

164

RESETTLEMENT OF TRIBAL FAMILIES DISPLACED BY IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A survey of the Dimbhe and Pimpalgaon Joge projects in Pune
district of Maharashtra

“The reason for selecting this subject for survey and analysis is that the resettling of project refugees shows the dark side of the administration – a side that has enjoyed protection from evaluation. Even where the legislation, rules and procedures are in place, like in many others areas, the implementation is unbelievably feudal. Equally unbelievable is the pain threshold of the poor, their tolerance, their silence, and their survival in harsh conditions. The debate regarding the merits of small versus large dams often gets diverted to the plight of the project displaced persons. Consequently many of the reasons given for banning large dams tend to pertain to resettlement problems rather than to the consequences of creating large water storages and irrigated agriculture.”

A report prepared by the Tribal Research and Training Institute, Pune,
Maharashtra, with policy recommendations
27.5.2002

CONTENTS

Sr. No.	CONTENTS	Pages	
1.	Summary of main findings & recommendations		
	Findings	1	
	Recommendations	5	
2.	Introduction	9	
3.	Comparative analysis of economic status before and after rehabilitation		
	(1) Actual irrigation in the alternative lands given to displaced persons	13	
	(2) Time gap between submergence of holdings and receipt of alternative land	14	
	(3) Shift in occupational status after resettlement	15	
	(4) Land holding size before and after displacement	17	
	(5) Livestock ownership before and after the project	18	
	(6) Distance of place of work before and after displacement	19	
	(7) Food quality before and after the project	20	
	(8) Food grain availability from own farms before and after the project	21	
4.	Transparency in implementation of resettlement policy	21	
5.	Pimpalgaon Joge project	23	
6.	Annexure-I (Dimbhe Project)		
	Tables		
	1.	Data regarding submergence	24
	2.	The details of village-wise surveyed	25
	3.	Receipt of compensation of acquired land	25
	4.	Statement showing no.of families who have not received alternative land	26
	5.	No.of families to whom land shown before allotment	26
	6.	No.of families who received alternative land according to distance from new gaathan	26
	7.	Statement showing no.of project affected families who received alternative lands after measurement of area	27
	8.	Time gap between submergence of land and grant of alternative land	27
	9.	Alternative land shown before allotment	27
	10.	No.of families who have irrigation facilities on alternative land	28
	11(A)	Details of loss of trees	28
	11(B)	Details of loss of Bandh and Grass land	28
	12.	Statement showing details about submerged houses	29
	13.	Receipt of compensation for houses	29
14.	Displaced families who received residential plots in new village site.	29	
15.	Statement showing no.of families living in new village site	30	

Sr. No.	CONTENTS		Pages
	16.	Statement showing the details of transport facility provided to the affected families for shifting household goods	30
	17.	No.of surveyed households according to main occupation	30
	18.	Details of project affected certificates issued	31
	19.	Benefits received by the Project Affected families on account of Project affected certificates	31
	20.	Sources of Drinking Water	31
	21.	Period of drinking water availability	32
	22.	Statement showing village-wise amenities provided	32
7.	Annexure - II (Pimpalgaon Joge Project)		
	Tables		
	1.	Data regarding submergence	33
	2.	The details of village-wise surveyed families	33
	3.	Receipt of compensation of acquired land	34
	4.	Statement showing no.of families who have not received alternative land	34
	5.	Year wise submergence of land	34
	6.	(a) Compensation received for trees (b) Compensation received for bandhs & grass land	35
	7.	Statement showing details about submerged houses	35
	8.	Receipt of compensation for houses	36
	9.	Displaced families who received residential plots in new village site	36
	10.	Statement showing no.of families living in new village site	36
	11.	Statement showing the details of transport facilities provided to the affected families for shifting household goods.	37
	12.	No.of surveyed households according to main occupation	37
	13.	Statement showing the details of land holdings of 32 PAPs whose main occupation became agricultural labour after displacement along with landless families.	38
	14.	Distance-wise main employment availability to the surveyed displaced families	38
	15.	Information regarding diet	39
	16.	No.of households having a live stock	39
	17.	Total no.of livestock	40
	18.	Details of project affected certificates issued	40
	19.	Benefits received by the Project Affected families on account of Project affected certificates	40
	20.	Period for which food grains are available from own land (land holders only)	41
	21.	Sources of Drinking water	41
	22.	Period of drinking water availability	41
	23.	Statement showing village-wise amenities provided	42
8.	Annexure-III - Research Team		43

RESETTLEMENT OF TRIBAL FAMILIES

DISPLACED BY IRRIGATION PROJECTS

SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

The main findings are summarized below. The data pertains to the Dimbhe project in which the submergence of villages was from 1990 to 1993. Therefore delays in this project pertaining to land distribution, provision of irrigation etc. would be of ten years or more. The status of project affected families in the Pimpalgaon Joge project is either similar or worse as the resettlement has been delayed and families have opted not to receive alternative lands. The data for this project has been given in Annexure 2.

- 1) There has been a deterioration in the economic profile of the displaced families after their resettlement.
- 2) There is a lack of transparency in key operational areas in spite of the elaborate procedures prescribed in the Land Acquisition Act and the Resettlement Act.
- 3) 54% of the households had not received irrigation after resettlement in spite of receiving alternative land within the command area of the project and in spite of the area calculation for alternative land being based upon the provision of irrigated land.

- 4) The reasons for not receiving irrigation after land allotment were that water channels had not been completed, water supply was inadequate, the lands were not leveled and the lands were at a higher level than the canal.
- 5) 57% of the families did not receive alternative land before submergence of their holdings.
- 6) 20% of the families have not yet received alternative land even though many had paid the required amount.
- 7) Of those that had received alternative land, 46% did not receive alternative land prior to the submergence of their holdings.
- 8) Before displacement, agriculture was the main occupation of 83% of the households. After displacement this fell to 56%. Agricultural labour as the main occupation rose from 10% to 33%. This shift in occupational pattern indicates a lowering of living standards and harsher living conditions.
- 9) The difference in the land area owned by the project affected families before and after resettlement shows a decrease of 55%. (This was expected to be compensated by the provision of irrigation in the alternative lands granted).
- 10) The size of holdings decreased after the project. Households holding more than 5 acres decreased from 69% to 26%. Landless families and those with less than 2.5 acres increased from 19% to 41%. (This was expected to be compensated by the provision of irrigation in the alternative lands granted).
- 11) Livestock ownership in terms of the number of households owning cows, buffaloes and bullocks has declined by 56%, 75% and 51%, respectively.

