven articles that include subjects ranging from sustainable design to historical dimensions of the North American and European landscape and the aerial photographic technology commonly used in landscape architecture to comparative studies of landscape change perceptions in Canada and the northeastern United States. The first entry by Steven Windhager, Frederick Steiner, Mark T. Simmons, and David Heymann of the University of Texas at Austin, examines the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system and the Sustainable Sites Initiative as examples of performance-based design strategies that will enable the protection of ecosystem services in the practice of environmental design. This article initiates a new occasional and peer-reviewed feature of the *Journal* known as *Emerging Landscapes*. This series will highlight landscapes produced by the emergence of new ways of thinking about and executing the design, planning, and management the land.

Complementing this focus on sustainable design, the second article by Daniel Roehr and Yuewei Kong, University of British Columbia, examines the hydrologic and water quality performance of design strategies inspired by the Seattle Green Factor. The paper compares the runoff depth, volume, peak flow rate, and mass loading of contaminants emanating from existing conditions for an urban residential site in Calgary, Canada with the performance of the same site retrofitted to include sustainable design technologies. Compared

with existing conditions, significant improvements in performance are attained through application of technologies related to green roofs, permeable pavement, rain gardens, and bioswales. The paper concludes, however, that the landscape performance of green factor scores must be more carefully specified as landscape designs may achieve the same score yet perform quite differently relative to hydrologic and water quality objectives.

In a comparative examination of the post World War II responses to loss of urban trees, Judith Stilgenbauer and Joseph McBride of the University of California at Berkeley chronicle the disparate developments to replant urban forest in Hamburg and Dresden, Germany. Both cities were extensively fire-bombed late in the war resulting in large losses, not only of human life, property and cultural heritage, but urban tree cover. Their chronicles demonstrate that the cities' responses varied by ideological, political, economic, and other cultural issues and urban plans, unrelated to the technical challenges of this human-induced natural disaster. As a case study, this article provides another lesson of the significance of cultural frameworks of recovery after disaster.

Sonja Duempelmann, University of Maryland, examines the history of our understanding of landscape as it is seen from the air and modified in its program by air travel. She chronicles the technological changes in air photographic imagery and aviation and the impact of these changes on a range of issues from the increasing scale and scope of landscape design and planning to modes of representation that provide a synoptic view of the landscape. The author also provides insight into the less-known works of significant practitioners who used the view from above to frame innovations in their work, including Leberecht Migge, Achille Duchêne, and Carl Theodor Sørensen.

In revisiting "City Tour 9, the industrial heart of Philadelphia," from the *American Guide Series*, a project of Works Progress Administration in the 1930s, Daniel

Campo of Morgan State University contemplates not only the state of preservation of the neighborhood, but its changed uses and residents. Through thoughtful observations captured over a series of visits, Campo guides us along one neighborhood's odyssey from the industrial heyday of America, to the post-industrial and multicultural resource that it now represents as the city plans for adaptive reuse and re-purposing. As an approach that might be adopted in preservation projects for other industrial areas, the author offers some new adaptations of cultural landscape observation, thinking, and work.

In a mail survey of northeastern United States residents living in a fire-prone pitch pine ecosystem, Robert Ryan, University of Massachusetts, examines homeowner preferences for and motivation to undertake residential landscape design strategies meant to reduce wildland fire risk. Despite their previous experiences with wildfire, residents perceive wildfire risk at their homes to be moderate to low but engage in risk avoidance landscape design strategies. Highest residential design preferences exist for scenes showing a balance of native and ornamental plantings.

John Lewis, University of Waterloo, presents a cross-cultural comparison of landscape change perceptions among aboriginal and nonaboriginal residents of British Columbia's upper Skeena Valley. Content analysis of data elicited in semi-structured interviews examining resident perceptions of computer-generated, photo-realistic simulations reveals considerable inter-ethnic consistency among the landscape change preference evaluations. Patterns of forest use and knowledge resulting from purposive activity were common among the two ethnic groups and appear to be the essential determinants of preference judgments. The study suggests that landscape preferences are most closely associated with intended patterns of use and the ability of landscape to provide for preferred activities.

LN DP