Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (Initial)

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 12/11/2001

Section I - Basic Information

A. Basic Project Data

Country: INDIA Project ID: P067606
Project: Uttar Pradesh State Roads Project Task Team Leader: Guang Zhe Chen
Appraisal Date: December 6, 2001 IBRD Amount ($m): 470.00
Board Date: July 16, 2002 IDA Amount ($m):
Managing Unit: SASEI Sector: TH - Highways
Lending Instrument: Specific Investment Loan (SIL) Status: Lending

I.A.2. Project Objectives:
The development objectives of the project are to:
Significantly improve the flow of traffic on highly congested corridors in the State’s core road network; and
Enhance the institutional capacities and financial effectiveness of the government agencies in managing the State’s road program, assets, and services.

I.A.3. Project Description:
To achieve the above development objectives, the project will comprise the following components:
(i) Upgrading and widening of about 1,000 km of priority state roads;
(ii) Major maintenance on about 2,500 km of state roads, which will involve rehabilitation of existing roads within their existing width
(iii) Institutional strengthening of PWD and development of an effective road maintenance system in the PWD and
(iv) Road safety enhancement.

The project will be implemented in two phases. The first phase will include upgrading and widening work on 374 kilometers of roads and major maintenance on 808 kilometers of roads. In the second phase, which is expected to commence 18 months after implementation of the project begins, the remaining upgrading and widening and major maintenance works, as well as the planned bypasses and bridges will be carried out. For Phase I, all the detailed engineering, Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) environmental management plans (EMPs) for upgrading roads and Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for maintenance roads all have been completed. A similar process will be conducted for phase II roads, including the bypasses and bridges, during phase II. The implementation of RAP and EMPs are included in component (i), and ESMP in component (ii).

I.A.4. Project Location: (Geographic location, information about the key environmental and social characteristics of the area and population likely to be affected, and proximity to any protected areas, or sites or critical natural habitats, or any other culturally or socially sensitive areas.)

The project roads are located throughout the state of Uttar Pradesh, with most of the roads selected for upgrading situated in the eastern part of the state, the fertile Indo-Gangetic Plains. The area is densely populated, with some parts exceeding 1000 persons per square kilometer. Many of the project roads pass through several urban and semi-urban areas.
Most of the civil works, except for the bypasses and bridges in Phase II, will be carried out on the existing Right-of-Way. The majority of the Project Affected Persons (PAPs) are those who have settled and encroached on the existing ROW. The Social Assessment (SA) carried out as part of the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) for road upgrading found that the project will affect 1482 families, out of which 838 families will be displaced. In the case of the bypasses in phase II, private land will be acquired (21.8 hectares) affecting 240 families.

The SA further found that most of the PAPs are likely to belong to Other Backward Castes, most are likely to be engaged in petty trading. One-fourth of the PAPs are categorized as “workers”, of these, over one-fifth (mostly women) are engaged in household chores. Nearly two-fifth of the PAPs fall below the poverty line, defined as annual income below Rs24,000 per family.

Two project routes are close to some protected areas. the ROW for Route 7 (Bahraich - Faizabad) selected for upgrading in Phase I forms a boundary with the Parvati-Aranga Bird Sanctuary, and the Meerut-Naziabad route selected for major maintenance passes through Hastinapur Wildlife Sanctuary.

The proposed widening of the project roads in Phase I will have limited impact on common property resources, with only 50 common property resources within the Corridor of Impact (COI) being affected. These include 30 hand pump locations and 17 religious structure, all of which will be shifted in consultations with the affected community. Under Phase II, there are two important arch gates and a mosque located on Route 4. Although these are not protected monuments, a mitigation plan as per OPN 11.03 has been prepared as part of the RAP. Approximately, 7800 trees will be cut within the COI to widen the road during Phase I.

B. Check Environmental Classification: ERROR: Invalid UNID; UNID must be a 32-digit hex string.
Comments: The project has been categorized as ‘A’ because of the combined social and environmental impacts likely to stem from the high population density in the urban and semi-urban areas where the project roads pass through, and a similar impact from the construction of the bypasses and major bridges in Phase II of the project. Most of the social and environmental impacts identified are, however, local, reversible, and will be mitigated and minimized through detailed environmental and social impact management plans.
C. Safeguard Policies Triggered
Policy Applicability
Environmental Assessment (OP/BP/GP 4.01)
Forestry (OP/GP 4.36)
Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)
Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)
Pest Management (OP 4.09)
Involuntary Resettlement (OD 4.30)
Indigenous Peoples (OD 4.20)
Cultural Property (OP 4.11)
Projects in Disputed Territories (OP/BP/GP 7.60)*
Projects in International Waterways (OP/BP/GP 7.50)
*By supporting the proposed project, the Bank does not intend to prejudice the final determination of the parties' claims on the disputed areas*

Section II - Key Safeguard Issues and Their Management
D. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues. Please fill in all relevant questions. If information is not available, describe steps to be taken to obtain necessary data.

II.D.1a. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts.

