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FOREWORD

The Hubble Bridge Replacement project in Gouyave Estate, St. Johns commenced at the end of March 2016. It was completed and opened for public use in February 2017. The Hubble Bridge Replacement cut-off date was November 19, 2014. This was the date when the project area was clearly delineated and knowledge of this was widely circulated in the project area. It was also around that time that discussions with direct PAPs/potential PAPs commenced, including research which facilitated finalization of an appropriate location for installation of a temporary footbridge. OP 4.12 establishes that the cut-off date is the date the census begins or when the project area is clearly delineated and the information is widely circulated. The latter applied in this case. The census was conducted a short time later in January 2015.

Hubble Bridge Replacement sub-project has four (4) direct project affected persons (PAPs). PAP No. 1 is a vendor who owns a mobile stall was impacted because her mobile vending stall required relocation from its usual place in the area of the bridge replacement. However, she was not prevented from continuing to sell her products. She was satisfied with the alternatives discussed with her and chose the option to relocate her mobile vending stall to her front yard (short distance of about 120 ft. from where she would usually vend). From her front yard she will move the stall to and for on a daily basis to continue her vending.

The other PAPs were a family of three (3) persons, a sister (PAP No. 2), and her two brothers PAP No. 3 and PAP No. 4. Together, they jointly owned a parcel of land that was temporarily leased by the project to be used for the installation of a temporary footbridge over the river so that residents could continue to access both sides of the community via the footbridge until the Hubble Bridge Replacement project was completed.

Consultations with the family of PAP # 2,3 and 4 occurred at various times from March 12, 2014. Minutes of consultation with the family of PAP # 4 is annexed to this ARAP at Annex 4. Discussions and
consultations with PAP #2 also occurred in December 2017 and January 2018. See Annex 13 for a summary of the outcome of the consultations with PAP #2 which occurred in December 2017 and January 2018. PAP no 2,3 have been compensated as per the RAP. The details are in Annex 4 and 5.

Community consultations and consultations with other stakeholders of the Hubble Bridge Replacement project occurred before and after reconstruction of the bridge started. Consultations included officials from the Ministry of Works (MOW), the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) and a wide range and cross section of members of the community, including direct PAPs. During community consultations held April 5, 2016 which took the format of a town hall meeting, members of the community received information about the sub-project. They asked questions and presented their views. Other consultations took various forms including discussions with community members, interviews, surveys and meetings.

During excavation and other earth works for reconstruction of the bridge, stones from the river were placed on one side of the river embankment near the boundary of three households whose properties are in boundary with that side of the river embankment. Some of those stones were packed within the immediate boundary of the property of two households. Additionally, residents in the immediate vicinity of the bridge expressed concerns about the bridge design and finishing works. Those two sets of issues were addressed through consultations with the households affected by the stones who wanted the stones that were packed in the immediate area of their property boundary removed, and through community consultations with members of the community who expressed concerns with the bridge design and finishing works.

The community consultation to address these concerns was held on December 8, 2017. Prior to the community consultation, the PCU received complaints about bridge design and finishing works. Among the complaints received were the small size of inlet on the bridge pavement and ponding. Other issues associated with river embankment and flood mitigation were also raised by members of the community, including silt buildup under the Hubble Bridge, narrowing the channel flow, noise from boulder movement impacting the bridge structure occasioned by heavy rainfall events and risk of flooding of the bridge and surrounding areas.

In December 2017, the PCU responded to complaints received by providing a matrix of complaints and remedial actions previously undertaken and proposed to be undertaken by the contractor and MOW. Additional questions and suggestions were addressed during the consultations with full knowledge and involvement of the community, including clarification of the agreed remedial actions and responsible agencies for undertaking the remedial actions. A copy of the matrix containing the complaints, proposed remedial actions and responsible agencies is annexed to this ARAP at Annex 7. Also, a copy of the report of the community consultations is annexed to this ARAP at Annex 8.

The community was encouraged to monitor the matrix timetable for addressing the remedial actions and to contact the PCU on an ongoing basis to follow-up the remedial actions agreed to and contained
in the matrix if these remedial actions are not being undertaken in a timely manner. The consultations included presentations and responses from the design consultants (remote participation), the Member of Parliament for the constituency, the Chief Engineer from the MOW, the contractor, other members of the contract team, other engineers and technical personnel associated with the project and members of the PCU including the PCU engineer and head of the PCU. The World Bank STC attended the consultations. Thirty-five (35) members of the community participated in the consultations. Discussions were lively and extensive, lasting more than two hours. The community responded positively to the PowerPoint presentation of the matrix and especially positive about being given copies of the said matrix presented to carry home with them so they could monitor the decisions and agreed actions contained in the matrix. The community, Member of Parliament for the constituency and other attendees thanked the PCU for having the community consultations.

Consultations with the two households affected by stones packed on the river embankment near or immediately within their property boundaries occurred during the first, second and third weeks of December 2017. At the site visit to engage in further consultations during the week of December 18, 2017, a team comprising representatives from the PCU, Physical Planning Unit, World Bank STC met with members of four households including the two households where stones were to be removed. A report of the consultation with these households and the agreed course of action which was to remove the stones immediately within the property boundaries of two of the four households is annexed to this ARAP at Annex 10. Following these consultations, the agreed course of action was carried out and is now completed. The stones near and immediately within the property boundaries of the two households were removed on January 4th, 2018. Following this action, the households expressed satisfaction with the actions of the PCU and thanked the PCU for following up and resolving their concerns. Based on interactions with members of the community in January 2018, no new issues were raised.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (A-RAP) has been prepared for the Hubble Bridge Replacement Sub Project under the Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project (DVRP) in accordance with the World Bank’s (WB) Involuntary Resettlement Policy (OP 4.12). It intends to address OP 4.12’s objectives to assist affected persons in their efforts to improve their standards of living or at least to restore them, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher. The policy specifically covers direct economic and social impacts that both result from Bank assisted investment projects that are caused by:-

(a) The involuntary taking of land resulting in:-

1. Relocation or loss of shelter
2. Loss of assets or access to assets
3. Loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected person must move to another location

(b) The involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of the displaced persons.

This Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (ARAP) provides details on the likely impacts resulting from the relocation for the construction of the proposed works and the mitigation measures that will be implemented to address any potential adverse impacts.

Specifically, the objective of this Abbreviated RAP is to provide:

- Details of events leading to activation of OP 4.12 and results of census survey of project affected people (PAP);
- Inventory of adverse impacts on PAP’s assets;
- Description of compensation packages offered to PAP and option selected by PAP;
- Consultations with PAP about acceptable compensation alternatives;
- Institutional responsibilities for implementation of ARAP and timetable for implementing ARAP;
- Arrangements and timetable for monitoring and implementation of ARAP;
- Procedures for grievance redress;
- Source of funding and estimated cost for implementation of ARAP.
2.0 BACKGROUND

The Government of Grenada (GoG) has entered into financing arrangements with the World Bank, the proceeds of which are allocated towards the financing of the Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project (RDVRP).

The Support from Pilot Program for Climate Change (PPCR) and World Bank under the RDVRP is aimed at providing Grenada with financial and technical assistance to reduce vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change impacts. Among the specific aims of the project are the goals to integrate disaster vulnerability reduction and climate resilience in national development strategies and management of public infrastructure. As such, a significant proportion of the project addresses selected engineering works around the country in support of building climate resilience and reducing climate change vulnerability.

The Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project (DVRP) was assessed and approved by the World Bank as a Category B project. This indicates that works proposed under the project primarily involve rehabilitation works and any anticipated potential impacts are considered short term, not significant and readily preventable with standard measures. Although the Project was classified as a Category B Project, it was assessed as having triggered social safeguards, specifically Bank’s Operational Policy 4.12, Involuntary Resettlement, as planned works could lead to public acquisition of private property and subsequently impact beneficiary assets or access to assets.

In light of this, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) was developed and published to serve as a guide for the project. The purpose of an RPF is to clarify resettlement principles, organizational arrangements, and design criteria to be applied to subprojects to be prepared during project implementation. A social Assessment also was undertaken during the project preparation stages of the DVRP. In the case of Hubble Bridge Replacement sub project, the Social Assessment highlighted the possibility of land acquisition and adverse social impacts for residents living in close proximity to the project were likely during the construction phase.

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

According to the Ministry of Works (MOW), the Hubble Bridge is about a quarter mile upstream from the Lance Bridge in Gouyave, crossing the same river, the “Little River”, on the outskirts of the town, in an area called Gouyave Estate. The Hubble Bridge is a triple span (6m each) reinforced concrete structure. The bridge was effectively destroyed in 2004 when it completely lost one of two channel piers and has now been reduced to a pedestrian footbridge for safety reasons. The destruction of the channel pier will require a complete reconstruction of the bridge as it puts into question the design adequacy of the remaining pier and bridge. The bridge accesses a residential area, two churches and a school which serves as an emergency hurricane shelter. In the absence of the bridge, vehicular access is via a 1 km
detour further upstream along a road which itself is under threat by the river with embankment failures along the route.

Replacing the Hubble Bridge is essential at this time because the bridge which currently provides the only convenient pedestrian access across the river for the residents, school children and visitors and is essential to the proper functioning of the community collapsed on September 21, 2015. Additionally, the bridge has been in a state of disrepair for too long creating a dangerous situation for the pedestrians while the only remaining pier was subject to failure in the next flood. With loss of one of its piers, closure to vehicle traffic and likelihood of further damage through flooding of the remaining pier, the collapse of the bridge was predictable; hence the bridge replacement is overdue. Furthermore, the Hubble Bridge is an important by-pass in the event of disruptions on the Lance (the name of the area) or before the Lance Bridge, so that commuters en route to St. Mark and St. Patrick can continue that journey through the Hubble Bridge. This will considerably cut down the distance and time the eventual detour will take. The prolonged state of disrepair of the bridge has been a major concern for the residents. They complain that since the closure of the bridge from vehicular traffic, they have suffered major inconvenience, having to make that one to two and a half miles journey on the Gouyave Estate main road to get to their homes with the use of vehicles or to receive personal effects or delivery of building materials. The Hubble Bridge is an important facility in receipt and delivery of services to the community. Its closure to vehicle traffic lengthens the distance, time and eventual journey for emergency and other service vehicles to access residents and the school.

