

Chapter 1

AN EVALUATION TOWARDS DEBRIS MANAGEMENT PLANS IN TURKEY: THE CASE OF ISTANBUL

Alper BODUR¹

INTRODUCTION

Current investigation reveals that the number of disasters such as whirlwinds, floods, quakes, and tsunamis spreading around the world is increasing, acknowledging that human deaths, injuries, property damage, demolished buildings, infrastructures, and crop destruction have increased after disasters (Iskender et al., 2007; Tanyas et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2018; Karunasena et al., 2012). Emerging whether natural, human-made or technological, disasters can usually produce large quantities of debris in the precinct (UNDP, 2013; Brown and Milke, 2009; Rafee et al., 2008; Sahin et al., 2016). The debris afterward an earthquake causes considerable processing and disposal challenges (Askarizadeh et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2018). Evaluation of the rubbish produced by disaster is a complicated business because different variables should be allowed and the assessment expanse can diversify from a tiny amount of debris to thousands of weights (Askarizadeh et al., 2017). Debris discharge after a disaster offers trials unusual to that disaster. Frequently, the deportation of a considerable amount of debris process takes months or even years to finish (Luther, 2006; Pramudita and Taniguchi, 2014).

In history, a principal goal was to expatriate the debris created by disasters from an original site to its last address as quickly as possible (Kim et al., 2018). Experience notes that rubble discharge is regularly a sorely delayed and tiresome process, which can rigorously impede economic and social recovery (UNDP, 2013). Historically, the amount of debris has been approximately five to ten times the yearly solid waste production in a society. This cumbersome amount of debris produces setbacks in the debris discharge process and other emergency answers. It springs in the postponement of the whole disaster rehabilitation process (Kim et al., 2018). According to the U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), almost 55% of every federal disaster spending is pointed via direct relief; including debris relocation (Karunasena et al., 2012).

¹ PhD, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Faculty of Architecture, Samsun, TURKEY., boduralper@yandex.com

gle, everyone has a duty and responsibility. Efforts to minimize disasters can be achievable if a national policy may turn into a battle. The usual efficient method to fight disasters is the rehabilitation studies before the collapse. Though the legislation specifies the measures to be taken before the tragedy and the rules to be adhered to, it has become a tradition not to obey the regulations generally due to the absence of criminal sanctions. Debris management in Turkey should be an essential issue in that light. At this point, there must be effective debris management planning and policy under the umbrella of effective disaster management. Overall, Turkey has not made sufficient studies related to debris management aftermath of a disaster. It is evident that many reviews on this subject should be realized as soon as possible.

REFERENCES

1. AFAD, "Turkey Disaster Response Plan", the Disaster and Emergency Management Authority, (2013), Ankara, Turkey.
2. AFAD, "Explanatory Disaster Management Terms Dictionary", the Disaster and Emergency Management Authority, (2014), Ankara, Turkey.
3. M. Aktel, "The change occurred in disaster management in Turkey by the Law No. 5902", *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*. 27 (2015), 169-180.
4. R. Akyel, "Turkey disaster management in public administration", *Çukurova University Journal of Social Sciences*. 14 (2013) 15-30.
5. Ü. Arslan, T. Şahinöz, M. Kaya, "Health organization activities in disasters", *TM-MOB Disaster Symposium*, 467-471, 2007.
6. L. Askarizadeh, A.R. Karbassi, M.B. Ghalibaf, J. Nouri, "Management of post-earthquake construction debris in Tehran Metropolitan", *Int. J. Environ. Sci. Technol.* 13 (2015) 639-648. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13762-015-0893-z>.
7. L. Askarizadeh, A.R. Karbassi, M.B. Ghalibaf, J. Nouri, "Debris management after earthquake incidence in ancient City of Ray", *Global J. Environ. Sci. Manage.* 3 (2017) 447-456. DOI: 10.22034/gjesm.2017.03.04.010.
8. G. Azimli Çilingir, "Investigation of disaster management policies used in Turkey: legal regulations and Turkish natural catastrophe insurance pool", *Resilience*. 2 (2018) 13-21.
9. A. Bodur, "An assessment on housing satisfaction in post disaster housing: Yalova Subası case", *The 5th International Conference S.Arch 2018, Proc.* 835-845. May 22-24, 2018.
10. C. Brown, M.W. Milke, "Planning for disaster debris management", in the *Waste MINZ 21st Annual Conference*, 2009.
11. M.Aysan Buldurur, H. Kurucu, "Assessment on disaster management and emergency transportation routes in Istanbul", *Journal of Planning*. 25 (2015) 21-31. DOI: 10.5505/planlama.2015.47965.
12. T. Erkal, M. Değerliyurt, "Disaster Management of Turkey". *Eastern Geographical Review*, 22 (2009), 147-164.
13. FEMA, "Public Assistance Debris Management Guide". FEMA, July 2007, USA.
14. F. Genç, "Crisis communication: Marmara Earthquake case study", *Journal of Selcuk Communication*. 5 (2008) 161-175.