12) In terms of the total number of animals the trend is even more disturbing. The number of cows, buffaloes and bullocks decreased after resettlement by as much as 85%, 88% and 65%. Even goats which are usually owned by the poorer families decreased by 83%. The total number of large livestock and goats fell from 652 animals to 122.

13) Before displacement, 12% of the households had employment beyond 5 kms. After displacement this proportion rose to 19%.

14) Food quality declined significantly after the project. Families frequently consuming milk declined by 56%. Similarly, frequent consumption of eggs, meat/fish, and leafy vegetables declined by 55%, 73% and 33%, respectively.

15) In terms of food availability at the household level, the situation had worsened considerably. Prior to the project, 69% of the families were obtaining food grains from their own farms to last them for a period of 10 to 12 months. After the project this figure fell to 5%. Prior to displacement there was only one family (1.4%) which was producing grain sufficient for a period of two months or less but after the project the families in this category rose to 36 (51%).

16) 72% of the families were receiving tap water after the project for the first time.

17) Social infrastructure covering schools, roads and electricity were provided in the 9 villages surveyed but cattle sheds, threshing floors, market areas and cremation/burial grounds had not been provided in all villages.

18) 63 certificates were issued to project affected persons of which 7 were able to get employment.

19) Though all the surveyed land holding families received compensation for land lost there was a lack of transparency in calculating/awarding compensation. 92% of the families who claimed to have owned trees stated they did not receive compensation for trees. Similarly, 95% of the families who claimed to have owned bunds and grassland claimed not to have been compensated.

20) 6% of the households received agricultural land beyond 8 kms. from their new house sites.

21) Most of the families were shown alternative lands which were also measured before allotment.

21) In the Pimpalgaon Joge project the submergence of villages happened from 1997 to 2000. The villagers have opted for subsidy/enhanced compensation instead of alternative land. However no subsidy has so far been paid. For those whose lands were submerged in 1997 the delay has been for 5 years.

22) Conversations with displaced persons of the Pimpalgaon Joge project revealed that they did not opt for alternative land because they feared that the original holders would cause obstructions to peaceful cultivation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) A uniform ceiling of 4 acres should invariably be applied in the command area of all irrigation projects without exception. (The ceiling applied in Dimbhe was 8 acres). Discretion in applying various ceiling limits should be removed. The Act allows 5 options. Political considerations and pressure from down stream farmers tend to govern decisions regarding the size of the ceiling to be applied. Farmers also sub-divide holdings well before the notification under the Act is issued as the starting of a large project is known to all long before the official notification.
- 2) The surplus land generated in the command areas should be distributed not only to project affected persons but also to other landless and female headed families after fulfilling the requirement of the project families. Since irrigation is a highly subsidized sector it must be ensured, as far as possible, that the poor are being subsidized.
- 3) Submergence or water storage should not commence unless the distribution of alternative land has been completed. This clause should be incorporated in the Resettlement Act.
- 4) The eligibility of landless agricultural labourers (from the submergence areas) for land in the command areas should be raised from 1 to 2 acres.
- 5) There should be greater transparency in determining compensation for land, trees and bunds. Farmers should be informed how the compensation has been calculated in broad terms. This would apply especially to trees and bunds. Since village records are not regularly updated they do not reflect the correct number of trees, for example.
- 6) For greater participation of project affected farmers and transparency, farmers' committees should be established which would accompany the land acquisition officers during joint measurement or site inspections etc.

- 7) There should be greater transparency and equity in the allocation of alternative lands. Lots should invariably be drawn after announcing the time, location etc. to ensure that the better placed farmers do not corner the good lands. Command area farmers are permitted to offer any part of their holdings and naturally the low grade lands are declared surplus and offered to the project displaced families. However medium and better grade lands also become available. It is essential to ensure equity in land allocation. Some good and some poor fields need to be shared by all, as far as possible. Poor farmers might prefer cheaper lands in any case. So lands could be divided into categories.
- 8) There should be greater transparency in offering alternative lands to displaced persons. The list of survey numbers available for allotment in various villages of all the projects in surrounding districts should be published in the villages in the submergence areas. (This list can be prepared by the village officers (talathis) on the basis of the ceiling applied, even before the land is acquired).
- 9) For greater transparency in applying the ceiling, this list of survey numbers, areas and persons from whom land is to be acquired after the application of the ceiling in the command areas, should be published in the villages in the command areas also.
- 10) If the allotment of alternative land is stayed by the court, some other land should be offered to the farmer. It should be the responsibility of the Government to provide alternative land free from litigation. (Obviously the government would continue the court battle even if other land was provided).
- 11) In view of the lack of employment opportunities available, certificates to project affected families should only be given to the poorer households owning, say, less than 2.5 acres. The difference in economic status within project affected families should be recognized.

12) For at least 5 years after allocation of new lands, the revenue officers should monitor the peaceful possession of the new owner (project affected) to ensure that he is not disturbed/threatened by the original owner.

13) Communities/families within submergence villages that wish to break away from their original villages should be allowed to do so while being resettled in the new village sites. There appear to be old Government instructions that state that scheduled caste families cannot be settled separately presumably on the ground that this would prevent integration in the future. However integration cannot be enforced on the section that is weaker. If the weaker sections are given resources (land) and allowed to live separately, they will be strengthened. Maintaining the old bonds and keeping them dispersed, makes them more vulnerable to exploitation and they end up cultivating the fields of the same richer farmers that they have been doing for generations.

14) The water distribution systems, especially in relation to areas allotted to the displaced persons, should be completed immediately.

15) Lands allotted which cannot be irrigated because of their height, errors in the contour survey, etc. should be replaced immediately.

16) The reasons for the displaced families of the Pimpalgaon Joge project not wanting alternative land should be ascertained and addressed. Some families had stated that they feared taking alternative lands because these were good lands that had been developed by the original land holders and taking the lands away from them would create enmity and the displaced families would not be allowed to cultivate the lands. If this is correct it illustrates the failure of the administration in implementing the resettlement policy. The softer option of giving the displaced families subsidy/enhanced compensation would have to be discarded. The refusal to accept alternative lands because of attachment to the old habitations should not be accepted conveniently at face value but should be examined in more depth. If the lands offered previously are too expensive other lands should be shown. After giving awareness training and protection and showing alternative lands, the displaced families should be allowed to exercise

their option again because their free will appears to have been curtailed by the failure of the administration.

17) All projects in which a ceiling was imposed in the command area but land was not acquired from all the farmers holding land above the ceiling, ostensibly on the ground that the needs of the displaced persons from that project had been fulfilled, should be identified and land acquisition proceedings started. These cases could be of two types: in one case land could have been acquired from some of the farmers; and in the other case land acquisition might not have been done at all.