The MOW proposes that the new Hubble Bridge is designed as a single span, double lane, Reinforced Concrete Bridge. With this comes the removal of the significant inconveniences the community endures for so long. The receipt of quicker services such as emergency services as well as the delivery of goods and services to the community; including instances when the school may be occupied as a hurricane shelter as well as overall community activities will be greatly enhanced with the ease of access provided by this bridge and residents in turn will be relieved and happier. The disruption of pedestrian use of the bridge during construction, as well as noise and dust nuisance brings minor discomforts. A temporary foot path over the river will be erected to facilitate pedestrian use and villager access between the Gouyave estate main road and the village.

On Monday 21 September 2015, at approximately 5:45 pm, after some heavy rains the Hubble Bridge collapsed on its own weight. No one was injured. See picture below.
4.0. CENSUS SURVEY OF AFFECTED PERSONS AND VALUATION OF ASSETS

The census survey was conducted on January 19, 2015. This was the cut-off date for determining Project Affected Peoples (PAPS) in accordance with Bank policy, namely OP 4.12 – Involuntary Resettlement. The survey entailed collecting relevant data and information on the PAPs, identifies their numbers and locations. A two (2) page questionnaire (Annex 1 – Survey Form) was used to collect demographic information about the PAPs, including socioeconomic characteristics, place of residence, income source, location of business, household size, age, gender, land ownership, potential impacts from construction works on the PAP (business), nature and duration of impact(s), temporary or permanent, proposed and selected mitigation measures and timeline for mitigation measures.

Table 1: Summary of Census Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAP ID #</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Primary Occupation</th>
<th>Secondary Occupation</th>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>Number of Additional Persons in the HH</th>
<th>Sex and Age of other persons in the HH</th>
<th>Impact of Construction on PAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mobile Snack Vendor – Selling snacks to students of</td>
<td>Selling homemade cakes around</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vegetable stall unable to operate in its original location during construction period (six)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP ID #</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Primary Occupation</td>
<td>Secondary Occupation</td>
<td>Highest Level of Education</td>
<td>Number of Additional Persons in the HH</td>
<td>Sex and Age of other persons in the HH</td>
<td>Impact of Construction on PAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Government Employee – Social Worker</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Temporary Land Acquisition for use of temporary footbridge during period construction of the Hubble Bridge (anticipated for six months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsistence Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsistence Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PAP 1** is a vendor, self-employed and owns a small 6’x 3’x 5’ mobile business selling a variety of sweets and an assortment of snacks. The land which she occupies is owned by the Government. It is the government main road, a public thoroughfare typically used mobile vending hence PAP has no formal legal rights to land occupied to operate her mobile business. The mobile stall is usually moved to and fro. In the mornings it is moved to the bridge area and returned to the owner’s yard (about 120 ft. away) in the evenings.

PAP 1 household comprise of four (4) persons including herself, two males (one of school age), and two females. Her business is situated within (120) feet of the proposed project.

**PAP 2, 3 and 4** are siblings who live in separate households. They are collective owners of a plot of land near the old bridge which will be used to set up access for a pedestrian foot path bridge across the river. PAP 2 household consists of four persons including herself, two other females and one person of school age. PAP 3 household consists of PAP 3 only. PAP 4 usually lives abroad for up to six months each year. When in Grenada, PAP 4 household consist of PAP 4 only. PAP 4 has two sons living elsewhere separately and not part of PAP 4 household whenever PAP 4 is in Grenada.

The area of land needed is 1,200 square feet and is privately owned. This will facilitate the access to and the construction of the foot path bridge across the river for pedestrian use. The PAPs have willingly agreed to rent the land for an initial period of six (6) months. An agreement between PAP 2 and the Ministry of Works (MOW) for lease of the land for the initial period of six (6) months was signed between the parties. Original Agreement which was signed by PAPs could not be found. The document was recreated and the PAPs signed off. However, all attempts to get a counter –signature from the Ministry of Works seemed futile. A copy of the agreement is attached in annex 5 of this ARAP.

The impact on PAP 1 and PAPs 2, 3, 4 would be temporary in nature and would only last for the duration of the construction of the bridge which the contractor estimate would take approximately six (6) months starting in April, 2016. During this period a temporary foot path bridge will be erected over the river to
facilitate pedestrian use and villagers’ access between the Gouyave estate main road and the village. This will also allow full access of clients to PAP No. 1 business location to do their normal regular purchases. As a result, apart from the temporary relocation, PAP No. 1 small mobile business will not experience the negative impacts of loss of sale or limited access of clients to her business. Her family standard of living will not be impacted by loss of income but her small mobile business will be required to be temporarily relocated a short distance (120 feet) from her existing location to facilitate the sub-project. Consequently, there will be temporary impacts during the period the bridge would be constructed. When completed, PAP No.1 may revert to the original location on the public road in the area of the bridge to continue her normal livelihood. See Annex 2 for Schematic Illustration of PAP No. 1 temporary relocation. Similarly, upon project completion, land temporarily acquired for use of Footpath Bridge will be restored to PAP No. 2.

In the case of PAPs No. 2, 3, 4 a plot of land measuring twenty (20) feet by sixty (60) feet; a total of 1200 Sq. Ft will be leased for a period of six (6) months in the first instance. This is to facilitate access to pedestrians crossing the river anytime via the use of a temporary foot path bridge (See Annex 3, Schematic Illustration of PAP No. 2 plot of land relative to the Hubble Bridge).

### Table 2: Summary of Inventory and Value of Affected Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / # of PAP</th>
<th>Description of physical assets affected</th>
<th>Use of Asset</th>
<th>Quantity / Size of Affected Asset</th>
<th>Value of Affected Assets (XCD)</th>
<th>Type of Acquisition/Nature of Impact (Temporary or Permanent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAP # 1</td>
<td>Small mobile snack stall located on the Eastern side of Hubble Bridge on lands owned by Government (public thoroughfare or main road) PAP has no formal legal rights to land but owns the physical structure that is used as the place of her business Because the stall is a mobile structure The Ministry of Works (MOW) agreed that PAP will be allowed to return to her original spot when the Bridge is completed</td>
<td>For vending snacks</td>
<td>6’x 3’x 5’</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Temporary relocation of stall business for an initial 6 months to facilitate construction of bridge. The mobile stall is usually moved to and fro. In the mornings it is moved to the bridge area and returned to the owner’s yard (about 120 ft. away) in the evenings. There are no likely implications that the footbridge being on the opposite of the collapsed bridge will affect the sales because the distance between the vendor’s yard and the footbridge is about 120 feet. Her clientele will have complete access to her stall at all times. There will be no impact on the household income. The stall will be relocated and PAP will be able to continue her business uninterrupted for the duration of the construction period of the Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name / # of PAP</td>
<td>Description of physical assets affected</td>
<td>Use of Asset</td>
<td>Quantity / Size of Affected Asset</td>
<td>Value of Affected Assets (XCD)</td>
<td>Type of Acquisition/Nature of Impact (Temporary or Permanent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP # 2, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>A plot of land located on the Western side of the Hubble Bridge</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1,200 sq. ft. of non-productive land. This represents approximately 5% of the total amount of land owned by PAPs 2, 3, 4. PAP # 2 undertakes to provide a copy of formal legal rights to the property when obtained from her lawyers¹.</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>Temporary Acquisition of a family plot of land agreed to by all (sister and brothers) by way of lease for the purpose of constructing a temporary public footpath bridge for pedestrian crossing over the river. The lease will cover the initial 6 months period the contractor estimates it will take for the Hubble Bridge to be constructed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Communication with PAP 2 Attorney confirmed the documentation in their possession confirms the Alexis Family (the three siblings) possesses formal legal rights to the property and are finalizing formal legal transfer of the sibling’s names to the documents.
Table 3 below summarizes the nature and extent of impacts under this sub-project, the consultations that have taken place with the project affected persons and a summary of the Census Findings and Outcome of Consultations with PAPS. Furthermore, it indicates the mitigation options considered and discussed with the project affected persons as well as the mitigation measures agreed to by the PAPs.

Table 3: Summary of Census Findings and Outcome of Consultations with PAPs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Site, Nature of Assets Affected / Owner</th>
<th>Asset Ownership Status / Gender / Age</th>
<th>Amount of Land to be Acquired / Location / Land Ownership Status</th>
<th>Who will be Impacted Category of Affected Person</th>
<th>Impacts (How) /Income and # of Household Members</th>
<th>Consultations (who, when)</th>
<th>Consultations Outcomes</th>
<th>Mitigation Options considered</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures Selected / Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