The safeguard issues identified during the EA and SA process include the proximity of two road links to a Bird and Wildlife Sanctuaries, the resettlement and rehabilitation of project affected persons mostly settled on the existing ROW, and the relocation of some common properties. However, all these impacts are relatively minor, and do not pose any significant or irreversible impacts.

The road corridors have been selected to cause minimal direct adverse impacts on the people, land, and cultural property. To this end, the project is designed to minimize land acquisition and to avoid large scale displacement of communities by limiting the widening to the existing formation width of present-day roads. There will be no land acquisition for Phase I roads, and the land to be acquired for Phase II bypasses are relatively small (21.8 ha). Environmental and social safeguard issues have been carefully considered and integrated into the selection of the alignment of Phase I and II road improvement works and maintenance works.

Out of 1,482 project affected families, 17 families who are considered tribal people along 374 km of Phase I upgrading roads. To address the concerns and needs of vulnerable people, the RAP has special and additional provision for them to improve their livelihood.

Construction and operation related impacts have been identified, and their mitigation plans have been designed. The construction impacts, which will be confined to the to the existing ROW, except for the bypasses and bridges in Phase II, include:

(a) air and noise pollution;
(b) dust and smoke from material transport, crushers and asphalt plants during construction;
(c) pollution from spills of oil fuel, lubricants and construction camp wastes;
(d) operation of borrow pits, quarries and construction camps;
(e) cutting of trees; and
(f) additional traffic hazards.

During the operation period, the possible environmental impacts identified include increased traffic noise, air pollution, erosion, water pollution from service areas, induced impacts from undesirable developments, as well as additional safety risks from increased speeds.

The impacts from construction and operation of the project roads will be
mitigated and minimized through:

Providing retaining walls in environmental hot spot areas,
Evolving constricted cross sections in the settlement stretches,
Designing for a lower design speed,
Protecting community giant trees and cultural properties by the construction of retaining walls and the installation of road side barriers and signage, and
Providing closed drains in urban areas to ensure proper drainage.

II.D.1b. Describe any potential cumulative impacts due to application of more than one safeguard policy or due to multiple project component.

There are no significant cumulative impacts stemming from the identified safeguard policies and project components. All the environmental and social concerns identified are relatively independent and will be mitigated through corridor specific and detailed environmental and social management plans and Resettlement Action Plans.

II.D.1c Describe any potential long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area.

The findings from the EA and SA process indicate that there will be no major long term impact from the upgrading and maintenance of the proposed roads. The likely long-term and induced impact will come from the construction of bypasses in Phase II. The bypasses are likely to induce changes in the land use patterns of the project area from the resettlement of people and the loss of agriculture land for road construction and, in the long-run, for other uses, such as industrial and commercial and residential use. The induced impact on the land use patterns does necessary entail a negative impact since Uttar Pradesh is primarily an agricultural land and needs to balance its productive resources to other sectors of the economy to support its development goals.

II.D.2. In light of 1, describe the proposed treatment of alternatives (if required)

During the detailed feasibility study and the EA and SA process, several alternatives were considered for all the project roads including for the widening component and the bypasses. For the bypasses, three alternatives were examined: widening the existing road and two new alignments. The criteria for choosing the final option were a composite of the following factors: minimizing R&R activity, reducing tree cutting, reducing loss of arable land, minimize vehicle operating cost and travel time, and reducing conflicts between through traffic and local activity. Based on the EA and SA assessment and including public consultation, four bypasses in the project routes were identified and their construction will be carried out in the second phase of the project.
II.D.3. Describe arrangement for the borrower to address safeguard issues

The GOUP through the PWD and the assistance of the Project Coordinating Consultants (PCC) has carried out an Environmental and Social Assessment to identify, mitigate and minimize the environmental and social impacts of the project. The assessment process has produced several outputs including the following:

- Sectoral Environmental Assessment (SEA) Report for the entire project (Phase I and Phase II)
- Environmental Assessment (EA) Report for Phase I upgrading and maintenance projects
- Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) for 4 stand alone EMPs for each of the contract packages for phase I upgrading roads
- Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for Phase I maintenance roads
- Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) for Phase I road upgrading.

For Phase II, similar assessment and plans (EA, contract-specific EMPs, ESMP for major maintenance roads, and RAP reports) will be prepared during Phase I of the project.

An Independent Consultant was engaged by GOUP to review the outputs of the EA and SA process and to ensure compliance with Bank safeguard policies. The Reports are consistent with O.P. 4.01, OPN 4.11 and GOI’s environmental assessment policies. The RAP socio-economic and cultural assessments were carried in accordance with the O.D. 4.30 and OD 4.20, and the results have been integrated with the project design and endorsed by GOUP. The R&R policy includes an entitlement framework, which is approved by GOUP and endorsed by the Bank and is consistent with the Bank’s O.D. 4.30 and O.D. 4.20 to deal with land acquisition and other potential adverse social impacts of the civil works program.