18) Monitoring of resettlement work by an independent agency should be introduced. Displaced persons below the poverty line should be empowered to participate in this monitoring.

19) Responsibility should be fixed for not providing the complete set of civic amenities in the new village sites, especially burial/cremation grounds.

INTRODUCTION

The reason for selecting this subject for survey and analysis is that the resettling of project refugees shows the dark side of the administration – a side that has enjoyed protection from evaluation. Even where the legislation, rules and procedures are in place, like in many others areas, the implementation is unbelievably feudal. Equally unbelievable is the pain threshold of the poor, their tolerance, their silence, and their survival in harsh conditions.

The objective in this report is not only to gain an insight into the real state of affairs but also to present recommendations for serious consideration of policy makers. Though the survey has mainly covered tribal families the findings and recommendations would apply to all project affected families.

The debate regarding the merits of small versus large dams often gets diverted to the plight of the project displaced persons and then becomes bogged down in the quagmire of demands/complaints regarding better resettlement, the relevance or adequacy of the resettlement package, the misery of those whose lands are submerged, and the corruption and lack of commitment of the administration in implementing the policy of resettlement. These human aspects which can be addressed, and the defects in the resettlement package components/ implementation which can certainly be remedied, are allowed to overshadow the technical and ecological aspects of large dam construction. **Consequently many of the reasons given for banning large dams tend to pertain to resettlement problems rather than to the consequences of creating large water storages and irrigated agriculture.**

The families displaced by two dams, Dimbhe and Pimpalgaon Joge, in the Ambagaon and Junnar tehsils of Pune district have been studied. The details are given below.

Families surveyed

Project	Total displaced families	Families surveyed		
		Non-tribal	Tribal	Total
Dimbhe	1218	17	64	81
Pimpalgaon Joge	1356	6	43	49
Total	2574	23	107	130

Families were sampled from 9 villages and 5 villages in respect of the Dimbhe and Pimpalgaon Joge projects, respectively. In these villages an attempt was made to select displaced families of different economic strata for the survey.

The report covers the payment of compensation for land submerged, the distribution of alternative land in the command area of the project, the creation of new village sites and the provision of civic amenities, the provision of employment on priority to project affected persons, the change in the poverty status of the displaced families after resettlement, and recommendations.

Resettlement work involves a wide range of activities which include updating of village land ownership records for determining eligibility regarding extent of alternative land to be given and payment of compensation for land to be acquired in the submergence area, the survey of land in the command area to identify the areas under irrigation, the estimation of the land to be generated after the application of a ceiling in the command area, the acquisition of the surplus land in the command area, the determination of the choice of the displaced persons regarding the alternative lands to be given, the distribution of this land before submergence of upstream farms, the creation of new village sites with essential social infrastructure, the protection of the displaced persons who are allotted land from being ousted by the original owners or converted into tenants, the ensuring of equitable distribution of alternative land in terms of location and quality, the settling of competing claims for fertile lands or high value lands with a potential for non-agricultural use, the honest management of vast sums of compensation to be distributed to illiterate peasants, the redressal of the numerous complaints that arise in this elaborate process comprising of time and sequence bound activities etc.

In view of the nature of the work and responsibilities, few officers are happy to be assigned rehabilitation portfolios. There is little status attached to rehabilitation staff compared to those working in the regular executive posts. Consequently a high priority area of work tends to be neglected.

Staff from the institute filled in the questionnaires. An attempt was made to address questions pertaining to food availability and diet to women in the surveyed households. The core team consisted of Shri M.S.Gaikwad, Statistical Officer, Shri S.B.Darade, Research Officer and Shri P.R.Tikone, Research Officer, all of whom did excellent work. The work was coordinated by Shri Tikone to whom we are all grateful for the time and effort he spent on this survey.

Though the focus of this commentary is on the change in economic status of the displaced households, the recommendations and tables (in the annexure) cover other aspects of resettlement also.

Access was not available to some important information with the implementing agency. However it was decided not to delay this report for this reason. For example, it was necessary to know why the displaced persons of the Pimpalgaon Joge project have not yet been resettled. They seem to have opted for subsidy/enhanced cash compensation in preference to alternative land. This would have been relatively easier to implement. Information regarding the reasons for delay was not provided as the implementing department (revenue) is hesitant to become transparent on sensitive issues that could expose malfunctioning. In one case (Kolhewadi) the institute was informed that the case had been processed and was ready but funds were not available in spite of the delay. However the institute will continue in its attempts to access this information.

Similarly, it is necessary to ascertain from the implementing agency and the irrigation department, the precise reasons why irrigation has not been provided to families allotted lands within command areas, especially where the distribution network has been completed. Errors in the contour survey need to be addressed by replacement of land granted. The percentage of errors needs to be reviewed.

The institute would also like to study the nature and extent of access given by concerned departments to the displaced persons and the manner in which they articulated their problems over years of delay and indifference from the implementing agencies.

There was no time to examine if the resettlement package was hijacked by the better placed farmers and if so, to what extent. This would pertain to land allotment in terms of land quality and location, time gap between land submergence and new land allotment, access to information, anticipatory actions like sub-division of holdings in both, the command and submergence areas etc.

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC STATUS BEFORE AND
AFTER REHABILITATION**

The data pertains to the Dimbhe project. The status of project affected families in the Pimpalgaon Joge project is either similar or worse as the resettlement has been delayed. The data for this project has been given in Annexure 2.

**(1) ACTUAL IRRIGATION IN THE ALTERNATIVE LANDS GIVEN TO
DISPLACED PERSONS**

With the exception of lands adjacent to rivers, the lands in the hilly submergence areas tend to be not as good as the lands in the submergence areas and consequently are more expensive for the displaced persons. 65% of the compensation received for the lands acquired from the project affected persons is taken as the initial instalment towards the payment for the alternative lands granted in the command areas. According to the existing formula the displaced persons receive less land in terms of area. But these disadvantages are acceptable because the alternative lands are irrigated. However when the alternative lands do not receive irrigation or when the time gap between the submergence of lands and the provision of irrigation in the alternative lands granted is large the displaced persons become poorer than they were before the project. The table below indicates the extent of irrigation provided to the displaced families. 54% of the households had not received irrigation after resettlement.

No. of families who have received irrigation on alternative land

Category	Families which received land in command area	Families getting irrigation	Families not getting irrigation
Tribal	52	27	25
Non -tribal	13	3	10
Total	65	30	35

(2) **TIME GAP BETWEEN SUBMERGENCE OF HOLDINGS AND RECEIPT OF ALTERNATIVE LAND**

As mentioned above, if the time gap is large between loss of holdings and the effective possession and cultivation of alternative lands, it causes a regression into poverty, especially in the case of poor, marginal farmers whose fragile resource base cannot sustain the loss of an agricultural season. In the absence of alternative land there is also no crop residue available for livestock. The table below indicates that 57% of the families did not receive alternative land prior to the submergence of their holdings.