|   | Small mobile snack stall located on the Eastern side of Hubble Bridge PAP No.1 | The stall and products belong to PAP No.1 but not the land. PAP No.1 essentially is temporarily vending on public land / in a public space when vending on the public main road. Female aged 45. In verbal discussion with the Chief Technical Officer of the Ministry of works, PAP No.1 could return to the original location used to vend. It was however pointed out that the Ministry of Works did not give PAP No.1 the spot to vend hence would not be preventing her from returning to the spot to make a livelihood. In fact PAP # 1 will have more available space to conduct her mobile vending business because the new bridge will be even wider. The location where this vending occurs is a public thoroughfare available to and accessible by any member of the public. None. The stall is located on Government land Gouyave Estate No formal legal rights to land but owns the physical structure that is used as the place of her business as a Self-employed person. A female snack vendor who is the head of her household of (4) four (including PAP herself) with three unemployed HH members including one of school age. Removal of the stall from its original position near the old bridge for construction of the new bridge. Income of EC$2,500.00 to $3,000.00 per month via two sources:
1. Selling snacks to students. 2. Selling homemade cakes around Gouyave community. With PAP No. 1 in Mid-June, 2014 at her business place and on November 5 and 19, 2014 again at her business premises. No written minutes were taken at these meetings. Agreed to support the project in its entirety as well as with relocation options. 1. Relocation to the Gouyave Market. 2. Relocation to her front yard where she resides. 3. Relocation to the opposite side of the river. 1. Relocation to front yard where she currently resides. The movable stall is usually moved to and fro. In the mornings it is moved to the bridge area and returned to the owner's yard (about 120 ft. away) in the evenings. There are no likely implications that the footbridge being on the opposite of the bridge will affect the sale of the mobile vendor. This is because the distance between the vendor's yard and the footbridge is about 140 feet and her clientele have complete access to her stall at all times. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The stall and products belong to PAP No.1 but not the land. PAP No.1 essentially is temporarily vending on public land / in a public space when vending on the public main road. Female aged 45. In verbal discussion with the Chief Technical Officer of the Ministry of works, PAP No.1 could return to the original location used to vend. It was however pointed out that the Ministry of Works did not give PAP No.1 the spot to vend hence would not be preventing her from returning to the spot to make a livelihood. In fact PAP # 1 will have more available space to conduct her mobile vending business because the new bridge will be even wider. The location where this vending occurs is a public thoroughfare available to and accessible by any member of the public. None. The stall is located on Government land Gouyave Estate No formal legal rights to land but owns the physical structure that is used as the place of her business as a Self-employed person. A female snack vendor who is the head of her household of (4) four (including PAP herself) with three unemployed HH members including one of school age. Removal of the stall from its original position near the old bridge for construction of the new bridge. Income of EC$2,500.00 to $3,000.00 per month via two sources:
1. Selling snacks to students. 2. Selling homemade cakes around Gouyave community. With PAP No. 1 in Mid-June, 2014 at her business place and on November 5 and 19, 2014 again at her business premises. No written minutes were taken at these meetings. Agreed to support the project in its entirety as well as with relocation options. 1. Relocation to the Gouyave Market. 2. Relocation to her front yard where she resides. 3. Relocation to the opposite side of the river. 1. Relocation to front yard where she currently resides. The movable stall is usually moved to and fro. In the mornings it is moved to the bridge area and returned to the owner's yard (about 120 ft. away) in the evenings. There are no likely implications that the footbridge being on the opposite of the bridge will affect the sale of the mobile vendor. This is because the distance between the vendor's yard and the footbridge is about 140 feet and her clientele have complete access to her stall at all times. |
| 2 | Relocation to front yard where she currently resides. The movable stall is usually moved to and fro. In the mornings it is moved to the bridge area and returned to the owner's yard (about 120 ft. away) in the evenings. There are no likely implications that the footbridge being on the opposite of the bridge will affect the sale of the mobile vendor. This is because the distance between the vendor's yard and the footbridge is about 140 feet and her clientele have complete access to her stall at all times. |
A small plot of land located on the Western side of the Hubble Bridge

PAP’s 2, 3, 4 are joint owners of the land, they have formal legal rights to the land and they were all present during the initial consultations. Joint ownership comprising of a female age 51 and her two brothers aged 54 and 56 years respectively.

1,200 square feet of non-productive land with nothing planted on the land which is to be leased for six (6) months. This represents approximately 5% of the total amount of land owned by PAPs 2, 3, 4.

Gouyave Estate

PAP No. 2 (the sister of the siblings) is employed fulltime with Government as social worker. The brothers are subsistence farmers.

Formal legal rights to land are being finalized by attorneys of PAP No. 2.

A family of three (3) i.e., two (2) brothers and one (1) sister who are joint owners of the land. They were all spoken with and have all agreed to sign an agreement at the appropriate time. It will be will be sourced from the MOW.

Consultation s were had with all three PAPs on one occasion, in March 2014. Face to face meetings and phone discussions occurred at different times and occasions. Most meetings and discussions however occurred with PAP No. 2, Ms. Ena Alexis. PAP No. 4 resides abroad for various periods hence was least available but was part of the first formal or initial consultations where permission to lease the land to install the footbridge was granted by all three.

Allowing PAPs 2, 3, 4 privately owned plot of land to be accessed by the public via temporary footpath bridge for the duration of the bridge construction. The land on the other side of the river bank is government owned.

PAP No. 2 earns $1,500.00 per month and employed by Government. Her household is comprised of four members including her. Her siblings (i.e., her two brothers) are not part of her household.

The two brothers are subsistence farmers and earn a livelihood by

Consultation 1. Accepting one lump sum payment upfront for rental of the parcel of land before any construction works commences on the plot of land which would be distributed equally among the three PAPs. PAP #4 received the cheque on behalf of PAPs 3 and 4.

A family plot of land agreed by all (sister and brothers) to be leased/rented for the purpose of installation of a temporary footbridge to facilitate public access to both sides of the community over the river.
selling produce from another plot located about a mile away. When the brothers work the land together they earn an average of 

EC$2,000.00 per month.

PAP No. 3 is the only member of his household.

Whenever PAP No. 4 is in Grenada, he is the only member of his household. PAP No. 4 has two sons who reside separately. Siblings. See Annex 4 for Minutes of the first meeting/consultations with the

Other meetings and consultations occurred in 2014 and 2015 at the plot of land and at their place of business (a small shop in a nearby street. Additionally, meetings and discussions with officials of the MOW and PCU occurred by phone and during visits by MOW and PCU officials to the project site. There are no minutes of these other meetings and discussions.
3.1 Description of Compensation and Resettlement Assistance to be Provided

The World Bank Involuntary Resettlement policy (OP 4.12) makes provision for the following to take precedent.

1. Inform PAPs about their options and rights pertaining to resettlement;
2. Consult with PAPs on choices and provide technically and economically feasible resettlement alternatives; and
3. Provide PAPs with prompt and effective compensation at full replacement cost for loss of assets attributed directly to the project.

3.2 Valuation of Assets

With respect to PAP No. 1, no compensation was involved because no loss of income was suffered or would have been suffered by her as a result of installation of the temporary footbridge or as a result of reconstruction of the Hubble Bridge. A quick unofficial valuation of the assets was done to glean a value of the assets merely as a benchmark exercise.

PAP No.1’s stall is usually left near the bridge but is required to relocate. Her main clientele who are the students from nearby primary and secondary schools will not be denied access to her new location because of a temporary installed footpath bridge for the duration of the sub-project. Consequently, there will be no loss of income or source or livelihood for PAP No. 1 during her temporary relocation for the duration of the project and will require no compensation or relocation assistance (as her stall is mobile and is usually moved to the bridge in the mornings and taken back to her front yard in the evenings).

With respect to PAPs 2, 3, 4 (joint owners of a plot of land near the old bridge), the asset to be valued is sixty feet by twenty feet (60’ x 20’) of land at a current market price of eight dollars $8.00 ECD per sq. ft. for a total of $9,600.00 ECD. PAPs 2, 3, 4 have signed an agreement for the rental of the said land. There will be no loss of income or livelihood incurred because the current plot of land is non-productive with nothing planted on it.

3.3 Resettlement Entitlement Matrix

With this Sub Project, a self-employed snack vendor and three siblings jointly owning a parcel of land will be affected. The Resettlement Entitlement Matrix in Table 4 below sets out the project impact and resettlement entitlement measures in relation to this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Resettlement Entitlement Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary relocation of mobile vending stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary land acquisition through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 DESCRIPTION OF COMPENSATION AND RESETTLEMENT ASSISTANCE TO BE PROVIDED

A participatory process involving PAPs whose livelihood was at stake was the mode of engagement on the Hubble Bridge Replacement Sub Project. The Social Development and Communication Specialist of the DVRP together with the Project Engineer led the process very carefully. The cut-off date was established on November 19, 2014. OP 4.12 establishes that the cut-off date is the date the census begins or when the project area is clearly delineated and the information is widely circulated. By cut-off date, screening for project impacts on PAPs already occurred. Impact on PAP No. 1 included relocation in accordance with the Bank’s social safeguards operational policy OP 4.12. PAP No. 1 agreed with the relocation options discussed with her and actually offered the option that she preferred, as seen in Sub-section 5.1 below.

Similarly, it was determined PAPs 2, 3, 4 would be directly impacted since their jointly owned private land will be temporarily acquired to install a footbridge to allow public access over the river for a period of six (6) months in the first instance based on the estimated duration of reconstruction of the Hubble Bridge. See Annex 7 for picture of the temporary footpath bridge.

5.1 Compensation Packages Offered

PAP # 1

PAP No. 1 welcomed the project as discussions about relocation options began. Three (3) options for temporary relocation offered and discussed with PAP # 1 are as follows:

1. Relocation to the Gouyave Market.
2. Relocation to her front yard where she resides.
3. Relocation to the opposite side of the river

Of the three temporary relocation options discussed namely to the Gouyave market; to the opposite side of the river or to her front yard (as suggested by her), she selected the latter option to relocate to her front yard. This relocation options means rather than the mobile stall remaining stationary on the side of the road from where snacks and products for sale are brought to and from the stall, the stall will be located in her front yard, items for sale placed in the stall and the stall will be moved to and from the front yard to the side of the road. Upon completion of the Hubble Bridge reconstruction, the PAP can return to the original spot where she previously vended since the original spot is a public space accessible to any member of the public. PAP # 1 expressed satisfaction with this arrangement.

| lease of 1,200 square feet of land for the duration of the sub-project. | two self-employed brothers aged 54 and 56 years old respectively. They jointly own a plot of land near the old Hubble Bridge. The female household comprises 4 members, 3 females and 1 male including her. Her two siblings are the only members of their respective households. | market value for temporary lease of the property. | the initial period of six months estimated for the duration of the project. PAP # 2 received the cheque on behalf of PAPs 3 and 4. See Annex 6 for copy of cheque of lump sum payment and copy of receipt for payment received. |
PAPs # 2, 3, 4

One option was considered and discussed with PAPs 2, 3, 4 to lease a portion of the land jointly owned by PAPs 2, 3, and 4 to facilitate the temporary installation of the footpath bridge for the duration of the project. The PAPS agreed to lease the land for an agreed sum after discussions which included the amount to be paid for the lease and the methodology for calculation of the amount to be paid for the lease of the land. The PAPs agreed to accept a lump sum payment upfront for rental of the land before the commencement of any construction works.

