

AN APPRAISAL REPORT OF THE EXPERT GROUP CONSTITUTED FOR STUDY OF THE SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT OF KRISHNAYAPALEM (V)

The District Collector, Guntur, has constituted an Expert Group through the orders Rc/B/251/2016 dated 08-09-2016 as required under the Section 7 of the LA R&R Act, 2013, for appraisal of Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Report and Social impact Management Plan (SIMP). The Expert Group consisted of the following, namely:

1. Dr. R. Veeraraghavaiah, Dean of Post-Graduate Studies, ANGRAU, Guntur.
2. Dr. A.V.V.S. Swamy, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Environmental Science, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur.
3. Dr. M. Trimurthi Rao, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Sociology and Social Work, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur.
4. Dr. K. Somasekhar, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Rural Development, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur.
5. Sri D. Roshan Kumar, Director, Social Educational and Economic Development Society, Guntur. *Sudhakar*
6. Sri Thulluri ~~Sridhar~~ Independent Engineering Consultant, Hyderabad.
7. Manchikalapudi Vaishnavi, Member, Grama Panchayat, Krishnayapalem.
8. Avala Srinivasa Rao, S/o Ammayya, Member, Grama Panchayat , Krishnayapalem.




The committee has gone through the SIA study report, the proceedings of the Public Hearing, the details of Socio Economic Study conducted, the EIA study reports, and notified Master Plan pertaining to the Capital City area in addition to making a visit to the Village, Krishnayapalem, to study in respect of following issues:




- Whether the project serves any public purpose
- Whether the potential benefits outweigh the social costs and adverse social impacts
- Whether the extent of land proposed to be acquired is the absolute bare minimum extent needed for the project.
- Whether there are other less displacing options available.

It was observed from the final SIA and SIMP reports, Capital City Master Plan, Infrastructure:

The State of Andhra Pradesh has been put under reorganization through the Andhra Pradesh Reorganization Act 2014, which resulted in the loss of Capital city of then State namely Hyderabad. Accordingly, a dire need arose for identifying suitable area for establishment capital in the new state of Andhra Pradesh. In this context, the Cabinet of Government of Andhra Pradesh met on 01-09-2014 and resolved "to locate the Capital City in the central place of the state, around Vijayawada, and to go for decentralized development of the State with 3 Mega Cities and 14 Smart Cities.

Signatures of the Committee:

1.  25/9/2016
3. 
5. 
7. M. ప్రేక్షణి

2. 
4. 
6. 
8. చవలె నువసూరాజి

It is proposed to go for Land Pooling System to be worked out by the Cabinet Sub Committee". Therefore, the Government came up with a new scheme called Land Pooling Scheme wherein landholders come forward proactively to participate in the scheme by offering their lands to share benefits from the development of Capital City in a win-win situation, which the state Government like to call the new capital so developed as the "People Capital", christened as "Amaravathi Capital City".




Public Purpose: The project proposed, Amaravathi Capital City, satisfies the norm of public purpose (-any purpose, for the own use, hold and control of the appropriate Govt. including public sector undertakings, for infrastructure projects is a public purpose) as per the Section 2 of the LA R&R Act, 2013. As it is going to serve as a Capital City with all state of art infrastructure facilities, it certainly serves public purpose of entire State of Andhra Pradesh as well. Further, the proactive participation of public, the landowners by voluntary land pooling, also testifies that it would serve public purpose.





Potential benefits vis-à-vis social costs and adverse social impacts:

It is observed that this project is aimed at constructing a green field Capital City, mainly acquiring the lands under voluntary Land Pooling Scheme as per the provisions of AP CRDA Act, 2014 and AP Capital City LPS (F & I) Rules, 2015. The proposed Amaravathi Capital City Andhra Pradesh falls in Guntur district covering an area of Ac 38049.48 cents belong to 31 villages. Krishnayapalem is one of those 31 Villages from which a total area of Ac 1567.35 cents of which 1425.06 is covered under LPS and remaining Ac 87.13 cents is proposed for acquisition.