Families who did not receive alternative land before submergence of their holdings

Total families surveyed	Families not yet given land	Families given land but not <u>before</u> submergence	Total families not given land before submergence	% families not given land before submergence
	A	b	a + b	
81	16	30	46	57%

Time gap between land submergence and receipt of alternative land in respect of families who received alternative land

Tribal/ Non-tribal	Total families surveyed	Families given alternative land	Period between submergence of holdings and grant of alternative land						
			Before submergence	1 yr	2 yrs	3 yrs	4 yrs	5 yrs	above 5 yrs
Tribal	64	52	28	8	4	5	-	3	4
Non-tribal	17	13	7	1	2	2	0	-	1
Total	81	65	35	9	6	7	-	3	5
%		100 %	54 %	14 %	9 %	11%	0	4 %	8 %

(3) **SHIFT IN OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AFTER RESETTLEMENT**

Main occupation before and after resettlement

Sr. no	Occupation	Before displacement	After displacement
		Total families	Total families
1.	Agriculture	67	45
2.	Agricultural labour	8	27
3.	Other labour	0	0
4.	Service	5	7
5.	Dairy	0	0
6.	Other	1	2
Total		81	81

The main occupation is that which contributes the major part of the annual income of the family. Before displacement agriculture was the main occupation of 83% of the households. After displacement this fell to 56%. Agricultural labour as the main occupation rose from 10% to 33% which indicates a lowering of living standards and harsher living conditions.

The change in land ownership status of the 27 families, shown in the table above, relying on agricultural labour as their main income source after resettlement, is indicated in the table below. Landless families (within these 27 families) had increased from 8 to 13 and those owning less than 2 acres, from 2 to 7. Those owning above 6 acres had decreased from 13 to 1.

**Change in land ownership status of the 27 families relying on agricultural wages
after resettlement**

Sr. no.	Land holding category (acres)	Before displacement	After displacement
1.	Landless	8	13
2.	1 – 2	2	7
3.	2 – 3	1	2
4.	3- 4	0	0
5.	4 – 5	2	3
6.	5 – 6	1	1
7.	Above 6 acres	13	1
Total		27	27

Some of the reasons for the steep rise in the proportion of families relying mainly on income from agricultural labour are that some families had not received alternative land, others who had received alternative land had not received irrigation, the alternative lands in some cases were not fertile, and the land holding size had decreased, as mentioned above.

(4) LAND HOLDING SIZE BEFORE AND AFTER DISPLACEMENT

The difference in the total land area owned by all the surveyed project affected families before and after resettlement is indicated in the table below. The area shows a decrease of 55%.

Total land area owned before and after resettlement

No. of total families	Total land holdings of surveyed families before displacement (acres)	Land acquired for project	After displacement		
			Land remaining in possession of surveyed families	Alternative lands received	Total holdings in possession of surveyed families (52 + 255)
81	726=03	675=23 (93%)	52=00	255=06	307=06

The details of size of holdings before and after the project are given in the table below. Households holding more than 5 acres decreased from 69% to 26%. Landless families and those with less than 2.5 acres increased from 19% to 41%.

Size of family holdings

Land holding range	Before displacement (Families)	After displacement (Families)
1) Landless	10 (12%)	16 (20%)
2) Up to 2.5 acres	6 (7%)	17 (21%)
3) 2.6 to 5.0 acres	9 (11%)	27 (33%)
4) Above 5 acres	56 (69%)	21 (26%)
Total	81 (100%)	81 (100%)

(5) **LIVESTOCK OWNERSHIP BEFORE AND AFTER THE PROJECT**

The livestock ownership before and after displacement is indicated in the table below.

No. of families owning livestock

Type of livestock	Before displacement			After displacement		
	Tribal	Non-tribal	Total	Tribal	Non-tribal	Total
Cows	38	10	48	18	3	21
Buffaloes	41	11	52	11	2	13
Bullocks	45	10	55	23	4	27
Goats	23	8	31	14	5	19
Poultry	48	10	58	26	3	29
Other	0	0	0	2	0	2

The number of households owning cows, buffaloes and bullocks has declined by 56%, 75% and 51%, respectively.

In terms of the total number of animals the trend is even more disturbing as the table below will show. The number of cows, buffaloes and bullocks decreased by as much as 85%, 88% and 65%. Even goats which are usually owned by the poorer families decreased by 83%. The total number of large livestock and goats fell from 652 animals to 122. The main reasons for reduction in herd size were that holdings were smaller and crop residues for feeding livestock were reduced, grazing areas were limited, some of the old villages were near forests where grazing was available, no area for cattle sheds was provided in the new villages etc.

Total no. of animals

Type of livestock	Before displacement			After displacement		
	Tribal	Non-tribal	Total	Tribal	Non-tribal	Total
Cows	176	35	211	24	7	31
Buffaloes	118	29	147	16	2	18
Bullocks	109	24	133	41	6	47
Goats	105	56	161	19	7	26
Poultry	497	98	595	189	13	202
Other	0	0	0	11	0	11

(6) **DISTANCE OF PLACE OF WORK BEFORE AND AFTER
DISPLACEMENT**

Distance of the school or drinking water source are indicators of human development. Similarly the distance of the place of work which constitutes the main occupation (including agriculture) is an indicator living standard. The table below states these distances.

Distance from place of main employment

Sr. no	Distance/ Range	Before displacement			After displacement		
		Tribal	Non Tribal	Total	Tribal	Non Tribal	Total
i)	Within 2 kms.	50	14	64	16	4	20
ii)	2 to 5 kms.	11	1	12	38	8	46
iii)	5 to 10 kms.	1	0	1	6	2	8
iv)	10 to 20 kms.	0	1	1	1	0	1
v)	Above 20 kms.	2	1	3	3	3	6
Total		64	17	81	64	17	81

Note: Main employment includes agriculture, agricultural labour, and other types of employment,

Before displacement, out of 81 families, employment was available to 64 (79%) families within 2 kms. but after displacement only 20 (25%) families had access to employment within two kms. from their residence. Before displacement, 12% of the households had employment beyond 5 kms. After displacement this proportion rose to 19%.