6.0 CONSULTATIONS WITH COMMUNITY & DISPLACED PEOPLE ABOUT ACCEPTED ALTERNATIVES

Public consultation under this sub project will be carried out on an ongoing basis throughout the entire life of the sub project particularly through the implementation and construction phases. The public consultations for Hubble Bridge Replacement Sub Project is ongoing and to date has seen different approaches and communication techniques, interviews, surveys and community discussions took place and will continue to be a significant aspect of this sub project until its completion.

Several individual consultations and meetings and or discussions were held with PAP No.1 between June 2014 and November 2014. On each occasion information about the project was shared and several concerns, comments and suggestions were raised. Questions included clarifications on the project start date; whether or not the PAP would be allowed to relocate to somewhere else and if she would be assisted if required. Other questions included whether she would be allowed to return to the said spot after the sub-project (Bridge) is completed and if preference will be given to persons in Gouyave Estate as far as being employed by the sub-project. Several community residents and by-standers also took the opportunity to ask the Social Development and Communication Specialist and the Project Engineer of the DVRP questions and raised their concerns. For the younger persons, males in particular, the question of employment on the sub-project was an issue while other persons expressed their support for this sub-project which has been talked about since Hurricane Ivan in 2004 is finally going the come through.

Several discussions and one consultation for which minutes were recorded were held with PAPs No. 2, 3, 4 between January and June 2014. The consultation involved all three (3) siblings and took place at the private premises of PAP No. 2, PAP No. 2, on March 12, 2014. Discussions centered around temporary lease of their property, confirmation that they were the legitimate owners of the property (a document showing formal legal rights to the property was provided) and what option(s) for leasing of the property they were comfortable with. After considerable deliberations about lease arrangements, monthly rental fees and methodology used to calculate rental fees among other matters, the sibling’s decision was to accept a rent/lease agreement which included the requirement that full payment be made upfront for any initially agreed period. See Annex 4 for minutes of meeting with PAPs 2, 3, 4. Further, lease of the land includes removal of two derelict old shacks with no salvage value to be cleared off the plot of land. However, the cutting and or trimming of all shrubs, branches and trees (non-fruit bearing trees and trees of no economic value) in the path of the public access to the
A temporary footbridge was undertaken by the Ministry of Works as part of the works undertaken to construct the footbridge.

A community town hall information sharing took place on April 5, 2016 in attendance were the Project Consultant, the Parliamentary Representative for the area, the Contractor and other permanent members of the Gouyave Estate community, the Social Development and Communication Specialist and all stakeholders. Here community residents were told what exactly would be taking place at both bridges including the scope of works and were given the opportunity to have their questions, concerns and fears addressed. These centered mainly on employment. The primary objective of the information sharing consultation was to formally inform community residents of this phase (construction) of the sub-project.

On December 8, 2017, community consultations were again held with the community to address various community concerns. Prior to the community consultations, the PCU received complaints about bridge design and finishing works including size of inlet on bridge pavement and ponding. Other issues associated with river embankment and flood mitigation were also raised by members of the community (though the latter are not specifically related to the bridge replacement). The PCU responded by providing a matrix of complaints and remedial actions previously undertaken and proposed to be undertaken by the contractor and MOW. During the community consultations, the matrix of complaints, remedial actions already carried out since the complaints were received and further actions to be undertaken were explained by the PCU and MOW. Additional questions and suggestions were addressed during the consultations with full knowledge and involvement of the community including clarification of the agreed remedial actions and responsible agencies for undertaking the remedial actions. A copy of the matrix containing the complaints, proposed remedial actions and responsible agencies is at Annex 8. Also, a copy of the report of the community consultations is at Annex 9.

Copies of the matrix were given to members of the community. The community was encouraged to monitor the matrix timetable for addressing the remedial actions and to contact the PCU on an ongoing basis to follow-up the remedial actions agreed to. The consultations included presentations and responses from the design consultants (remote participation), the Member of Parliament for the constituency, the Chief Engineer from the MOW, the contractor, other members of the contract team, other engineers and technical personnel associated with the project and members of the PCU including the PCU engineer and head of the PCU. Thirty five (35) members of the community participated in the consultations. Discussions were lively and extensive, lasting more than two hours. The community responded positively to the PowerPoint presentation of the matrix and especially positive about being given copies of the said presentation to carry home with them. See Annex 10 for cross-section of participants at the community consultations.

Consultations were also held with households affected by stones packed on the river embankment near or immediately within their property boundaries. These consultations occurred during the first, second and third weeks of December, 2017. At the site visit to engage in further consultations during the week of December 18, 2017, a team comprising representatives from the PCU, Physical Planning Unit and World Bank STC met with members of four households including the two households where stones were to be removed. At these consultations, the agreed course of action was to remove the stones immediately within and near the property boundaries of two of the four households. A report of the consultations with these households is at Annex 11.
Following these consultations, the agreed course of action was carried out and is now completed. The stones near and immediately within the property boundaries of the two households were removed on January 4th, 2018. Following this action, the households expressed satisfaction with the actions of the PCU and thanked the PCU for following up and resolving their concerns. Those households were reminded that they can contact the PCU at any time should any issue arise associated with the bridge replacement, and to contact the MOW about matters related to the river. They expressed appreciation for this reminder. Based on interactions with members of the community in January 2018, no issues were raised. They continue to speak positively about the approach to resolution of past issues. See Annex 12 for an image of the Hubble Bridge Replacement.

During the months of December 2017 and January 2018, follow-up discussions and meetings were held with PAP No. 2. The discussions concerned obtaining from her a copy of documentation of proof of land ownership, verification or confirmation that each sibling received equal amounts of the lump sum payments and monthly payments from the lease of the property jointly owned by them and clarification regarding removal of old derelict structures on the leased property to facilitate installation of the temporary footpath bridge. With regard to proof of ownership of land, the documentation provided in 2014 required finalization of legal transfer of the siblings’ names to the document and related matters. Those matters were still being attended to by attorneys (see footnote 1, page 9 above). committed to submit a copy to the PCU when finalized and returned to her by her attorneys.

With regard to equal share of payments received for lease of property between the three siblings, a letter signed by PAP #2 and her brother PAP#3 confirmed monthly payment received for the duration of the use of their land (including the additional three months that the land was occupied) is attached to this ARAP. In that said letter, PAP #2 and PAP#3 both confirm that the money received for lease of their property was divided and shared equally among the three siblings. Further, in the said letter, contact information is provided for PAP #4 for verification purposes since he is abroad. See Annex 13 for the Letter.

With regard to removal of old derelict structures on the leased property, PAP#2 indicated the structures were demolished and removed by PAP No. 4 but the cutting of trees of non-economic value, branches and shrubs to facilitate installation of the footbridge was carried out by the MOW. See Annex 14 for a summary of the outcome of the follow-up discussions/consultations with PAP # 2 which occurred in December 2017 and January 2018.

### 7.0 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The PCU is responsible for the implementation of the ARAP. The Social Development and Communication Specialist within the PCU is directly responsible for coordinating with relevant institutions and with guidance from the World Bank Social Development Specialist ensures compliance with the requirements of the RPF and OP/BP 4.12. The institutions that are involved are:

- The PCU – Overall coordination and monitoring
- MOW – supervision of works
- MOF – budget and compensation payment
• Design and Supervision Consultant – developed engineering work site plans that provided information for project site delineation and the census that helped determine persons that will be affected by the project.

Table 5 below presents the institutional responsibilities for project implementation and management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Responsible Agency/Person</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction</td>
<td>Project Coordination Unit (PCU) / Social Development and Communication Specialist</td>
<td>Identify the affected persons, consult and advise them on their rights as per OP/BP 4.12 and to address their concerns, suggestions and comments.</td>
<td>On three occasions between January and November, 2014 at the PAP place of business. Consultations will be ongoing pre, post and during the construction of the bridge. In addition consultation will take place before the ARAP is finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction</td>
<td>PCU/Social Development &amp; Communication Specialist</td>
<td>Follow-up any site issues and project matters related to any complaint / concerns which PAPs or the community may raise during the pre-construction phase of the project</td>
<td>No site issue(s) to date. Community concerns related to placement of river stones near property boundaries and concerns related to finishing works on bridge followed-up, issues of stones addressed and finishing works on bridge being addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Communication and Works / PCU Social Development and Communication Specialist</td>
<td>Secure the necessary compensation to be paid to PAPs 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Compensation paid on 14th July, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction</td>
<td>PCU / Social Development and Communication Specialist</td>
<td>Identify with PAP suitable relocation area/site as agreed to by PAP</td>
<td>This was identified with PAP on November 19, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Communication &amp; Works</td>
<td>Relocate PAP to the agreed upon relocation area / site compensate for any cost of relocation.</td>
<td>PAP relocated Sunday April 10, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During and Post Construction</td>
<td>PCU / Social Development and Communication Specialist</td>
<td>Check status of PAP after relocation would have occurred. Monitor settling-in of PAP in new location and address any relocation related discomforts / concerns / comments of PAP</td>
<td>Followed-up PAP relocation in April 2016 at the start of construction after PAP relocated. PAP did not indicate any issues with relocation during and after completion of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.0 PROCEDURES FOR GRIEVANCE REDRESS
A redress mechanism is necessary for addressing eligible concerns of affected individuals and groups who may consider themselves denied or deprived of appropriate treatment under the project. Redress for grievances will be facilitated through the Grievance Appeal Committee.

**8.1 Grievance Appeal Committee Roles**

1. The Grievance Appeal Committee comprise the following persons:
   a. The Head of the Project Coordinating, Unit Ministry of Finance
   b. The Head of the Physical Planning Unit, Ministry of Works
   c. The Head of Lands Department, Ministry of Community Development
   d. The Comptroller of Inland Revenue Department, Ministry of Finance and
   e. The Social Development Specialist (RDVRP)

2. All Committee deliberations and decisions will be properly documented and preserved for records. See *Annex 15*, Grievance Redress Form for documenting grievances and preserving records.