Against the requirements of Ac. ^{1425.06}~~1567.35~~ cents lands for infrastructure development under the project from Krishnayapalem (V)/ LPS Unit area within Amaravathi Capital City Development Project, Ac. 1337.94 cents have been acquired under voluntary Land Pooling and the balance of Ac. 87.13 cents are proposed for acquisition under LA R&R Act, 2013. The location of the proposed lands for acquisition fall under Survey numbers ranging from 4 to 196 with land area ranging from 2.0 cents to Ac 4.59 cents mostly of dry type. These lands proposed for acquisitions are in intermix with those given under pooling scheme. Therefore, a contiguous land block couldn't be made unless both of these put together for any development that requires large contiguous block. Certainly, the project affects 262 people in the Village of those more than 23.66% are above the age of 51 years and 29.39 % are illiterates. The project as a whole has a much impact on the livelihoods and normal life of the people of the village. The potential benefits expected due to this developmental project would certainly outweigh the present negative impact on the society in the long run.

Signatures of the Committee:

- 1.  .. 20/11/2016
- 3. 
- 5. 
- 7. M. వెన్నెమి.

- 2. 
- 4. 
- 6. 
- 8. 

The main potential benefit identified is the construction of Capital City Development Project. The benefits contemplated are the construction of arterial roads connecting the village with educational institutions/health institutions/ Govt. Complexes and access to marketing and other livelihood requirements to the residents with the development of greenery to be more environmentally sound.

Cost benefit Analysis:

1457.82

The project cost is estimated at Rs. ~~6.54~~ crores. In view of the Govt. providing tier-I infra-City level infra to in addition to tier-II infra-Krishnayapalem LPS level for providing basic amenities and facilities the project cost is on the higher side, when compared to social costs and Social impacts. Further, Govt. is investing in implementing development of infrastructure in the village to ensure health and sanitation levels at par with Capital City Project area.

Minimum Extent needed & Alternatives:

The Capital City area is notified by Government and as per the Master Plan requirements all lands proposed for land acquisition are needed for construction of Capital City Development Project. To have a compact block for taking up the infrastructure development project, there is no choice for exclusion of certain small pockets of land or working out for alternative lands for them as the project area notified by the Govt. for the purpose of construction of Capital City and to implement the Master Plan conceived. Further, the land area proposed for acquisition in the village under the LA R&R Act, 2013 is only Ac. 87.13 (6.11 % of the total area proposed in the village) as against 93.89 % of lands acquired under Land Pooling Scheme.





Displacement & Relief:





As the village site and habitation has been demarcated and other lands required for village development have been included in residential planning zone (R1) as per notified Master Plan, the displacement of Village habitat is very less. During the visit made by the Expert Group, a few other land owners are also ready for offering the land under the LPS if the Revenue Officials clears up survey disputes in addition to sorting out of demarcation of village site/habitation (*Gramakantam*). The Committee is of the opinion that these issues can be solved easily and go for the LPS in a win-win way rather than going for the LA.

All the land owners, however, are sentimentally attached to these lands/houses over generations and meeting all their livelihoods from these lands only. The Committee feels that the following concerns of the people may have to be attended by the Officers concerned before going further as they have requested to postpone the *Gramasabha* till such time to clear all their concerns as come to consensus on 17-10-2016. A few of their concerns are

- Appeals given under 9.2 of Land Pooling Scheme are yet to be cleared

Signatures of the Committee:

1.  .. 20/11/2016
3. 
5. 
7. M. Basu 

2. 
4. 
6. 
8. 

- For the land given under the LPS, the owners are requesting for 1800 yards per every acre that they have given under voluntary pooling
- They are under the apprehension that the Government may sell their land for commercial establishments instead of using it for the notified purposes
- Unit level grievances redress meeting needs to be conducted once a week
- Demanding for payment of current prevailing market price for the land to be acquired
- Land value for registration in this Mandal is not enhanced like that of other Mandals like Kunchanapalli and Tadepalli.
- MSW site should not be closer to the Village of Krishnayapalem
- Fee reimbursement and issue of health cards are not yet taken place
- Proper issue of ration cards is yet to be completed
- 100 yards of land has to be given to landless poor/laborers, etc.