(7) **FOOD QUALITY BEFORE AND AFTER THE PROJECT**

Information regarding diet

Type of food	Before displacement			After displacement		
	Rarely	Frequently	Never	Rarely	Frequently	Never
Leafy vegetables	28	52	1	46	35	0
Fruit and Vegetables	37	43	1	48	33	0
Milk	18	61	2	47	27	7
Eggs	42	33	6	52	15	14
Meat/Fish	50	26	5	65	7	9
Pulses	4	77	0	18	63	0

Data collection regarding food consumption is always difficult to obtain with accuracy unless enumerators are physically present during meals. However it is an important indicator of well being. To achieve a comparison between the food intake status before and after the project the frequency of consumption was tabulated instead of the quantity and farmers expressed the change in status according to their own understanding of the terms. Milk consumption declined significantly after the project. Families frequently consuming milk declined by 56 %. Similarly, frequent consumption of eggs, meat/fish, and leafy vegetables declined by 55 %, 73 % and 33 %, respectively.

(8) FOOD GRAIN AVAILABILITY FROM OWN FARMS BEFORE AND AFTER THE PROJECT

As indicated above, out of 81 households, 71 held land. The details of 71 families regarding the number of months of food availability from their own farms are indicated in the table below. Prior to the project, 69% of the families were obtaining food grains from their own farms to last them for a period of 10 to 12 months. After the project this figure fell to 5%. Prior to displacement there was only one family (1.4%) which was producing grain sufficient for a period of two months or less but after the project the families in this category rose to 36 (51%). Thus in terms of food security the situation had worsened considerably.

**Period for which food grains are available from own land
(land holders only)**

Period	Before displacement	After displacement
	From own land	From own land
Up to 2 months	1	36
Up to 4 months	2	13
Up to 6 months	6	5
Up to 8 months	12	13
Up to 10 months	1	0
Up to 12 months	49	4

TRANSPARENCY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF RESETTLEMENT POLICY

The various operational areas in which transparency needs to be introduced (acquisition and allotment of land etc.) have been indicated in the recommendations given above.

Given below are two tables which show that according to the perception of the displaced persons they have not received compensation for trees, bunds and grass lands. The stock answer received from the implementing agency is that all these items were included in the compensation paid. There are reasons why some of these items might have been excluded. The village records that mention trees are not updated by the village officers (talathis). The site inspection and land measurement (known as joint measurement) might not have been done properly in terms of physical counting of trees. The valuation of the trees is done by a different department and the implementing agency does not monitor the work closely. It is also possible that payments have been made for these items but the farmers have not been informed. However this seems unlikely in view of the fact that almost all the farmers state they have not received payment. **It has therefore been recommended more participation of displaced persons and greater transparency should be introduced in the procedures.**

Compensation not received for trees

Tribal / Non tribal	Total families from whom land acquired	Families possessing trees	Families who received compensation	Families not received compensation
Tribal	58	50	5	45
Non-tribal	13	12	0	12
Total	71	62	5	57

Compensation not received for bandhs and grass land

Tribal/ Non tribal	Total families from whom land acquired	Families possessing bandhs & grass land	Families received compensation	Families not received compensation
Tribal	58	50	3	47
Non tribal	13	12	0	12
Total	71	62	3	59

PIMPALGAON JOGE PROJECT

As stated above, the situation in the Pimpalgaon Joge project is worse. For example, residential plots have been provided on the upper contours and 31% of the families were having to rely on ponds for drinking water for the first time; drinking water was not available for 12 months for 29% of the families for the first time; 36% of the displaced households were residing in the residual lands and had not accepted the residential plots distributed under the resettlement programme; the shift in occupational status from agriculture to agricultural labour was from 10% to 76%; the number of families whose main source of employment was more than 20kms. away increased from 2% to 33% etc. The data regarding Pimpalgaon Joge project is in Annexure 2.

Please also see the recommendations regarding this project.

28.5.2002

Arun Bahtia,
Commissioner,
TRTI, Pune.

ANNEXURE-I

Table 1

Data regarding submergence

I. Project Dimbhe Tal. Ambegaon -

Sr. No	Name of the submerged village	Area under submergence in Hect.	Landholders of submerged villages		No. of landholders to whom alternative land allotted	Area of the land allotted Hectore
			Total PAPs	Landholders eligible for alternative land		
1.	Ambegaon	280=75	134	134	127	252=36
2.	Megholi	48=94/9	18	18	16	19=85
3.	Vachape	276=96/2	146	146	146	214=08
4.	Koltawade	242=04	104	104	104	164=45
5.	Fulwade	392=67	174	174	172	255=73
6.	Kalambai	119=99	80	80	78	122=94
7.	Digad	58=76/8	33	33	30	38=09
8.	Panchale Bk.	33=39/7	45	45	40	76=30
9.	Kushire Kh.	33=19/7	52	52	50	63=00
10.	Mhalunge T. Ambegaon	13=11/8	20	20	14	21=59
11.	Sawarli	28=70	40	30	28	30=15
12.	Borghar	39=65	52	52	50	76=70
13.	Pachale Kh.	40=49	45	45	39	44=49
14.	Kushire Bk.	44=78	58	56	30	50=74
15.	Dimbhe Bk	164=19	76	76	60	86=73
16.	Jambhori	11=82	14	13	11	17=25
17.	Patan	2=52	7	7	2	3=98
18.	Pimpri	23=19	31	27	9	12=82
19.	Kalode	4=96	19	16	7	3=60
20.	Amade	2=60	11	11	4	4=77
21.	Sakeri	21=32	14	14	3	3=96
22.	Adivare	3=84	15	15	6	7=24
23.	Nanvade	4=58	13	13	5	3=61
24.	Pokhari	2=23	53	37	28	25=88
Total		1932=30	1254	1218	1059	1600=88

Note - (a) The villages selected for survey are new villages where families have been resettled.

(b) PAP : Project Affected Person

Table 2**The details of village-wise surveyed families.**

Sr. No	Name of the village	No.of families		
		Tribal	Non-Tribal	Total
Project Dimbhe				
1	Awasari Bk. (Gawadewadi), Taluka Ambegaon, Dist. Pune	7	3	10
2	Lakhangaon, Tal. Ambegaon	2	3	5
3	Nirgudsar, Tal. Ambegaon	16	1	17
4	Jawale, Tal. Ambegaon	1	0	1
5	Bharadi, Tal. Ambegaon	2	1	3
6	Khadki, Tal. Ambegaon	12	3	15
7	Kalamb, Tal. Ambegaon	11	3	14
8	Jawala, Tal. Parner	12	1	13
9	Mhase Kh. Tal. Parner, Dist. Ahmednagar	1	2	3
Total		64	17	81

Table 3**Receipt of compensation of acquired land****Dimbhe**

Category	No.of families surveyed	No.of families whose land acquired for project	No.of families who received compensation
Tribal	64	58	58
Non tribal	17	13	13
Total	81	71	71

Table 4**Statement showing no. of families who have not received alternative land****Dimbhe**

Category	Total No. of surveyed families	No. of families given alternative land	No. of families who have not yet received alternative land	Reasons for not receiving alternative land				
				Applied and contributed 65% amount	Applied but not considered	Not approved alternative land	Procedure known but not applied	Procedure unknown hence not applied
Tribal	64	52	12	7	-	1	2	2
Non Tribal	17	13	4	2	1	-	-	1
Total	81	65	16	9	1	1	2	3

Note :

(a) 65% of compensation received for submerged land has to be paid initially towards the cost of alternative land.