3. The Committee through the Social Development Specialist will receive and register all complaints and appeals and will consult with the complainant. The Committee will respond to all complaints with a rational or justification. It will indicate the date by which the complaint will be responded to, the process with which the complaint will be considered and explaining the reason for the decision reached by the Committee.

4. The Appeals Committee will meet as required to review complaints which have been received.

5. The Committee may call on witnesses, a facilitator or expert to provide additional information, testimony or opinion. These individuals act in an advisory capacity only and their input advice or opinion will not be binding on the Committee.

6. The Committee will consider each complaint on a case by case basis and the facts surrounding the particular case

7. Complaints will be examined to determine whether the case constitutes a valid complaint. If a complaint is valid, the Committee is required to find fair, timely and just solution to the claim.

8. All complaints and requests for information must be recorded and filed appropriately.

The Appeals committee will be chaired by the head of the Project Coordination Unit and therefore, the PCU will provide all the necessary support to enable the committee to assume its role including clerical work and budget support. The Committee must be based in a location that lends for easy access to PAPs and other persons who may raise any claims or complaints during the implementation of the project. This will ensure that the PAPs with grievances are not placed in a disadvantaged position when their issues are discussed. Claims and complaints will be submitted to the Committee for thorough assessment and further required actions. The maximum time to solve a grievance or complaint is three (3 months).
Table 6: Grievance Redress Procedures

| Grievances from affected parties | • Grievances made verbally/letter/email to the Social Development Specialist  
| Access Point | • Complaint / grievance received by the PCU other than the Social Specialist  
| Grievance Log | • The PCU serves as the access point for grievances  
| Assessment | • Grievances received verbally, written (via letter or on paper) or by email are documented, verified and signed by both parties.  
| | • Grievances will be copied to the relevant authority as defined in the Land Acquisition Act.  
| Resolution and Follow-up | • Grievances categorized by type. Determination of eligibility of grievance.  
| | • The first assessment of the grievance conducted by a Grievance Committee comprising persons drawn from the PCU and technical officers from the MOW and MOF.  
| | • Letter acknowledging grievance relating to resettlement issued by the PCU to the aggrieved persons.  
| | • The Social Development Specialist to provide assistance with dealing with conflict resolution and grievance. The Specialist will communicate all disputes and grievances to the PCU immediately when received. Should a resolution of the dispute persist beyond this redress mechanism or further dispute arises, the applicable Laws of Grenada will prevail.  
| | • Development of Implementation Plan for resolution of grievances.  

9.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE ARAP

The RAP will be monitored and implemented by the PCU with the Social Development Specialist directly responsible for ensuring that OP/BP 4.12, the Bank safeguard on Involuntary Resettlement, is carried out.

9.1 Internal Monitoring

The PCU through the Social Development and Communication Specialist is responsible for monitoring and implementation of the ARAP against predetermined targets and to facilitate the work of any external monitors through effective record keeping and preparation of periodic Project Progress Report.

9.2 Bank Monitoring

The World Bank supervision mission will regularly and systematically review the progress of ARAP implementation and reference their findings in an Aide Memoir.

10.0 TIMETABLE AND BUDGET FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ARAP

Table 7 A below presents the resettlement time table while and 7B below presents the resettlement budget.
Table 7A: RESETTLEMENT TIME TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>1qt</td>
<td>2qt</td>
<td>3qt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Task/ Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform affected persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct of Census Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultations/Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Vending Booth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed starting time of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of Compensation to PAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.1 Resettlement Budget

Cost estimate for compensation of PAPs affected by the Hubble Bridge Replacement Sub-Project for the Implementation of the ARAP is presented in table 7B below. The table presents the budget to cover the cost of compensation for the initially agreed period of temporary land acquisition.

Table 7B: Resettlement / Compensation Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost (XCD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation cost for temporary land land acquisition (rent/lease)</td>
<td>10,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.0 ANNEXES
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Annex 13 – Ena Alexis and Floyd Alexis Letter

Annex 14 – Summary of Follow-up Consultations with PAP No. 2, Ms. Ena Alexis

Annex 15 – Grievance Redress Form
Census/Socioeconomic Survey for Hubble Bridge

Objective is to determine location, number, and types of persons and assets potentially affected

1. Business or Household? Business ☐ Household ☐

If Household please answer questions 2 to 9 and question 15 to 20

If Business please answer questions 10 to 14 and question 20

2. Name of head of household

3. Gender (Male or Female) (tick one) Male ☐ Female ☐

4. Address / Location on site

5. Contact numbers

6. Total number of household members

7. Any vulnerable household members (e.g. elderly, disabled).... Y/N....
   a. Who...
   b. How vulnerable...
   c. Special consideration...

8. Household Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age Group (0-20)</th>
<th>Sex M/F</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Source of income /employment</th>
<th>*Estimate monthly Income</th>
<th>Estimate the impacts of resettlement on incomes and living standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21-40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(41-65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(66 and over)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Could the project lead to other impacts on yourself (and/or household members) beyond the impacts mentioned? Y/N. If yes, - What other impacts (to yourself and your family) might result from the project?

Will the project affect your (or your households) ability to perform daily activities? Y/N. If yes who will be impacted and how will they be impacted?
Might the project affect your ability to engage in community activities? Y/N. If so what activity (ies) and how you/your family will be potentially impacted?

Do you have any other concern(s) about the potential impacts of the project that you would like to share? Y/N. If so please list/name concern(s).

10. What is name of Business?
11. Name of business owner
12. Type of Business
13. Number of Employees
14. Describe how project intervention will affect business and assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset description</th>
<th>Quantity of asset</th>
<th>How affected</th>
<th>Relocation/resolution options</th>
<th>Value of asset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Inventory of affected assets. What assets will be impacted by the project? (Check all that apply below, Q. 16 onwards).

16. What is the magnitude of the expected loss of assets (total or partial and the extent of displacement, physical or economic? Indicate all that apply
✓ Land
  o Total surface Area of land affected
  o Location of Land to be acquired
  o Current productive use of land to be acquired
  o Permanent or temporary (duration) impacts
  o Magnitude of loss (total, partial, % of land assets lost)
  o Livelihoods affected? How?
  o Physical relocation?
✓ Crops
   - Surface Area of cropped land
   - Inventory of Crops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop/Trees</th>
<th>Surface Area/Number</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Permanent/temporary (duration) impacts</th>
<th>Magnitude of loss (% of assets)</th>
<th>Livelihood impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Physical Structure (list each structure / type of structure/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of structure</th>
<th>Size of structure</th>
<th>Purpose/use</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Relocation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Other impacted assets (wells, livestock, equipment?)

18. Public infrastructure and social services that will be affected?

19. Will income/livelihood of household be affected by the project? Y/N
   - How?
   - Duration of impacts
   - Who will be impacted (household members)
   - Other?

20. Ownership status of land/property (criteria for eligibility)
   - Formal legal rights
   - No formal legal rights but have a claim
   - No recognizable legal right
Annex 2 – Schematic Illustration of PAP No. 1 Temporary Relocation
Annex 3 – Illustration of PAPs 2, 3, 4 Plot of Land relative to the Hubble Bridge (Shaded in Red)
Annex 4 – Minutes of the First Meeting/Consultations with PAPs 2, 3, 4 (the Alexis Family)

Consultation held on March 12, 2014 at the Alexis residence – Gouyave, St. Johns.

It started at 10:00am with the social development and communication specialist saying that their discourse would be recorded. He spoke about the significance of the sub project to the community and the relative importance of a footbridge just prior to and during the construction of the Hubble Bridge. The family of PAP 2, 3, and 4 were asked if they were willing to rent or lease the portion of land close to the old Hubble Bridge and under what condition and for what price.

The PAP 2, 3, and 4 all agreed on the importance of the project to the community and immediately stated that they owned the said property and were interested in an arrangement that would enable them to have some financial benefit.

The proposal for a lease agreement was worked out to the satisfaction of the Alexis family owners of the property.

Proposal

The social development and communication specialist and the PAP 2, 3, and 4 family agreed that an average of 700 persons would use the footbridge daily at a cost of ten cents per person for a total of $70.00 ECD dollars per day for 30 days per month for a total of $2,100.00 ECD monthly.

Proof of Ownership

The social development and communication specialist asked to see proof of ownership of land. The deed was produced by the Alexis and a copy was kept for the records. The copy was further verified by the Inland Revenue Division. Additionally, it was agreed by PAP 2, 3, and 4 that two derelict store rooms located in the path where the temporary footbridge would be erected will be carted away from the site by PAP 2, 3, and 4. They also agreed to the cutting of one tree and the trimming of others on the land to be rented to facilitate the setting up of the temporary footbridge. PAP 2, 3, and 4 requested to receive one lump sum payment prior to the start of the construction works. It was also agreed that a mutually agreed date for the starting of the rental of the land between the PAP 2, 3, and 4 and the social development and communication specialist would be set up at a later date closer to the start of the project.
The PAP 2,3, and 4 expressed concern about payment and who would be responsible. The social development and communication specialist agreed that the P.C.U will be responsible of this payment initially and additionally, after the agreed upon start date for rental of the land.

Two Weeks later
During a telephone conversation two weeks later between the PAP 2,3, and 4 and the social development and communication specialist it was agreed that $60.00 ECD dollars per day x 30 days per month = $1,800.00 ECD per month for 6 months. A lump sum of $10,800.00 ECD dollars would be paid which would be divided equally between the two brothers and one sister. Beyond the 6 months initial payment, all additional payment(s) will be monthly, preferable at the end of the month until the project is completed including the curing period for the new bridge. The discussions end at 12 35 pm.
Annex 5 – Signed Agreement with PAPS 2, 3 & 4 is in project files.
Annex 6 – Copy of Cheque of Lump Sum Payment and Receipt for Payment Received. In project files.
Annex 7 – Picture Illustration of Temporary Footpath Bridge (installed over the river October, 2015)

Picture below shows entrance of Footpath Bridge
## Questions

1. The height of the bridge is 5½ feet from the bottom of the channel. The community reported that the current height makes it lower than the previous bridge. This is too low because the recent rainfall events showed that the water was almost touching the bridge. As you are aware the projections for climate change for Grenada is for extreme weather events including extreme rainfall and therefore the construction of any bridge should take that into consideration as well as design for debris as well as water. The previous bridge had a column in the middle of the channel and it was damaged by debris during Hurricane Ivan. Therefore the new design with columns is appropriate but the lower bridge would suffer damage from debris.