Evaluation of SIA/SIMP Report:



The acquisition of land is an issue which has both efficiency and equity dimensions. However prosperity the project brings in future, the present impact on human settlements in the area is quite difficult to quantify. Therefore, there is an immense need to address the human costs and the measures to be taken should create trust and hope preferably with immediate monetary gains to create confidence in the functioning of the system. Concrete plan to avoid impoverishment risks and restore/ upgrade the incomes and livelihood of the affected families shall be made in place immediately. Food security measures shall be taken for the loss of agriculture productivity in area. The literacy rate in the village Krishnayapalem is quite less (70.61 %) compared to that of the State average of 73% showing their dependency on non-skilled village wage earning activities, primarily on the agriculture. Therefore there is a need to create employment to earn their bread but with immediate payment of unemployment gratuity especially based on individuals' minimum needs rather than based on a family because all the members in landless family in a village are mostly daily wage earners. Further, 23.6 per cent of the PAPs are more than 50 year old, who needs much health care and financial assistance.

Ameliorative Measures Recommended:

1. The Agricultural livelihoods are to be converted into non-agricultural livelihoods and urban agricultural livelihoods, which calls for immediate measures for up gradation of skills.
2. Provision of ample access to interest free credit to encourage self employment
3. All PAFs should be provided with healthcare and quality education.

Signatures of the Committee:









1. 
3. 
5. 
7. M. లక్ష్మణ్

2. 
4. K Sarath Kumar
6. 
8. ఆవలత వివస్వరాజ్

4. Creation of varied opportunities for the people affected and impart them the skills accordingly.
5. New Technologies like Urban intensive and Terrace production of vegetables growth can be promoted.
6. Timely and regular disbursement of monthly compensation for unemployment that needs to be based on persons and not based on family for all the affected landless people and daily wage earners ~~(hitherto)~~ in the project areas. The minimum wage used to be Rs. 100/- and maximum used to be Rs. 500/- depending on the nature of work and season and the average wage per day is calculated as Rs. 300 and thus the minimum earning of a land less labour per month used to be Rs. 9000/- per head as it used to be a land with agricultural activity in the village throughout the year, whereas the Government's plan of paying only Rs. 2500/- per family as compensation amounts just 27.8% of an individual's average earnings and it needs to be calculated by multiplying with number of individuals working in the family. Therefore, every member in the family should get at least Rs. 9000/- per month. Further, these affected families may be considered for more entitlements under the regular public distribution system.
7. Establishment of homes for the aged people, who are neglected by their families due to the impact of the project.
8. Livelihood opportunities may be provided for the project affected families who losses livelihood by way of land acquisition as per the provisions of LAR&R Act, 2013.
9. As the soils in the area are largely deep black cotton type, the bearing ability and foundation design got to be studied scientifically with state of art technology and expertise before going for construction of any public structure in the project area.
10. A proper grievance redressal mechanism should be established for resolving disputes on LA.
11. Proper and humane arrival at payment of compensation and timely disbursement of all such benefits as contemplated under the LA R&R Act, 2013.
 12. The location of Solid Waste dump site should be shifted to far away from the village.

Finally, the Committee feels that the land proposed for acquisition may be acquired under the LA R&R Act, 2013 duly taking into consideration of the measures recommended to safeguard livelihoods of the people affected, who would eventually turn to future beneficiaries of the project. It is also of the opinion that the Capital City Development is a historic opportunity that provides long term multiplying benefits to current as well as future residents/ population.

Signatures of the Committee:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1.  | 2.  |
| 3.  26/11/2016 | 4.  |
| 5.  | 6.  |
| 7. M.  | 8.  |