Table 5**No. of families to whom land shown before allotment****Dimbhe**

Category	No. of survey families	No. of families who received alternative land	No. of families to whom land shown before allotment
Tribal	64	52	52
Non Tribal	17	13	11
Total	81	65	63

Table 6**No. of families who received alternative land according to distance from new gaathan****Dimbhe**

Distance Ranges	Tribal	Non Tribal	Total
i) Within 2 kms.	13	2	15
ii) 2 to 5 kms.	35	9	44
iii) 5 to 8 kms.	1	1	2
iv) Above 8 kms.	3	1	4
Total	52	13	65

Table 7

**Statement showing number of project affected families
who received alternative lands after measurement of area**

Dimbhe

Category	No.of families received substitute land	No.of families land received after measurement
Tribal	52	48
Non-tribal	13	12
Total	65	60

Table 8

Time gap between submergence of land and grant of alternative land

Dimbhe

Tribal / Non-tribal	Total families surveyed	No. of families who received alternative land	Period between submergence and grant of alternative land (No.of families)						
			Before submergence	1 year	2 yrs	3 yrs	4 yrs	5 yrs	above 5 yrs
Tribal	64	52	28	8	4	5	-	3	4
Non tribal	17	13	7	1	2	2	0	-	1
Total	81	65	35	9	6	7	-	3	5

Table 9

Alternative land shown before allotment

Dimbhe

Tribal/ Non-tribal	Total families	No. of families who received land	Families who received land after showing	Households who received lands without showing
Tribal	64	52	52	0
Non-tribal	17	13	11	2
Total	81	65	63	2

Table 10**No. of Families who have irrigation facilities on alternative land****Dimbhe**

Category	Families who received alternative land in command area	Families receiving irrigation	Households not receiving irrigation	Classification of household according to reasons for not receiving irrigation				
				Incomplete field channel	Incomplete to canal work	Insufficient water supply	Land too high	Land not levelled
Tribal	52	27	25	8	3	7	7	-
Non tribal	13	3	10	6	1	-	1	2
Total	65	30	35	14	4	7	8	2

Table 11 (A)**Details of loss of trees****Dimbhe**

Tribal / Non tribal	Total families acquired land	Families possessing trees	Families received compensation	Compensation not received
Tribal	58	50	5	45
Non-tribal	13	12	0	12
Total	71	62	5	57

Table 11 (B)**Details of loss of Bandh and Grass land****Dimbhe**

Tribal / Non tribal	Total families acquired land	Families possessing Bandh & Grass area	Families received compensation	Compensation not received	Reasonwise classification of families who not received compensation		
					No information	No applied	Govt. not taken cognisance
Tribal	58	50	3	47	13	20	14
Non tribal	13	12	0	12	5	6	1
Total	71	62	3	59	18	26	15

Table 12**Statement showing details about submerged houses****Dimbhe**

Category	No. of affected families	No. of affected families whose	
		House submerged	not submerged
Tribal	64	57	7
Non-tribal	17	15	2
Total	81	72 (89%)	9 (11%)

Table 13**Receipt of compensation for houses****Dimbhe**

Tribal/Non-tribal	No. of families eligible for compensation	Families received compensation	Families not received compensation
Tribal	57	53	4
Non-tribal	15	14	1
Total	72	67	5

Table 14**Displaced families who received residential plots in new village site****Dimbhe**

Category	No. of families	Families received plot	Families not received plots	Families received loan	Plot received according to choice
Tribal	64	56	8	31	48
Non-tribal	17	16	1	12	14
Total	81	72	9	43	62

Table 15
Statement showing no. of families living in new village site

Dimbhe

Category	Families not given plots	No. of families received plots	Families not living in plot	Reason for not living in new village site (No.of families)		
				Farm far away	Due to separate family	House not constructed
Tribal	8	56	7	5	1	1
Non-tribal	1	16	-	-	-	-
Total	9	72	7	5	1	1

Note : 9 families have not yet received plots because the case is still being processed

Table 16
Statement showing the details of transport facility provided to the affected families for shifting household goods

Dimbhe

Category	Eligible to receive transport facility	Transport facility provided	Transport not provided
Tribal	64	52	12
Non tribal	17	16	1
Total	81	68	13

Table 17
No. of surveyed households according to main occupation

Dimbhe

Sr.No	Occupation	Before Displacement	After Displacement
		Total families	Total families
1.	Agriculture	67	45
2.	Agricultural labour	8	27
3.	Other labour	0	0
4.	Service	5	7
5.	Dairy	0	0
6.	Other	1	2
Total		81	81

Table 18
Details of Project Affected Certificates issued

Dimbhe

Category	No. of families received certificate	Families demanded certificate and not received	Families not demanded certificate
Tribal	47	8	9
Non tribal	16	1	0
Total	63	9	9

Table 19
Benefits received by the project affected families on account of project affected certificates

Dimbhe

Category	No. of affected families	Families received certificate	Families got job as Project Affected	Families received training	Families received TSP schemes
Tribal	64	47	4	0	3
Non-tribal	17	16	3	0	Not applicable
Total	81	63	7	0	3

Table 20
Sources of Drinking water

Dimbhe

Sr. No	Source	Tribal/Non-tribal	Before displacement	After displacement
1	River	Tribal	49	0
		Non-tribal	0	0
		Total	59	0
2	Well	Tribal	28	8
		Non-tribal	9	3
		Total	37	11
3	Bore well	Tribal	0	11
		Non-tribal	0	4
		Total	0	15
4	Pond	Tribal	0	0
		Non-tribal	0	0
		Total	0	0
5	Tap	Tribal	0	46
		Non-tribal	0	12
		Total	0	58

Table 21
Period of drinking water availability

Dimbhe

Sr. No.	Period	Tribal/Non-tribal	Before displacement	After displacement
1	Upto 8 months	Tribal	0	0
		Non-tribal	0	2
		Total	0	2
2	8 to 10 months	Tribal	0	0
		Non-tribal	0	0
		Total	0	0
3	10 to 11 months	Tribal	0	0
		Non-tribal	0	0
		Total	0	0
4	11 to 12 months	Tribal	64	64
		Non-tribal	17	15
		Total	81	79

Table 22
Statement showing village-wise amenities provided.