## Technical Specifications - Hydraulic Considerations - Yes

According to the Final Design Report prepared by INES Ingenieros Consultores, the hydraulic considerations used to design the Hubble Bridge were taken from a study entitled “Consultancy Services to Undertake Detailed Designs of Flood Mitigation Works – Natural Disaster Management – Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (Extreme Rainfall Event). Final Design – Report. October 2014”.

According to INES Ingenieros Consultores Final Design Report, the free height necessary to fulfill the hydraulic requirement of a 50 year return period was 2.90m, however the geometrical section developed was 3.0m in order to guarantee performance. The Hubble Bridge was constructed by Qingdao Fuhaiyang Construction Group Co. Ltd to meet this specification as seen in Figure 1 below.

### Figure 1

- Hubble Bridge hydraulic riverbed situation at the end of the construction.

## Were technical specifications met and are they adequate? Y/N

Yes technical specifications were met and are adequate - Consultancy Services to Undertake Detailed Designs of Flood Mitigation Works – Natural Disaster Management Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (Extreme Rainfall Event). Final Design – Report. October 2014” was used as the guide to design the Hubble Bridge, which guided the hydraulic requirements of the bridge.

## What needs to be done?

- Excavate the riverbed in order to recover the original project hydraulic section.
- Repack displaced boulders to protect river banks and dredge the river yearly before the rainy season starts.

## By whom?

The Ministry of Communications & Works.

## By when?

Completed
### Reconstruction of Hubble Bridge – Grenada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Technical Specifications?</th>
<th>Were technical specifications met and are they adequate? Y/N</th>
<th>What needs to be done?</th>
<th>By whom?</th>
<th>By when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repack displaced boulders to protect river banks and dredge the river yearly before the rainy season starts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 - Hubble Bridge proposed geometrical section as per design.

Figure 3 - Hubble Bridge hydraulic riverbed currently

It is also important to note that on November 4th, 2017 and September 13th into 14th 2017, Gouyave experienced two extreme rainfall events. As a result along the length of the river bed large boulders which act as protective layer against soil erosion were displaced along the length of the river as seen in figure 4 below.

Figure 4 - Boulder constantly being displaced because of weather event.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Technical Specifications?</th>
<th>Were technical specifications met and are they adequate? Y/N</th>
<th>What needs to be done?</th>
<th>By whom?</th>
<th>By when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the photographs presented it is evident that boulders have been displaced due to the natural course of the river and have settled below the deck of the bridge reducing the free height of the bridge. It is also important to note that in the event that water touches the deck of the bridge, the structural integrity of the bridge will be maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repack displaced boulders to protect river banks and dredge the river yearly before the rainy season starts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qingdao Fuhaiyang Construction Group Co. Ltd</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. There are four grated street drainage inlets which are too small to handle debris and are easily clogged. The current design of the bridge is allowing ponding and the uneven surface of the bridge is also encouraging ponding. The community reported that the bridge gets flooded during rainfall events. **Technical Specifications** – Have been provided. The four bridge drains have been designed based on the 50-year return period and have been constructed to meet the technical specifications to enable evacuating the rainfall corresponding to the 50 year period, affecting the deck surface. However, during the placement of the asphalt pavement a few sections of the grills were blocked with asphalt see figure 6 and occasionally tree leaves settle into the grills. Technical specifications were adequate, however they were not met by the contractor. Contractor to remove existing asphalt and repave the bridge ensuring that the grills of the drains are left free from asphalt build up. Clean the debris (leaves) weekly. | Qingdao Fuhaiyang Construction Group Co. Ltd | Completed |
Reconstruction of Hubble Bridge – Grenada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Technical Specifications?</th>
<th>Were technical specifications met and are they adequate? Y/N</th>
<th>What needs to be done?</th>
<th>By whom?</th>
<th>By when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The original design also considered a surface slope in order to guarantee that the water will not stagnate over the deck of the bridge and is directed to the evacuation elements. However during the placement of the asphalt the contractor and the construction supervision team forgot to pay attention to the surface slope resulting in it not being implemented. The problem was noted and it will be fixed by the contractor once he is finished with the works corresponding to Lance Bridge. As Hubble Bridge serves as alternative path of Lance Bridge for vehicles, the repair works on Hubble Bridge need to wait to be undertake. This is not an additional cost as it is under the defects of the contract.

![Figure 5 – Hubble Bridge drainage specifications](image)

![Figure 6 – Hubble Bridge drains](image)
### Reconstruction of Hubble Bridge – Grenada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Technical Specifications?</th>
<th>Were technical specifications met and are they adequate? Y/N</th>
<th>What needs to be done?</th>
<th>By whom?</th>
<th>By when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The community is also complaining about the design of the sidewalk which is a creating to problems for pedestrians. One is the metal joint is at a different height to the sidewalk and persons have been tripping on it. The step down on one sidewalk is also causing persons to fall. The other sidewalk was constructed over the constructed drainage and the street cleaners cannot access it.</td>
<td>Technical specifications – Have been provided</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Steel plate can be adapted</td>
<td>Qingdao Fuhaiyang Constructi on Group Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7 – Hubble Bridge proposed pavement slopes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The river channel was well amoured prior to the construction of the bridge and there was no bank erosion and the community never felt threatened by the river. However, the river channel was dredged and the bank was excavated and the stones were packed along the river bank. The persons who own the property along the bank objected to the excavation and the packing of the stones but they were ignored. The stones are now hindering access to the river which was an integral part of the life of the community. The recent rainfall removed many of the stones placed along the bank. The placing of the stones along the bank on both sides reduced the size of the channel and it would be one of the factors contributing to the rising of the water in the channel and making the community feel threatened by the river for the first time.</td>
<td>Technical specifications – were not included in the scope of works</td>
<td>N/A - were not included in the scope of works</td>
<td>Discussion and awareness to be raised with residents of the importance of boulder protection. Further consultation with affected residents on December 18, to clarify concerns regarding stones/boulders that were placed alongside the river banks. The additional Table A below provides the details of this consultation and decisions made.</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 8 depicts that the river channel is not well amoured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reconstruction of Hubble Bridge – Grenada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Technical Specifications?</th>
<th>Were technical specifications met and are they adequate? Y/N</th>
<th>What needs to be done?</th>
<th>By whom?</th>
<th>By when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 9 – Boulder protection implemented.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Water backs up on to bridge and channels.

- The street drains are now being affected by the rising water in the channel. When the water level in the channel rises to the height of the street drains the water in the drains backs up onto the street and onto the bridge.

- It is important to have in mind that the drains are designed to move rainwater and not to evacuate floods coming from river overflows; therefore it is a natural process and cannot be prevented. If the river overflows its banks water from the drains will not be able to evacuate into the river as they have been designed to do.

- N/A

- Discussion with the residents on the function of the drains.

- Consultant

- Issue resolved

### 6. Access to homes.

- The access which comprised of steps were not destroyed but temporarily disrupted to accommodate the construction processes. A ramp with railings was built to ensure easy access by the homeowner.

- N/A

- Discussion with the home owner

- Consultant

- Issue resolved

## Additional Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident’s/ Complainant’s Concerns</th>
<th>Resolution discussed and agreed</th>
<th>Action to be taken by?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Robertson. Mr. Robertson advised that post Hurricane Ivan (circa 2004) some boulders were packed along the river bank next to his property. These boulders, he indicated never moved or shifted due to river action, prior to construction of the Hubble Bridge. He is however unhappy with the manner in which the boulders were placed during the construction of the Hubble Bridge. Some of the boulders were placed on his property. As a result of this, access to his boundary markers along the river bank has been unsuccessful, and this was demonstrated during the walk-through.</td>
<td>All boulders that were placed beyond Mr. Robertson’s boundary, on his property are to be removed. The approximate location of the boundary markers were identified.</td>
<td>Issue Resolved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Corrine Mitchell.** Ms. Corrine Mitchell is happy in general with the boulders that were packed during the construction of the Hubble Bridge, since it provides some level of flood protection to her property and house. Since the completion of the project and packing of stones, the branches of a trimmed mango tree in the vicinity of the boulders near her property, were packed atop the boulders. However there is a cluster of about three boulders that she wants removed. These boulders, she claimed, were placed during the project intervention and are on her property.

It was agreed that this small cluster of approximately three boulders will be removed from Ms. Corrine Mitchell property.

**Issue Resolved**

| Alwyn George. Mr. Alwyn George concern/complaint is the lack of boulders/embankment protection along the river adjacent to his property. Mr. Alwyn's property is immediately next to and down-stream of the bridge abutment. He claimed that the boulders placed along the river bank next to his property (during bridge construction) were all moved away during heavy river flow. | The course of action to resolve the concern were discussed as follows: Boulders will be re-packed. Engineering/technical advice would be sought regarding the extent to which boulders can be packed near this property without compromising the river channel's cross section. | Issue Resolved |
Annex 9 – Report of Community Consultations held December 8, 2017

Report on Community Consultation held on the

Reconstruction of Hubble Bridge, Market Square, Gouyave, St. John’s – Grenada

December 8, 2017

On Friday 8th December, 2017, at the St. Peters R.C. School, in Market Square, St. John’s, a community consultation on the reconstruction of the Hubble Bridge was held. The consultation came about as a result of complaints which were sent to the World Bank by members of the immediate community surrounding the bridge construction. In response to the complaints, the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) of the Ministry of Finance in its capacity as project implementation entity, together with project partners the Ministry of Works (MOW) and the World Bank coordinated the convening of the community consultations to review and address community concerns. Further, the community consultations form an integral part of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) of World Bank Projects and which the government of Grenada accepts as a means of addressing community concerns.

