Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM

Volkan YILDIRIM, Bura Adem ATASOY and Volkan BASER, Turkey

Key words: geographic information systems (GIS), logistics centers, freight village, spatial-multi criteria decision making (S-MCDM)

SUMMARY

With the developing technology and trade volume, the concept of time becomes one of the most important concepts affecting the cost. For this reason, logistics and freight village concepts are important concepts to be considered to maintain order in trade and increase speed while reducing costs. In addition to literature surveys on this subject, action plans and strategic plans of public institutions were also examined. Accordingly, the logistics sector was identified as one of the priority sectors to work in Turkey. In this respect, the case study of the "Improving Investment Environment with Geographic Information Systems" project, which was prepared under the supervision of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization, was conducted on the logistics sector. The project aimed to determine the most suitable areas for sectoral facility investments. The results of the literature were examined in determining the factors affecting the location of the logistics centers. In the analysis phase of the project, the interface developed based on the integration of GIS and spatial MCDM techniques was used. In this study, the AHP method was used as the MCDM method. Through this interface, many GIS operations were implemented in a hierarchical sequence and cost surface maps were created. Besides, a workflow chart and methodology for site selection across the case study is presented.

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM

Volkan YILDIRIM, Bura Adem ATASOY and Volkan BASER, Turkey

1. INTRODUCTION

With the impact of globalization and the increasingly competitive environment logistics has become one of the most important factors of trade (Martí et al., 2014). Logistics activities are of great importance in addressing transport, storage, and packaging problems effectively and particularly to increase the competitiveness of companies and the country. The significant sources of sustainable competitive advantage have been supplying chain management and logistics (Çakır, 2017).

Countries are reviewing their understanding of maritime, airline, rail, and road transport in line with the transformations in world trade. The return of these changes in the understanding of trade can be seen in logistics centers, where all types of transport are integrated and operate on an international scale (Filik, 2011).

The goal of becoming a center in transportation, transportation, and trade increases the need for logistics infrastructure. To take advantage of the advantages of Turkey's geographical position and to realize the objectives set out, a solid infrastructure needs to be established. Accordingly, the establishment of logistics centers on the intersection areas of the transportation networks in the regions that can be described as junction points comes to the fore as an important need.

A Logistics Center is a center in a defined area within which all activities relating to transport, logistics, and the distribution of goods - both for national and international transit, are carried out by various operators on a commercial basis. All activities related to freight transport can be carried out through logistics centers (Baydar et al., 2019; URL-1, 2020). Most users use the same facilities and equipment around a transportation terminal. In this way, transportation costs are reduced and the reliability and healthy realization of the transportations are ensured.

In the view of such information, when the logistics centers in Turkey are examined, the lack of logistics centers throughout the Eastern Black Sea region is noticeable (*Figure 1*). There is a need to establish a Logistics Center to be used both in commercial activities with neighboring countries in the Black Sea region and in commercial activities within the country. Besides, the low amount of flat and wide area in the Black Sea region also necessitates the monitoring of the scientific and technical process in the "site selection for logistics center" operations in the region. In the site selection study conducted to meet this need, Ordu province located in the Central and Eastern Black Sea Region was chosen as the pilot study area (Figure *2*).

Transportation investments such as the airport, the ring road connections, the highway project that will connect the Black Sea and the Mediterranean under construction, and the planned

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

railway connection make the Ordu province logically feasible. Besides, the ports in the city will provide great advantages in terms of maritime trade.

Figure 1. Logistics centers in Turkey (Ozceylan et al., 2016)

Figure 2. Pilot study area (Ordu Province in Turkey)

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

2. FACTORS AFFECTING LOCATION SELECTION OF LOGISTICS CENTERS

The results of national and international literature and application projects were examined in determining the factors affecting location selection of logistics centers.