Dimbhe

Sr.No.	Amenities	No.of villages provided amenities	No.of villages not provided amenities	Total villages
1	Water source			
	1) Wells	6	-	9
	2) Bore wells	3	-	9
2	School and playground	9	-	9
3	Chavdi/Samaj Mandir	8	1	9
4	Roads/Internal roads	9	-	9
5	Electricity	9	-	9
6	Open drainage	8	1	9
7	Public latrine	7	2	9
8	Cattleshed	2	7	9
9	S.T.Stand	8	1	9
10	Khalwadi (Threshing floor)	2	7	9
11	Grazing area	1	8	9
12	Market place	1	8	9
13	Cremation and burial ground	5	4	9

Note: 8 out of 9 villages have taps for water supply

ANNEXURE - II

Table 1

Data regarding submergence

II. Project - Pimpalgaon Joge, Tal. Junnar

Sr. No	Name of the submerged village	Area under submergence in Hector	Landholders of submerged villages		No. of landholders to whom substitute land allotted	Area of the substitute land allotted (Hect.)
			Total holders	Out of total holders eligible for receiving substitute land		
1.	Khireswar	183=00	88	88	-	-
2.	Karanjale	249=00	112	112	-	-
3.	Sangnore	419=00	101	101	-	-
4.	Sitewadi	46=00	46	46	-	-
5.	Watkhal	74=00	112	112	-	-
6.	Khubi	294=00	155	155	-	-
7.	Madh	716=00	337	337	-	-
8.	Pangari T. Madh	144=00	95	95	-	-
9.	Pargaon T. Madh	33=00	47	47	-	-
10.	Pimpalgaon Joge	239=00	179	179	-	-
11.	Kolhewadi	168=00	93	93	-	-
12.	Kolwadi	9=58	24	24	-	-
13.	Bagadwadi	-	30	30	-	-
	Total	2574=58	1355	1355	-	-

Table 2

The details of village-wise surveyed families.

Project - Pimpalgaon Joge

Sr. No	Name of the village	No. of families		
		Tribal	Non-Tribal	Total
1	Sangnore, Tal. Junnar, Dist. Pune	11	2	13
2	Kolhewadi No.1, Tal. Junnar	5	1	6
3	Kolhewadi No.2, Tal. Junnar	6	1	7
4	Khubi, Tal. Junnar,	10	2	12
5	Bhoriwadi, Tal. Junnar	11	0	11
Total		43	6	49
<u>All Total</u>		107	23	130

Table 3**Receipt of compensation of acquired land****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Category	No.of families surveyed	No.of families whose land acquired for project	No.of families who received compensation
Tribal	43	39	38
Non tribal	6	6	5
Total	49	45	43

Table No. 4**Statement showing no. of families who have not received alternative land****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Category	Total No.of surveyed families	No.of families received given alternative land	No.of families who have not yet received alternative land	Reasons for not receiving alternative land		
				Alternative land not considered by respondent	Do not follow up to receive alternative land	No information
Tribal	43	-	43	41	1	1
Non Tribal	6	-	6	6	0	0
Total	49	-	49	47	1	1

Table 5**Pimpalgaon Joge yearwise submergence of lands**

Year	No of PAPs
1997	12
1998	12
1999	21
Total	45

(Note : There are 4 landless families)

Table 6 (A)**Compensation received for trees****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Tribal / Non tribal	Total families from whom land acquired	Families possessi ng trees	Families who received compensation	Families who did not receive compensation
Tribal	39	21	13	8
Non tribal	6	3	-	3
Total	45	24	13	11

Note : This information represents the perception of the farmers. The stock reply from the revenue department is that all trees were included in awarding compensation.

Table 6 (B)**Compensation received for bandhs and grass land**

Tribal/ Non tribal	Total families acquired land	Families possessing Bandh & Grass area	Families received compensation	Families not received compensation
Tribal	39	37	16	21
Non tribal	6	5	3	2
Total	45	42	19	23

Note : This information represents the perception of the farmers. The stock reply from the revenue department is that all bands and grass lands were included in awarding compensation.

Table 7**Statement showing details about submerged houses****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Tribal/ Non-tribal	Total No. of affected families	No. of families whose	
		houses submerged	not submerged
Tribal	43	39	4
Non-tribal	6	6	0
Total	49	45	4

Table 8**Receipt of compensation for houses****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Tribal/Non-tribal	No. families eligible for compensation	Families received compensation	Families not received compensation
Tribal	39	35	4
Non-tribal	6	6	0
Total	45	41	4

Table 9**Displaced families who received residential plots in new village site****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Category	No. of families liable for plots	No. of families received plots	Families not received plots	Reasons not received plots			Plots received according to choice
				Plot situated on long distance	Voluntarily residing on residual lands	Not present at the time of distribution	
Tribal	43	25	18	3	14	1	19
Non-tribal	6	6	0	-	-	-	3
Total	49	31	18	3	14	1	22

Table 10**Statement showing no. of families living in new village site****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Category	Families not given plots	No. of families who received plot	Families not living in plots	Reasons for not living in new village site (No. of families)	
				No money to construct the house	Plot is not proper
Tribal	8	25	3	1	2
Non-tribal	0	6	0	0	0
Total	8	31	3	1	2

Note : Plots have not been accepted because of distance from residential lands where persons are living.

Table 11
Statement showing the details of transport facility provided to
the affected families for shifting household goods

Pimpalgaon-Joge

Category	Liabile to receive transport facility	Transport facility provided	Transport not provided
Tribal	43	15	28
Non tribal	6	5	1
Total	49	20	29

Note : Transport was not required by many families as they have settled on the upper contours on their residential lands.