Site Visit
Prior to the convening of the community consultation which was scheduled to commence at 5:00 p.m., a project site visit and walkthrough of the entire area was done from 3:00 p.m. to get a physical view of the construction matters in order to better aid project parties’ understanding of the concerns raised and the proper mechanisms which would be followed to address same.

The walkthrough comprised representatives from the following project related agencies:
- PCU
- MOW
- Project Contractor
- Project Consultant
- Community members

During the walkthrough and upon its completion, the following were highlighted and acknowledged:
- The access railing and footpath to the four residents in the immediate vicinity of the bridge included inputs from the community which the community wanted to place on record and which was acknowledged by the contractor and project parties.

- The bridge was constructed at a height of 3 meters or approximately 9.6 ft. Ongoing measurement of the height of the bridge from the bridge platform to the river bed immediately beneath the bridge will change over time due to silt/sediment and other debris deposit build-up on the river bed immediately beneath the bridge. This will have the effect of a reduced height (reduced vertical space between river bed and bridge platform) in the channel immediately beneath the bridge. This will recur over time and will be addressed by the MOW. It however does not deny the official height of the bridge at construction.

- Placing of boulders at a location near the river’s edge in boundary with the four residents in the immediate vicinity of the bridge by the contractor was reviewed.

- Ponding and questions of inlet size on the bridge was already acknowledged in original exchanges between the community and the PCU/MOW and was seen by project parties as subject to attention.
Community Consultations

At the commencement of the community consultations, an attendance register was circulated and signed by members of the community upon entry in the room. 35 community residents attended the consultations from the immediate area of the bridge (commonly referred to as Harlem) and from Gouyave, Lower and Central Market Square and lower Gouyave Estate. The consultations opened with introductions of the relevant project related parties and the head table.

Members of the head table consisted of:

- Hon. Alvin Dabreo Parliamentary Representative
- John St. Louis Chief Technical Officer, Ministry of Works
- Bob XU Contractor – Qingdao
- Leslie Barry Contractor’s Engineer
- Davel Fernansez INES Representative
- Jenny Alexander Chairperson
- Najar Andall PCU Engineer /Narrator/Facilitator

The meeting was chaired by Ms. Jenny Alexander of the Project Coordination Unit. She welcomed everyone and explained the main reason for the consultation. Ms. Alexander explained that the PCU did not receive any complaint to that nature before and was surprised that the complaint was sent directly to the World Bank and subsequently channelled through the bank to the PCU rather than sent directly to the PCU for its attention.

Ms. Najar Andall – Project Engineer facilitated the question and answer session. She started by explaining that in April of 2011, the town of Gouyave was affected by an extreme rainfall event which caused the Little River which flows through the Hubble Bridge to overflow its banks and flood the Lance causing major infrastructural damaged to the town of Gouyave. This rainfall event and the associated damaged gave rise to a project funded by the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) in the name of the Natural Disaster Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Project-Extreme Rainfall Grenada which comprise of two components – (1) to collect hydrologic data for the Little River and to install an early warning system (2) to undertake flood mitigation works to the entire length of the river. From this project that Hydraulic data was used to design the Lance and Hubble bridges. The Flood Mitigation works have been designed by Hydroplan a German company and Lance and Hubble Bridges have been designed by a Spanish firm by the name of INES.

Ms. Andall then went on to address the questions one by one which was submitted to the bank on the community’s behalf by reading them out aloud. The following are the issues and responses provided:

1. **The height of the Bridge is 5 ½ feet from the bottom of the channel.**

   The community reported that the current height makes it lower than the previous bridge. This is too low because the recent rainfall showed that the water almost touching the bridge. As you are aware the projections for Grenada is for extreme weather events including extreme rainfall and therefore the construction of any bridge should take that into consideration as well as design for debris as well as water. The previous bridge had a column in the middle of the channel and it was damaged by debris during Hurricane Ivan. Therefore the new design with columns is appropriate but the lower bridge would suffer damage from debris.
Mr Robertson said he complained on behalf of himself and some of the persons in the immediate community that is Ms. Coreen Mitchell, Ms. Louis and Ms. Beldier that is the persons he is representing.

The question was asked what the height of the bridge was before so they can compare the old height with the new height. The facilitator said the bridge was designed for 3.0 meters and upon completion it was 3.0 meters.

said they measured some places 5 feet 7 inches some place they got over 4 feet. The bridge was commissioned on 17 February, 2017 and presently his major concern is deposition taking place and the rate at which it is taking place.

The PCU Engineer explained that two heavy rainfall events occurred since the bridge was completed which would have moved large boulders in the river, downstream and caused some boulders settled below the deck of the bridge. She also referred to the photographs which were taken upon the completion of the bridge which depicts the bridge having the required height and no siltation build-up.

Mr. John St. Louis reported that the bridge was designed to accommodate hydraulic considerations and constructed to meet specifications. He insisted that maintenance is of critical issue.

The Chairman explained the process is that you need to contact the local office if you have any concerns or queries which is the Project Coordination Unit or the Ministry of Works who has the overall responsibilities, however this one was taken to the highest level before reaching to the PCU and once this happens the PCU will have to show that consultations were held and that the issues are going to be addressed. She further reminded the meeting that the slides are being shared with persons who raised the concerns and the Ministry of Works who is responsible for maintenance has alluded to the fact that the matter will be dealt with as explained, that is regular maintenance to remove build up on the river’s bed.

2. There are four grated street drainage inlets which are too small to handle debris and are easily clogged. The current design of the bridge is allowing ponding and the uneven surface is also encouraging ponding. The community reported that the bridge gets flooded during heavy rainfall.

The Project Engineer responded by saying that they are aware of the issue so upon the completion of the Lance Bridge at the end of February the asphalt will be removed and a complete resurfacing will be done to get the necessary slope so that the water will run in the drains to alleviate this problem. Also, the street drains would be cleaned thoroughly from the asphalt build up. Following this, the facilitator asked if there were any queries or concerns on this matter, but there was none. The meeting then moved to the next item.

3. The community is complaining about the design of the sidewalk which is creating problems for pedestrians. One is the metal joint is at a different height to the sidewalk and persons have been tripping on it. The step down on one sidewalk is also causing persons to fall. The other sidewalk was constructed over the constructed drainage and the street cleaners cannot access it.

The Project Engineer stated that the Technical Specifications have been provided and she went with Mr Robertson to look at the concerns on the sidewalks, there are steps which can be converted into slopes which persons with wheelchairs can easily access. This is something that can be taken into consideration. Community members complement the initiatives on the new sidewalk which was not there before so it makes it easy access for all.
4. The river channel was well armoured prior to the construction of the bridge and there was no bank erosion and the community never felt threatened by the river. However, the river channel was dredged and the bank was excavated and the stones were packed along the river bank. The persons who own the property along the bank objected to the excavation and the packing of the stones but they were ignored. The stones are now hindering access to the river which is an integral part of the life of the community. The recent rainfall removed many of the stones placed along the bank. The placing of the stones along the bank on both sides reduced the size of the channel and it would be one of the factors contributing to the rising of the water in the channel and making the community feel threatened by the river for the first time.

Other community members said that there is small erosion taking place but the bridge is better now for the entire community. The riverside have erosion but not as bad as before.

Mr. Frederick said he can attest to what is being said on the issue of erosion, small erosion is taking place at the side of the river and some deposition on the other side of the river.

At this point the Chairman said the issue of the stones where person’s complaint about not accessing the river it is proposed that the stones will be removed and an agreement will be signed stating the implication of the removal of the stones and to agree for the removal of the stones from residents’ property. The chair further stated if there is any flood or overflow the PCU will not be responsible for any damages caused (arising from residents’ request to have stones removed).

The Project Engineer added that she went through the Flood Mitigation designs that Hydroplan has done and what is proposed for that section in the future is that boulders will be grouted and permanently placed on this section of the river for protection.

Mr Leslie Barry from Barry Construction (Site Engineer for the Contractor), mentioned that they (Engineer) have a responsibility to the Community, and the people of Gouyave. He further said that residents should take a second look at removing stones from property because it will have a dangerous effect in the future. He advised that no one should sign any agreement to remove the stones but ask for more stones to be packed.

The CTO advised that the Contractor is working based on a signed contract, based on the terms and conditions. He advised if the community have any problems they should contact the Ministry of Works, not the contractor.

Minister Dabreo also emphasised the need to contact the Ministry of Works who is responsible for any problems so any concerns please contact the Ministry.

5. Water backs up on to bridge and channels. The street drains are now being affected by the rising water in the channels. When the water level in the channel rises to the height of the street drains the water in the rains backs up onto the street onto the bridge.

The Project Engineer stated that the drains are designed to move the surface rainwater and not to evacuate floods coming from the river overflows; therefore it is a natural process of how drains function and cannot be prevented. If the river overflows its banks, water from the drains will not be able to evacuate into the river as they have been designed to do, as the river overflow will be covering the drains. Community members said that this has never happened as the concern alludes to.
Mr Frederick said that all the issues presented is not based on any technical concerns or the structural integrity of the bridge. He went on to say that no flooding out took place as been stated because of the rain. Only some maintenance works needs to be carried out which the next phase will take care of.

Mr Robertson said he met Minister Dabreo and he (Minister Dabreo) referred him (Mr. Robertson) to someone to liaise with the Community, but unfortunately no one turned up to meet with them.

Minister Dabreo responded by saying he referred Mr. Robertson to the relevant authority to solve this issue.

The Project Engineer intervened to inform the meeting that the project sign boards are placed at all the projects sites, so the contact numbers are on the board in case persons need to contact the office.

The Chairman added for purpose of clarity that the Minister is just the Parliamentary Representative, but the PCU work along with the Ministry of Works to implement projects. The Chair reiterated to the meeting that if there are any concerns please direct those concerns to the Ministry of Works.

