Journal of Transport and Land Use 1:2 (Fall 2008) pp. 1–3
Available at http://jtlu.org

JTLU

From the Editors

In the summer of 2008 we rolled out the first issue of the Journal of Transport and Land Use. Our opening commentary made the case that, despite an already crowdeed landscape of academic journals, there was space, demand, and need for a quality publication that squarely addressed the nexus of transport and land use (Levinson et al. 2008). If "Internet hits" is any indication of success, then we were correct in our argument.

Prior to the release of Issue 2, the Journal of Transport and Land Use web site received over 5,000 visits from over 3,500 unique readers. These readers hailed from over 59 counties (and all 50 United States) yielding a total of over 19,000 page views. Of those visitors, over 800 have registered with the site. We currently have 24 papers under review and our most recent submission was the one-hundredth.

We are pleased to present our second issue. Like the previous issue, many of these papers center on accessibility. We recruited these papers from the second international conference on Access to Destinations held at the University of Minnesota in August, 2007; they are authored by leading contributors to the domain of transport and land use.

Kay Axhausen (2008) takes a historical perspective considering the changes in Switzerland from the early nineteenth century to the present. He notes the world is shrinking, now more than ever because of the rise of telecommunications and the ability to maintain distant social networks, as well as because of gains in transport.

Lo, Tang, and Wang (2008) describe the most successful public transport system in the world, that of Hong Kong, where the company operating the rail lines is profitable and traded on the stock exchange. The conditions enabling this, however, are not common; the authors estimate a population density of 31,500 persons per km^2 is required for this unique circumstance to emerge. It also requires joint development of transport and land use, which provides a large portion of the company's profits.

Cho, Rodriguez, and Song (2008) examine residential location decisions in metropolitan Charlotte, North Carolina (USA) and consider to what extent these decisions

are shaped not just by distance to the traditional downtown, but by the accessibility of local employment subcenters. The authors find that residential location depends on access to multiple centers.

Scott and Horner (2008) study metropolitan Louisville, Kentucky (USA) to test questions about social exclusion, asking whether lack of access affects different groups differently. They find that groups that traditionally face social exclusion (due to income or age) do not suffer from less accessibility. They may, however, lack the tools of mobility, as auto-based accessibility was generally much greater than transit-based accessibility; other (non-spatial) strategies may be required to deal with social exclusion.

Jacobson and Forsyth (2008) study seven Transit-Oriented Developments in the United States: Rosslyn, Clarendon, and Ballston in Virginia; the Delmar Loop and Emerson Park in metropolitan Saint Louis (Missouri and Illinois); and Oakland City Center and Fruitvale in California. Not all of the transit stations and surrounding developments have fully realized their potential, suggesting that we need to understand the underlying attributes of success.

Leck, Bekhor, and Gat (2008) consider the distributional effects of transportation on core vs. peripheral cities in Israel. Enhancing accessibility expands short term economic welfare, and directed improvements aimed at poorer areas can assist in accomplishing this change.

These papers complement discussions of the dimensions of accessibility covered in the first issue, in which Bruegmann (2008) and Crane (2008) discussed the issues of accessibility and sprawl. The debate over whether to maximize accessibility or to minimize sprawl, whether those goals are consistent, and how they should be achieved is of increasing importance for planners and policy makers.

Samaniego and Moses (2008), borrowing from metabolic scaling theory in biology, raised important questions about how cities and their networks work, and whether there are underlying structural properties that shape the distribution of roads across cities. Their results show that miles driven and population size are correlated, and suggest that networks and travel in United States cities are consistent with a mix of completely centralized and completely decentralized destinations.

Ottensman and Lindsey (2008) developed a measure of accessibility to study the use of urban trails in Indianapolis, Indiana (USA) that accounted for demand elasticity. This treatment of elasticity made the measure better at predicting trail use.

Elhorst and Oosterhaven (2008) evaluated proposed Maglev trains in the Netherlands, considering how land use might change in response to this large-scale transport infrastructure. The Maglev projects are not necessarily socially desirable, but were they to be built, they would have significant economic effects beyond what would normally be considered in a transport-only benefit-cost analysis.

We could not be happier with the much needed contribution the Journal of Transport and Land Use is making to the academic discourse on transport and land use.

We greatly appreciate the positive comments and suggestions we have received. Please continue to submit top quality manuscripts, discussion papers, and book reviews—and encourage your colleagues to do the same. And look for our next issue in Winter 2009.

– David Levinson and Kevin J. Krizek

References

Axhausen, K. 2008. Accessibility: Long-term perspectives. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (2): 5–22.

Bruegmann, R. 2008. Point: Sprawl and accessibility. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (1): 5–11.

Cho, E.J., D.A. Rodriguez, and Y. Song 2008. The Role of Employment Subcenters in Residential Location Decisions. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (2): 121–151.

Crane, R. 2008. Counterpoint: Accessibility and sprawl. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (1): 13–19.

Elhorst, J.P., and J. Oosterhaven 2008. Integral cost-benefit analysis of Maglev projects under market imperfections. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (1): 65–87.

Jacobson, J., and A. Forsyth 2008. Seven American TODs: Good practices for urban design in transit-oriented development projects. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (2): 51–88.

Leck, E., S. Bekhor, and D. Gat 2008. Equity impacts of transportation improvements on core and peripheral cities. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (2): 153–182.

Levinson, D.M., K.J. Krizek, M.J. Dijst, H.K. Lo, and J.Y. Guo 2008. Introducing the Journal of Transport and Land Use. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (1): 1–17.

Lo, H.K., S. Tang, and D.Z.W. Wang 2008. Managing accessibility on mass public transit: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (2): 23–49.

Ottensmann, J.R., and G. Lindsey 2008. A use-based measure of accessibility to linear features to predict urban trail use. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (1): 41–63.

Samaniego, H., and M.E. Moses 2008. Cities as organisms: Allometric scaling of urban road networks. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (1): 21–39.

Scott, D., and M. Horner 2008. The role of urban form in shaping access to opportunities. *Journal of Transport and Land Use* 1 (2): 89–119.