(Karaşan and Kahraman, 2019) proposed a new integrated fuzzy decision model for logistics center location selection. In this model, the DEMATEL method was used to determine the most effective criteria and to determine the internal and external dependencies of the criteria. ANP method was used for weighting of the determined criteria, and the TOPSIS method was used to determine the best location alternative. (Maharjan and Hanaoka, 2017) focused more on disasters and bad weather in their study and used these factors in their location analysis. Afterward, they examined the results with sensitivity analysis. Factors used in the study in general terms; uncontrollable fires, storms, landslides, floods, extreme temperatures, epidemics, earthquakes, and drought. (Jacyna-Gołda and Izdebski, 2017) have stipulated that factors such as logistics warehouse capacity, transportation cost, fuel cost, raw material transfer cost, labor cost, distance to transportation infrastructures, local taxes should be used as a basis for assessment. In the same study, it is stated that this type of MCDM problem can be solved by using TOPSIS, ELECTRE, Gray Theory methods, fuzzy logic, or Choquet integral method. (Zak and Węgliński, 2014) has used the following factors in his study: transport infrastructure, economic development, cost of investment, level of transport and logistics competition, investment attractiveness, transport and logistics attractiveness, social attractiveness, ease of use in environmental terms, trust, and safety. Besides, the ELECTRE method was used as the method of MCDM. (Yildirim and Önder, 2014) stated in their study for Istanbul, Turkey that existing distribution centers did not meet the need. Land cost, proximity to industrial areas, proximity to the airport, proximity to ports, proximity to the railway network, proximity to highways are the factors used in the study. In the study, the AHP method and PROMETHEE method were used as the MCDM method. (Eryuruk et al., 2013) in their study for Istanbul, they used the necessary physical, spatial, infrastructure services, transportation, labor, fixed expense, and capital factors. Also, the AHP method was used as the MCDM method in the study. (Roh et al., 2013) has predicted that the factors that should be used to determine regional logistics warehouse locations should be location, logistics, national stability, cost, and cooperation. Besides, the AHP method was used as an MCDM method in the study. The sub-factors used in the study are as follows;

- Location: Geographic location, distance to beneficiaries, disaster areas, opinion of suppliers, climate, proximity to other logistics warehouses, distance to disaster areas
- Logistics: Airport, port, road, logistics warehouses
- National Stability: Political stability, social stability, economic stability
- Cost: Labor, land, storage, replenishment, logistics
- Cooperation: Local governments, neighboring countries, logistics organizations.

(Liu and Zhang, 2011) has conducted a study that minimizes transportation time by using environmental, economic, and technical factors. In this study, time was used as a more important factor than the cost for emergency centers. Besides, in this study, the AHP method was used as the MCDM method. (Kayikci, 2010) in her study, economic, environmental, etc. have used many factors. The most important of these are land use, transportation cost and time,

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

accessibility, social balance, economic balance, import and export volume, hazardous materials, which can also be used in spatial location selection. Besides, in this study, the Fuzzy-AHP method was used as the Multiple Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) method. (Meidutė, 2007) has made an economic evaluation of logistics centers. For this assessment, the total surface of the logistic storage areas, the total surface of the parking areas, the size of the administrative buildings, the surface of the railway, road terminal and transfer areas, the number and capacity of the loading and unloading equipment, the total length of the internal road and main road connection, the internal railway network and the main railway network, the total length of the connection, the total length of other technical infrastructures, land acquisition cost, total construction cost, equipment acquisition cost, etc. took into account the factors.

3. DATA USED IN PILOT REGIONAL STUDY

The factors used in the logistic area location selection in Ordu province, the geographical data sets and, scales corresponding to these factors are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Factors used in the study and geographical data sets

Factors	Geographic Data	Scale
Distance to the airport	Airport (point)	1/1000
Distance to highway	Highway (line)	1/25000
Distance to the port	Port (point)	1/1000
Distance to industrial zones	Industrial zone	1/1000
Slope	Topography	1/25000
Distance to streams	Hydrology	1/25000
Distance to lakes	Hydrology	1/25000
Natural gas infrastructure	Natural gas	1/5000
Soil structure	Soil	1/25000
Land use	Land cover	1/25000
Geological structure	Geology	1/25000
Highway projects	Highway (line)	1/25000

4. METHODOLOGY AND WORK FLOW PROCESSES
4.1. Analysis and calculations

To create the accumulated cost surface, analyzes were performed on the GIS using the appropriate S-MCDM parameters. The data used in the study is divided into four different classes. In the first grade, some data come directly as raster. These data have been subjected to reclassify operations according to AHP scores and reclassified and made ready for use. There are point data to be interpolated in the second class. These data have been interpolated by IDW, Kriging, and similar methods. The resulting continuous surfaces have re-sampled according to standard Pixel-sized raster data and converted to raster data format. The third data class contains data to be converted directly to raster format. These data have been converted to raster data format according to the values assigned to the attribute data in the relevant column. The fourth data type is the data that must be located at different distances to the domains and subject to different evaluations. These data have converted to polygon vector format while the line was in

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

vector format with multiple ring buffer analysis and then have converted to raster format over defined parameters. These data, collected in four different classes in raster format, have first converted into standard scales according to data score - weight distributions. All raster data have then multiplied (with AHP weight coefficients) and collected using the map algebra function to create an accumulated cost surface (Figure 3).