The Chairman again emphasised that for future references any project funded by donor agencies and there is any issues or concerns it should come to the Project Coordination Unit or the Ministry of Works.

6. **Access to homes** the access to homes which was destroyed to accommodate the bridge was badly designed and the affected residents they had to combine funds to correct the badly designed access.

PCU Engineer explained that the access which comprised of steps were not destroyed but temporarily disrupted to accommodate the construction processes. A ramp with railings was built to ensure easy access by the homeowner. She asked the contractor to also clarify what was done at this section and he said that railings were not included only the ramp was built.

Mr. Robertson said originally there was an access road which entrance was turned into a step and most recently, the contractor provided a ramp which he said is totally unacceptable.

Some Community members said the entrance to the access road is much better now and there is easy access to get to the other side to their homes.

The Chairman said they have noted the concerns and wants to know how the problem can be addressed.

Mr Robertson said they have done over the access road and that the issue is solved now.

At this juncture, the Chairman asked if there were other concerns. There was none. The chair then thanked everyone for coming out to the meeting.

Minister Dabreo expressed his thanks to everyone for coming out to the meeting and said he was a bit disappointed that the community members had to report directly to the World Bank.

CTO St. Louis emphasised the need for the community members to call the Ministry of Works if they have any problems or any concerns.
The chair told the meeting that a report on the consultation would be compiled and submitted to the bank. A copy of the report would be made available to the complainants for their information.
Annex 10 – Cross-section of Participants at the Community Consultations

Participants (above and below)
Above – Head Table, below – participants
Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project (RDVRP)
Consultation with Residents of Community near Hubble Bridge

Date: December 18, 2017

Attendees:

Residents
Alwyn George
Corrine Mitchell
Jason Robertson
Judith Vincent

World Bank Representative/Social Safeguards Consultant
Learrie Barry

Project Coordination Unit Representatives
Jenny Alexander
Ronnie Theodore

Physical Planning Unit Representative
Husent Elcock

Objectives of Consultation with Residents
1. To determine the concerns and complaints of each of the four residents, regarding the boulders that were placed along the river bank in the vicinity of their properties
2. To determine and locate the boundaries of each resident’s property along the river bank.

Minutes and Summary of Consultation

1. Mr. Barry made introductions of the four residents and explained the objectives of the consultation with them, indicating that clarity on the specific concerns of the boulders and how it affects them is needed to develop adequate solutions.
2. Mr. Theodore introduced the team from the PCU and Physical Planning respectively and explained their role and their coordination of the response to the solutions that would arise from the consultation with each resident.
3. Each resident was allowed to explain his/her concerns, with the aid of a walk-through of the affected areas within their respective property boundary. The concerned residents all own lands that are bordered/bounded on one side by the river. The annexed photos will provide support to the following explanations and records of complaints:
Resident’s/ Complainant’s Concerns | Resolution discussed and agreed | Action to be taken by?
--- | --- | ---
Advised that post Hurricane Ivan (circa 2004) some boulders were packed along the river bank next to his property. These boulders, he indicated never moved or shifted due to river action, prior to construction of the Hubble Bridge. He is however unhappy with the manner in which the boulders were placed during the construction of the Hubble Bridge. Some of the boulders were placed on his property. As a result of this, access to his boundary markers along the river bank has been unsuccessful, and this was demonstrated during the walk-through. | All boulders that were placed beyond boundary, on his property are to be removed. The approximate location of the boundary markers were identified. | Project Coordination Unit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrine Mitchell. is happy in general with the boulders that were packed during the construction of the Hubble Bridge, since it provides some level of flood protection to her property and house. Since the completion of the project and packing of stones, the branches of a trimmed mango tree in the vicinity of the boulders near her property, were packed atop the boulders. However there is a cluster of about three boulders that she wants removed. These boulders, she claimed, were placed during the project intervention and are on her property.</th>
<th>It was agreed that this small cluster of approximately three boulders will be removed from Ms. Corrine Mitchell property.</th>
<th>Project Coordination Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alwyn George’s concern/complaint is the lack of boulders/embankment protection along the river adjacent to his property. Mr. Alwyn’s property is immediately next to and downstream of the bridge abutment. He claimed that the boulders placed along the river bank next to his property (during bridge construction) were all moved away during heavy river flow.</td>
<td>Two courses of action to resolve the concern were discussed: Boulders will be re-packed. Engineering/technical advice would be sought regarding the extent to which boulders can be packed near this property without compromising the river channel’s cross section.</td>
<td>For resolution # 1- Project Coordination Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The PCU representatives and World Bank’s Consultant all reiterated to the residents that the rebuilding of the Hubble Bridge did not address flood mitigation. The project intervention was aimed solely at replacing the bridge. A flood mitigation project for the river is in the pipeline and this will be implemented under a separate financing agreement.

2. Given that [redacted] indicated that the boulders placed at the river bank next to his property were all removed during the recent heavy river flows, R. Theodore suggested that Mr. George should begin to consider developing his own flood mitigation structures. R. Theodore made this suggestion after indicating that the Government should not be expected to continuously repack boulders along his section of the river bank, since there must be a closure to the complaints/concerns process. [redacted] positively acknowledged the suggestion and stated that he thinks that the Government’s help will be required based on the magnitude of the impact of adverse river conditions.

3. L. Barry on several occasions asked the complainants if they had any other concerns or issues to be tabled. They all indicated that there were no other concerns outside of what was previously raised. L. Barry strongly encouraged the residents to monitor and track the progress of the resolution of the complaints. He reminded them to make full use of the complaints matrix that was submitted to them during the previously held community consultations on Friday December 8, 2017 in which each resident was present and received copies of the complaints matrix. Each resident acknowledged they received and have in their possession the complaints matrix and undertook to follow-up the agreed actions in response to complaints in the matrix going forward, having been advised by Barry to so do.

4. L. Barrie commented on the build-up of sediments and boulders under the bridge deck, and spoke to the need for the Ministry of Works to carry out a routine maintenance program that involves removal of sediments and boulders.

5. J. Alexander and R. Theodore advised the complainants that every effort will be made to have all concerns speedily resolved and timelines for resolving each resident’s concern will be provided at the earliest time possible.

6. Residents were reminded that copies of their property boundary surveys were requested by the PCU and Physical Planning Unit to determine boundary locations primarily along the river bank. All residents, with the exception of [redacted] indicated their willingness to have such document available. [redacted] advised that she will provide her decision to the request at a later date.

7. Each resident thanked the team for coming and expressed complete satisfaction with the follow-up intervention of the team in respect of their concerns with the boulders impacting their respective properties.
Annex A: Photographs

This photograph shows some of the boulders that are on the property of Jason Robertson.

This photograph depicts the river boundary section of Corrine Mitchell’s property. The cut mango tree branches can be seen lying atop the boulders that were packed during the bridge construction project. The cluster of boulders that are to be removed are those located to the right, next to the black garbage bag.
The boulders in the foreground are the ones that [removed] has requested to be removed.
These two photographs show the section of boundary with the river bank. The bridge abutment and start of bridge deck can be seen also. is requesting to have some boulders packed against the river bank.
Build-up of silt and boulders under bridge deck
Annex 13 – Ena Alexis and Floyd Alexis Letter – Retained in Project Files

Consultations with Ms. Ena Alexis occurred on December 8 at the Community Consultation and on other occasions by phone in December 2017 and January 2018. Discussions with her focused on status of documentation of land ownership and other documentation related to payments received for lease of property for the Foot Bridge, confirmation that money received was shared equally with her two brothers and clarification regarding removal of old derelict structures on the property leased to make way for the installation of temporary footbridge. With respect to property ownership, Ms. Alexis indicated that the property document is being finalized at her attorneys’ office (Attorney Mr. Andre Thomas). Ms. Alexis committed to having a copy of the document submitted to the PCU once the document is finalized and returned to her from her attorneys. She offered that the PCU could follow-up the said matter directly with her Attorneys (whom she said she asked to provide information to the PCU should the PCU seek such information) or that the PCU could follow-up with her directly. Her Attorney did make contact and confirmed the documentation regarding land ownership is a legal document which confirms the Alexis family does have formal legal rights to the property. The attorney confirmed that the current legal work being done with the document is to finalize the transfer of names of ownership of the land to PAPs 2, 3, 4.

With respect to confirmation of payments received and such payments received shared equally between Ms. Alexis and her two siblings, Mr. Floyd Alexis confirmed payments received and shared equally. They both signed a letter confirming same which is part of the Hubble Bridge Records at the PCU. They stated that their letter is also on behalf of their brother Mr. Kenneth Alexis who is abroad.

With respect to removal of old derelict structures on the property leased to make way for the installation of temporary footbridge, Ms. Alexis indicated the structures were demolished and removed to another location by PAP No. 4, Mr. Kenneth Alexis. She said PAP No. 4 did not receive assistance or compensation for demolition and removal of the structures from the MOW. She indicated that the cutting of trees of no economic value, as well as cutting of branches and shrubs on the property to make way for installation of the footbridge was done by the MOW.
Annex 15 – Grievance Redress Form

GRIEVANCE FORM

Indicate the Nature of Grievance(s) 

1. Name……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   Address………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

2. Contact………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
   Name of Sub Project

3. Name of Sub Project ……………………………………………………………………………………………………….
   Date and registration of grievance

4. Name……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

I agree that the duration of time to solve this grievance will be no longer than three (3) months unless the Grievance Appeal Committee sees otherwise.

I agree that the Grievance Appeal Committee is the final forum for decisions on any claim for compensation of any sort and that all decisions will be guided by the applicable laws.

I will abide by the ruling of the Appeal Committee on the outcome of the grievance/complain.

-----------------------------------------------
Signature of Complaint Signature of Agent Signature of Grievance Officer

OFFICIAL USE

The outcome of the claim is in favour of the complainant □

The outcome of this claim is in favour of the defendant □

The outcome of this claim requires further research □

-----------------------------------------------
Signature of Chairperson