Table 12
No. of surveyed households according to main occupation

Pimpalgaon-Joge

Sr. No	Occupation	Before Displacement			After Displacement		
		Tribal	Non Tribal	Total	Tribal	Non Tribal	Total
1.	Agriculture	38	6	44	9	2	11
2.	Agricultural labour	5	0	5	33	4	37
3.	Other labour	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.	Service	0	0	0	1	0	1
5.	Dairy	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.	Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	43	6	49	43	6	49

Table 13

**Statement showing the details of land holdings of 32 PAPs
whose main occupation became agricultural labour
after displacement along-with landless families.**

Pimpalgaon-Joge

Sr No.	Type of Landholders (Area in Acre)	Before displacement					After displacement				
		Land-less	Non-irrigated	Irrigated	Both non-irrigated + irrigated	Total	Land-less	Non-irrigated	Irrigated	Both non-irrigated + irrigated	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	Landless	4	-	-	-	4	31	-	-	-	31
2.	1 to 2	-	2	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	3
3.	2 to 3	-	8	2	-	10	-	2	-	-	2
4.	3 to 4	-	6	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-
5.	4 to 5	-	5	1	-	6	-	-	-	-	-
6.	5 to 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.	Above 6 acre	-	8	1	-	9	-	1	-	-	1
	Total	4	29	4	-	37	31	6	-	-	37

Table 14

**Distancewise main employment availability to the surveyed displaced families
Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Sr.No.	Distance Ranges	Total families before Displacement	Total families after Displacement
i)	Within 2 kms.	41	19
ii)	2 to 5 kms.	6	6
iii)	5 to 10 kms.	0	1
iv)	10 to 20 kms.	1	7
v)	Above 20 kms.	1	16
	Total	49	49

Table 15**Information regarding diet****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Type of food	Category	Before Displacement			After Displacement		
		Rarely	Frequently	Never	Rarely	Frequently	Never
Leafy vegetables	Tribal	21	21	1	41	2	0
	Non-tribal	4	2	0	6	0	0
	Total	25	23	1	47	2	0
Fruit Vegetables	Tribal	18	19	6	36	2	5
	Non-tribal	3	2	1	5	0	1
	Total	21	21	7	41	2	6
Milk	Tribal	9	20	14	24	2	17
	Non-tribal	2	3	1	4	0	2
	Total	11	23	15	28	2	19
Eggs	Tribal	32	6	5	34	0	9
	Non-tribal	4	2	0	5	0	1
	Total	36	8	5	39	0	10
Meat/Fish	Tribal	31	4	8	25	5	13
	Non-tribal	4	2	0	5	0	1
	Total	35	6	8	30	5	14
Pulses	Tribal	30	12	1	32	6	5
	Non-tribal	4	2	0	5	0	1
	Total	34	14	1	37	6	6

Table 16**No of Households having livestock****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Type of livestock	Before displacement			After displacement		
	Tribal	Non-tribal	Total	Tribal	Non-tribal	Total
Cow	17	0	17	7	0	7
Buffaloes	20	5	25	11	1	12
Bullock	31	6	37	21	1	22
Goat	9	1	10	10	0	10
Poultry	26	5	31	24	4	28
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 17
Total no. of livestock

Pimpalgaon-Joge

Type of livestock	Before displacement			After displacement		
	Tribal	Non-tribal	Total	Tribal	Non-tribal	Total
Cow	88	0	88	13	0	13
Buffaloes	34	7	41	14	1	15
Bullock	69	11	80	46	2	48
Goat	46	1	47	44	0	44
Poultry	231	52	283	144	30	174
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 18
Details of Project Affected Certificates issued

Pimpalgaon-Joge

Category	No. of families received certificate	Families demanded certificate and not received	Families not demanded certificate
Tribal	21	4	18
Non tribal	2	0	4
Total	23	4	22

Table 19
Benefits received by the project affected families on account of project affected certificates

Pimpalgaon-Joge

Category	No. of affected families	Families received certificate	Families got job as Project Affected	Families received training	Families received TSP schemes
Tribal	43	21	0	0	7
Non-tribal	6	2	0	0	Not applicable
Total	49	23	0	0	7

Table 20**Period for which foodgrains are available from own land
(landholders only)****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Period	Before displacement (Own land)	After displacement (Own land)
Upto 2 months	1	38
Upto 4 months	1	3
Upto 6 months	4	3
Upto 8 months	1	0
Upto 10 months	0	0
Upto 12 months	38	1

Table 21**Sources of Drinking water****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Sr. No	Source	No. of families before displacement	No. of families after displacement
1	River	10	0
2	Well	24	22
3	Bore well	33	21
4	Pond	0	15
5	Tap	0	0

Note : Some families use more than one source.

Table 22**Period of drinking water availability****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Sr.No	Period	No. of families before displacement	No. of families after displacement
1	Upto 8 months	0	4
2	8 to 10 months	0	10
3	10 to 11 months	0	0
4	11 to 12 months	49	35

Table 23**Statement showing villagewise amenities provided****Pimpalgaon-Joge**

Sr. No	Amenities	No.of villages provided amenities	No.of villages not provided amenities	Total villages
1	Water source			
	1) Only wells	2	-	5*
	2) Wells as well as bore wells	3	-	3
2	School and playground	4	1	5
3	Chavdi/Samaj Mandir	5	-	5
4	Roads/Internal roads	5	-	5
5	Electricity	5	-	5
6	Open drainage	5	-	5
7	Public latrine	3	2	5
8	Cattle shed	0	5	5
9	S.T.Stand	2	3	5
10	Khalwadi (Threshing floor)	3	2	5
11	Grazing area	2	3	5
12	Market place	3	2	5
13	Cremation and burial ground	2	3	5

Note : Delivery through taps is in 3 out of 5 villages.

ANNEXURE - III

RESEARCH TEAM

Guide, Commentary

Shri Arun Bhatia, I.A.S..
Commissioner

Coordination (Logistics)

Shri V.S. Patil, Jt. Director
&
Shri D.R. Choudhari, Law Officer

Coordination, collection of information from Govt. agencies, preparation of tables, analysis

Shri P.R. Tikone, Research Officer
Shri S.B. Darade, Research Officer
Shri M.S. Gaikwad, Statistical Officer

Electronic data processing

Shri J.B. Avachat, Statistical Asstt.
Shri S.R. Kute, Stenographer (HG)
Shri D.D. Gaikwad, Stenographer (LG)
Smt. S.S. Bhutkar, Steno-typist
Smt. A.J. Gaikwad, Steno-typist
Shri K.P. Kurde, Steno-typist

Investigators

Shri S.G. Kamble, Sr. Research Officer
Shri P.S. Wani, Research Officer
Shri R.R. Gaikwad, Research Officer
Shri S.R. Shinde, Office Superintendent
Shri S.R. Tarakasband, Research Assistant
Shri A.V. Avachat, Research Assistant
Shri G.K. Jadhav, Research Assistant
Shri P.B. Kudale, Research Assistant
Shri D.D. Gaikwad, Research Assistant
Shri G.C. Londhe, Research Assistant
Shri P.A. Bharekar, Jr. Admn. Officer
Shri U.M. Yadav, Draughtsman
Shri S.R. Mane, Sr. Clerk
Shri D.J. Zargad, Jr. Clerk
Shri D.R. Gode, Jr. Clerk
Shri R.S. Pawar, Investigator

Drivers

Shri A.B. Kadam
Shri R.G. Jadhav
Shri I.A. Pirjade