Figure 3. The process of transaction for site selection of logistics center

The processes have been specified in the workflow diagram of the pilot zone application were carried out sequentially and the logistics center location selection analysis has been completed successfully. According to the approaches in projects and publications completed around the world, the geographical data sets (factors), their sub-factors, and their scores were determined. Interviews were made with the experts on these data sets via the questionnaire and the final score table is presented below (Table 2). There are two different methods for sub-factor score valuation: giving high points to appropriate areas and low points to appropriate areas. In this study, the appropriate areas were given low scores on the cost surface. In other words, the areas with a small pixel value in the intermediate layers and the final cost surface map are the most suitable areas for logistics center location selection.

4.2. Calculation of Factor Weights

In Table 2 and Table 3, the calculation of the weights of the factors affecting the logistics area location selection was shown.

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

Table 2. The main factor matrix affecting logistics center location selection

	Contour	Land Cover	Industrial Zone	Highway	Port	Airport	Stream	Lake	Mine	Soil Type	Geology	Natural Gas
Contour	**1.00**	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	6.00	6.00	7.00	8.00
Land Cover	0.50	**1.00**	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00	7.00
Industrial Zone	0.50	0.50	**1.00**	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	7.00
Highway	0.33	0.50	0.50	**1.00**	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	6.00	6.00
Port	0.25	0.33	0.50	0.33	**1.00**	1.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Airport	0.25	0.33	0.33	0.33	1.00	**1.00**	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00
Stream	0.20	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.50	0.50	**1.00**	1.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	4.00
Lake	0.20	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.50	0.50	1.00	**1.00**	2.00	2.00	3.00	4.00
Mine	0.17	0.20	0.25	0.25	0.33	0.33	1.00	0.50	**1.00**	3.00	4.00	4.00
Soil Type	0.17	0.17	0.20	0.20	0.25	0.25	0.50	0.50	0.33	**1.00**	4.00	5.00
Geology	0.14	0.14	0.17	0.17	0.25	0.25	0.33	0.33	0.25	0.25	**1.00**	4.00
Natural Gas	0.13	0.14	0.14	0.17	0.20	0.20	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.20	0.25	**1.00**
Weights	**0.23**	**0.17**	**0.14**	**0.13**	**0.07**	**0.07**	**0.04**	**0.04**	**0.04**	**0.03**	**0.02**	**0.01**

AHP Summary Report
Number of comparison: 66
Consistency rate: 5,3% (acceptable)

Table 3. Main factor weights as a result of AHP calculations

Factor	Weight (Multiplication Factor)	Factor	Weight (Multiplication Factor)
Contour	0,226	**Stream**	0,041
Land Cover	0,172	**Lake**	0,044
Industrial Zone	0,142	**Mine**	0,04
Highway	0,128	**Soil Type**	0,03
Port	0,72	**Geology**	0,02
Airport	0,71	**Natural Gas**	0,014

4.3. Calculation of Sub-Factor Weights

The calculation of sub-factor weights is shown in Table 4.
Table 4. Sub-factor weights

Factor	Sub-factor	Score	Factor	Sub-factor	Score
Slope (Degree)	0-5	1	Geology	Alluvion	3

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

Criterion	Class	Score	Criterion	Class	Score
	5-10	2		Conglomerate, sandstone	3
	10-16	3		Andesite, basalt, lava etc.	1
	16-22	4		Granitoid	7
	22-27	5		Argillaceous limestone	2
	27-32	6		Limestone	3
	32-38	7		Kackar granitoid	7
	38-49	8			
	49-100	9			
Land use	Forest	6	Soil classification	I	8
	Pasture	1		II	7
	Shrubbery	1		III	6
	Agriculture	5		IV	5
	Dry farming	5		V	4
	City center	3		VI	3
	Marsh	7		VII	2
	Grassland	2		VIII	1
Distance to main road (m)	0-200	1	Natural gas infrastructure	Exist	1
	200-400	3		Non-exist	10
	400-600	5			
	600-800	7			
	800-1000	9			
Distance to stream (m)	0-200	10	Distance to port (m)	0-1000	2
	200-400	8		1000-2000	3
	400-600	7		2000-3000	5
	600-800	6		>3000	10
	800-1000	5			
	>1000	0			
Distance to industrial facilities (m)	0-1000	0	Distance to lake (diameter)	0-1000	10
	>1000	10		>1000	1
Distance to mine sites (m)	0-1000	10	Distance to airport (diameter)	0-3000	1
	>1000	0		>3000	10

5. ANALYSIS RESULTS

In the analysis phase of the study, the interface developed based on the integration of GIS and Spatial-Multi Criteria Decision Support Systems (S-MCDM) was used. Many GIS operations were implemented in consecutive and hierarchical order through this interface and cost surface

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

maps were created as a result (Figure 4, Figure 5a-5l). The "cost surface map" produced as a result of the analysis for the pilot region is shown below (Figure 4). In the first stage, 43 areas were determined on the cost surface map. Then, 5 of these 43 areas were evaluated as the most suitable areas for investment in terms of logistics centers. These areas were also examined in detail and it was decided that one of the 5 alternatives identified was the most suitable area.