In order to achieve effective implementation of the mitigation measures, the GOUP has established an Environment and Social Management Cell within the PWD to coordinate and oversee the implementation of environmental and social components of the project. The Cell is headed by the Project Director and currently includes two Assistant Engineers (AE), and two additional officers of AE level will be in place by negotiations. The Cell will liaise with relevant government departments, contract with NGOs for assistance with the RAP, and oversee the implementation of EMPs and RAP and the preparation of EA/SA for Phase II roads. Independent consultants, as Supervision Consultants (SC), will be responsible for overseeing and monitoring all aspects of the upgrading component of the project, and their team will also include inputs from environmental specialists. The supervision of major maintenance will be undertaken by PWD staff with technical audit from independent consultants, again to include environment specialists. Construction and associated environmental mitigation activities will be implemented by contractors working on behalf of the UPPWD. The mitigation and enhancement measures will be enforced and closely supervised by the independent Supervising Consultants for the upgrading component and PWD staff for the major maintenance component. Relevant provisions and clauses have been included in the Bills of Quantities and contract documents. Training of the PWD staff, the SC, NGOs providing RAP services and the Contractors’ personnel will be undertaken as per the training modules and plan prepared as part of the EMPs.

II.D.4. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on
potentially affected people. Extensive consultation was carried out with a wide array of stakeholders likely to be affected by the project on several stages of the project, namely, during screening, preliminary design, and design finalization stages. The public consultation will continue during the implementation and monitoring and evaluation stages. The consultation was carried out at state, district, and local and village level.

The main purpose of the consultation process was to inform the stakeholders on the proposed project and its likely impact, and to solicit their views and inputs for the design and implementation of the project. The consultation process uses in-depth interviews with key informants, focus group discussions, seminars, workshops and meetings. The consultation program included the following stakeholders:

Heads of households likely to be impacted
Household members,
Cluster of PAPs
Villagers
Village Panchayats
Local voluntary organizations, community based organizations and nongovernmental organizations
Government agencies and departments, and
Major project stakeholders, such as women, tribal and ethnic communities, road user groups, health professionals, and others.

A separate consultation forum was given for women to voice their views.

Detailed information on the project was distributed to NGOs, government agencies, university and research organizations during the State Level Workshop. Extensive district and local level consultation complemented this process with different social groups, district administration, NGOs and other interested groups.

The views of the stakeholders have been incorporated to facilitate the minimization of negative impacts, and to enhance the benefits through the design and preparation of the RAP. Moreover, the focus group discussions with the villagers and panchayats enabled GOUP to develop the R&R policy and the RAP according to the real needs of the affected PAPs.

The SEA, EIA, EMPs, R&R policy, RAP, and ESMP have been made public through Bank’s PIC and in the project area. To ensure continuous participation of people, the RAP provides a mechanism for institutionalizing consultation with the affected people and the panchayats for the implementation and monitoring the progress of the work. A series of follow on consultations have been completed in October 2001, to share the EMPs, RAP, ESMP and the designs.

E. Safeguards Classification. Category is determined by the highest impact in any policy. Or on basis of cumulative impacts from multiple safeguards. Whenever an individual safeguard policy is triggered the provisions of that policy apply.

[ ] S1. - Significant, cumulative and/or irreversible impacts; or significant technical and institutional risks in management of one or more safeguard areas
[X] S2. - One or more safeguard policies are triggered, but effects are limited in their impact and are technically and institutionally manageable
[   ] S3. - No safeguard issues
[   ] SF. - Financial intermediary projects, social development funds, community driven development or similar projects which require a safeguard framework or programmatic approach to address safeguard issues.

F. Disclosure Requirements Environmental Assessment/Analysis/Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of receipt by the Bank</td>
<td>10/31/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of &quot;in-country&quot; disclosure</td>
<td>10/31/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of submission to InfoShop</td>
<td>10/31/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For category A projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of receipt by the Bank</td>
<td>10/31/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of &quot;in-country&quot; disclosure</td>
<td>10/31/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of submission to InfoShop</td>
<td>10/31/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework: Expected Actual

| Date of receipt by the Bank               | 10/31/2001 |
| Date of "in-country" disclosure           | 10/31/2001 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop            | 10/31/2001 |

Pest Management Plan: Expected Actual

| Date of receipt by the Bank               | 10/31/2001 |
| Date of "in-country" disclosure           | 10/31/2001 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop            | 10/31/2001 |

Dam Safety Management Plan: Expected Actual

| Date of receipt by the Bank               | 10/31/2001 |
| Date of "in-country" disclosure           | 10/31/2001 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop            | 10/31/2001 |

If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why.

Signed and submitted by Name Date

Task Team Leader: Guang Zhe Chen 12/06/2001
Project Safeguards Specialists 1: Mridula Singh, Social Development Specialist
Project Safeguards Specialists 2: Sonia Kapoor, Environmental Specialist
Project Safeguards Specialists 3: Approved by: Name Date
Regional Safeguards Coordinator: L. Panneer Selvam 12/06/2001
Sector Manager/Director: Vincent Gourne 12/06/2001
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