15. IMM, "Performance Program 2018", The Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, 2018.
16. IPKB, "The Istanbul Disaster Response Plan", Istanbul Project Coordination Unit (IPKB), June 2014, Istanbul.
17. H. İskender, L. Trabzon, N. Erdoğan, "Debris response management for disasters and unusual events", 279-288, 2007.
18. G. Karunasena, D. Amaratunga, R. Haigh, Post-disaster construction and demolition debris management: A Sri Lanka case study. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*. 18 (2012) 457-468. <https://doi.org/10.3846/13923730.2012.699913>.
19. E. Kepenek, Z. Gençel, "Disaster mitigation studies in Turkey: an overall assessment in terms of laws and regulations", *Journal of Architecture Sciences and Applications*. 1 (2016) 44-50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30785/mbud.282563>.
20. J. Kim, A. Deshmukh, M. Hastak, "A framework for assessing the resilience of a disaster debris management system", *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 28 (2018), 674-687. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2018.01.028>.
21. A. Köseoğlu, H. Yıldırım, "Political effects of disaster management problems related with disaster logistics", *Akademik Bakış Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 49 (2015) 199-224.
22. L. Luther, "Disaster Debris Removal after Hurricane Katrina: Status and Associated Issues". Congressional Research Service, 2008.
23. B. Özmen, T. Özden, "A critical evaluation related to disaster management system of Turkey", *SİYASAL / Journal of Political Sciences*. 0 (2014) 1-28.
24. A. Pramudita, E. Taniguchi, A. Gul Qureshi, "Location and routing problems of debris collection operation after disasters with realistic case study", *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci*. 125 (2014) 445-458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1487>.
25. N. Rafee, A.R. Karbassi, E. Safari, M. Mehrdadi, "Strategic management of municipal debris aftermath of an earthquake", *Int. J. Environ. Res*. 2 (2008) 205-214.
26. H. Sahin, B.Y. Kara, O.E. Karasan, "Debris removal during disaster response: A case for Turkey", *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 53 (2016), 49-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2015.10.003>.
27. M. Tanyaş, Y. Günalay, L. Aksoy, B. Küçük, "Humanitarian logistics management system: a case study on the possibility of Istanbul earthquake", *National Logistics and Supply Chain Congress*, 2013.
28. B. Tercan, "Disaster policy and urban transformation in Turkey", *Abant Journal of Cultural Studies*. 3 (2018) 63-74.
29. UNDP, "Guidance Note: Debris Management. United Nations Development Programme", Philippines, 2013.
30. (Url-1). (<https://www.afad.gov.tr/tr/26567/Turkiye-Afet-Yonetimi-Strateji-Belgesi-ve-Eylem-Plani-TAYSB>), [Data received 17.08.2018].
31. (Url-2). (http://www.ibb.gov.tr/sites/akom/Documents/gorev_tanimi.html). [Data received 20.09.2018].
32. A. Üstün, A. Anagün, Determination of importance weights of Istanbul's districts using analytic hierarchy process, *Journal of the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture of Gazi University*. 31 (2016) 119-128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17341/gummfd.08342>.
33. M.S. Yamalı, Y. Akgün, A.S. Karaveli, An evaluation on the design of the emergency housing unit after the earthquake, 3rd Turkey Earthquake Engineering and Seismology Conference, 2015.