Figure 4. Accumulated cost surface map

Scoring logic in analysis; was constructed on the basis that the low scoring places are suitable for the logistics center and the high scoring places are not suitable for the logistics center due to their high cost.

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

Figure 5.a


Figure 5.b

Figure 5.c

Figure 5.d

Figure 5.e

Figure 5.f

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

Figure 5.g

Figure 5.h

Figure 5.i

Figure 5.h

Figure 5.k

Figure 5.l

Figure 5. (a) Classified slope map; (b) Classified soil map; (c) Classified geology map; (d) Classified stream map; (e) Classified lake map; (f) Classified land use map; (g) Classified road network map; (h) Classified mine map; (i) Classified industrial facilities map; (j) Classified airport map; (k) Classified port map; (l) Classified natural gas infrastructure map

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

6. FINALIZATION AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

After extensive S-MCDM analyzes, 43 different corridors have been determined in the study area based on the raster-based result cost surface map for the logistics center location selection. The areal size of these 43 different corridors have determined were transformed into 5 alternative areas as a result of their statistical results on the cost surface map and finally their appearance on the satellite image (Figure 6 and Figure 7).

Figure 6. 43 different corridors for site selection of logistics center

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

Figure 7. Alternative areas for logistics center

Table 5. Average scores obtained by alternative fields by layers

| | Scores of alternative fields based on classified values | | | | | | | | | | | | Results | |
	Airport	*Geology*	*Port*	*Mine*	*Slope*	*Lake*	*Road*	*Land Use*	*Natural Gas*	*Industrial Facilities*	*Soil*	*Stream*	*Total*	*Cost Surface Map*
Alternative 1	10.00	3.28	10.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	3.21	4.77	10.00	1.00	6.80	5.48	55.93	375.06
Alternative 2	10.00	3.68	3.04	0.00	3.55	0.00	6.76	5.26	10.00	3.34	3.74	6.38	55.75	456.04
Alternative 3	10.00	3.12	10.00	0.00	1.92	0.00	3.75	4.46	10.00	1.00	5.64	7.33	57.22	392.49
Alternative 4	10.00	3.00	4.19	0.00	1.42	0.00	3.23	4.32	10.00	1.00	5.48	8.14	50.78	333.37
Alternative 5	10.00	3.37	10.00	0.00	1.39	0.00	1.91	4.34	3.53	1.00	5.69	4.02	45.25	332.74

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

The scores given in Table 5 show the average scores obtained by the determined alternatives according to the layers. For example; the area which is named 'Alternative 1' obtained an average of 3.28 points from the layer named 'Geology'. The column titled 'Total' in the table shows the sum of the average scores obtained by the alternatives according to the layers. Similarly, the column titled 'Cost Surface Map' shows the average value obtained from the layer named 'Cost Surface Map' for alternative logistics centers. This value also gives the weighted sum of the average score values obtained by the alternatives given in the table for each layer.

According to the results obtained from Table 5, the eligibility rankings of the alternatives are given in Table 6 according to both the 'Total' and 'Cost Surface Map' columns. When the results are evaluated, Alternative-5 is considered to be the most suitable area within the pilot area for the logistics center.

Table 6. Suitability ranking of alternative areas

Ranking	Sort by 'Total' column	Sort by 'Cost Surface Map' column
1	Alternative 5	Alternative 5
2	Alternative 4	Alternative 4
3	Alternative 2	Alternative 1
4	Alternative 1	Alternative 3
5	Alternative 3	Alternative 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

REFERENCES

Baydar, A.M., Süral, H., Çelik, M., 2019. Potential effects of logistics clusters: The case of Turkish Freight Villages. J. Clean. Prod. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.294

Çakır, S., 2017. Measuring logistics performance of OECD countries via fuzzy linear regression. J. Multi-Criteria Decis. Anal. https://doi.org/10.1002/mcda.1601

Eryuruk, S.H., Kalaoglu, F., Baskak, M., 2013. Comparision of Logistics and Clothing Sectors for a Logistics Center Site Selection Using AHP. Fibres Text. East. Eur.

Filik, F., 2011. Lojistik Merkezlerin Rolü ve Önemi, in: Tanyaş, M., Hazır, K. (Eds.), Lojistik Temel Kavramlar (Lojistiğe Giriş). Çağ Üniversitesi Yayınları, Tarsus, Mersin, pp. 199–251.

Jacyna-Gołda, I., Izdebski, M., 2017. The Multi-criteria Decision Support in Choosing the Efficient Location of Warehouses in the Logistic Network, in: Procedia Engineering. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2017.04.424

Karaşan, A., Kahraman, C., 2019. A novel intuitionistic fuzzy DEMATEL - ANP - TOPSIS integrated methodology for freight village location selection. J. Intell. Fuzzy Syst. https://doi.org/10.3233/JIFS-17169

Kayikci, Y., 2010. A conceptual model for intermodal freight logistics centre location decisions, in: Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.04.039

Liu, H., Zhang, X., 2011. Study on location selection of multi-objective emergency logistics center based on AHP, in: Procedia Engineering. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2011.08.398

Maharjan, R., Hanaoka, S., 2017. Warehouse location determination for humanitarian relief distribution in Nepal, in: Transportation Research Procedia. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2017.05.128

Martí, L., Puertas, R., García, L., 2014. The importance of the Logistics Performance Index in international trade. Appl. Econ. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2014.916394

Meidutė, I., 2007. Economical evaluation of logistics centres establishment. Transport. https://doi.org/10.1080/16484142.2007.9638108

Roh, S.Y., Jang, H.M., Han, C.H., 2013. Warehouse location decision factors in humanitarian relief logistics. Asian J. Shipp. Logist. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajsl.2013.05.006

URL-1, 2020. Logistics Center Definition [WWW Document]. URL http://europlatforms.eu/Logistic CenterDefinition.html (accessed 1.27.20).

Yildirim, B.F., Önder, E., 2014. Evaluating Potential Freight Villages in Istanbul Using Multi Criteria Decision Making Techniques. J. Logist. Manag. https://doi.org/10.5923/j.logistics.20140301.01

Zak, J., Węgliński, S., 2014. The selection of the logistics center location based on MCDM/A methodology, in: Transportation Research Procedia. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trpro.2014.10.034

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Volkan YILDIRIM is a Professor at Karadeniz Technical University (KTU), Turkey. He graduated from the Department of Geodesy and Photogrammetry at KTU in 1999. He received his PhD degree with thesis entitled "*Development of a raster based dynamic model with geographical information system for the determination of natural gas transmission pipelines*" in 2009. His research interests are Geographic Information Systems, Urban Information Systems and Land Management.

Bura Adem ATASOY is a Research Assistant at Karadeniz Technical University (KTU), Turkey. He graduated from Department of Geomatics Engineering at KTU in 2017. He received his M.Sc. degree with thesis entitled "*Design of geographical information systems supported asset management system with in the context of the ISO 55001 standard*" in 2020. He is now doctoral student in Department of Geomatics Engineering at KTU. His interests are Geographic Information Systems and Land Management.

Volkan BASER is an Assistant Professor at Giresun University (GRU), Turkey. He graduated from Department of Geodesy and Photogrammetry at KTU in 1999. He received his PhD degree with thesis entitled "*Land management problems of coastal and marine areas and solution approaches*" in 2014. His interests are Land Management, Coastal Zone Management.

CONTACTS
Volkan Yildirim
Karadeniz Technical University
Department of Geomatics Engineering
Trabzon
TURKEY
Tel. +90 462 377 2794
Email: yvolkan@ktu.edu.tr
Web site: www.yvolkan.com

Bura Adem Atasoy
Karadeniz Technical University
Department of Geomatics Engineering
Trabzon
TURKEY
Tel. +90 462 377 2793
Email: bugratasoy@ktu.edu.tr

Volkan Baser
Giresun University
Department of Geomatics Engineering
Giresun
TURKEY
Tel. +90 454 310 1740
Email: volkan.baser@giresun.edu.tr

Determining Most Suitable Areas for Logistics Centers by Using GIS and S-MCDM (10913)
Volkan Yildirim, Bura Adem Atasoy and Volkan Baser (Turkey)

FIG e-Working Week 2021
Smart Surveyors for Land and Water Management - Challenges in a New Reality
Virtually in the Netherlands, 21–25 June 2021