



# Ministry of Public Works and Communications – Works Services Group

**Social Engagement Plan (Draft)** 

Project Name Sheriff Street-Mandela Avenue Roadway Design Project ATN/SF-11841-GY & ATN/OC-11841-GY

Project Number ADM-00025589-A0

## Prepared By:

exp Services Inc. 56 Queen St. East Brampton, ON L6V 4M8 Canada

Date Submitted 04.19.2013

In Association with:

**CEMCO Inc.** 304 Church Street Queenstown, Guyana South America

#### Acknowledgement

The author wishes to acknowledge the very good work done by Ms. Simone Mangal in 2011 in devising an approach to social engagement specifically for the 4-Lane, East Bank Demerara Road Expansion Project. The Mangal document - intended as a framework for other IDB projects - has been closely referenced and its recommendations implemented where applicable in this Draft Social Engagement Plan for the upgrade and expansion of the Sheriff Street/Mandela Avenue corridor.

Special thanks are due to the specialist researchers - individuals and organisations – and those stakeholders who have shared their expertise and opinions respectively. Theirs has been a generous effort to come to grips with the question of whether to expand and/or upgrade or whether, in an abundance of caution, to leave well enough strictly alone. The resulting road design - and accompanying Draft Plan for the genuine social engagement of stakeholders - have it is hoped, accurately and fairly summed up in their architecture the ideas for and dreams of an entire nation.

# Contents

| 1.0 Background                |  | 1  |
|-------------------------------|--|----|
| 1.1 The Purpose of the SEP    | >  | 2  |
| 1.2 SEP Objectives            |  | 2  |
| 1.3 Methodology               |  | 3  |
| 1.4 Inception                 |  | 5  |
| 1.5 List of Stakeholders for  | Recall Sessions – (Cited in ESIA Report, 2010) | 7  |
| 1.6. Stakeholder Matrix of C  | Concerns – Baseline (ESIA Report, 2010)        | 9  |
| 1.7 Roles and Responsibiliti  | ies  | 12 |
| 1.8 Communications Vehicle    | es   | 13 |
| 1.9 SEP Activities – Early In | nception                                       | 20 |
| 1.10 Lessons Learned          |  | 25 |

#### 1.0 Background

The original role of the Sheriff Street/Mandela Avenue asphaltic roadway as a 7km long bypass linking the heavily populated East Coast to East Bank Demerara has evolved into one of critical importance in the lives of the people of Guyana. The roadway provides the main access to very large residential areas in Greater Georgetown while acting as a hub of commercial and leisure activity for road users throughout the country.

The change in landscape since its initial construction in the seventies has been credited largely to entrepreneurs who had sought to provide those amenities needed by consumers over time. High rise buildings dot the commercial landscape as do restaurants, night clubs, supermarkets, a cultural centre, police station, schools, an Embassy, petrol station, spare parts dealerships, private residences and so on. A thriving closely knit informal sector of roadside vendors, who for the most part are located on State reserves, also depends on the corridor for its continued existence.

This densely populated thoroughfare consists of a chaotic mix of pedestrian, bicyclist and vehicular traffic congestion hampered by limited or no access to parking; road shoulders; pavements and reserve space. The daily hazards to pedestrians are made worse by the absence of consistent enforcement of road safety precautions in a culture in which 'driving crazy' has become a way of life. Road users seem to have come to accept that this corridor involves some level of personal risk despite improvements implemented over the last four decades to address intersection safety and traffic movement.

Several studies have been conducted to date to assess the possibilities for road improvement and expansion. Stakeholder opinion of the future of the road had been sought in the CEMCO/MML collaborative study of 2011; the IDB-commissioned study of 2012 on how to minimize the negative effects of Sheriff-Mandela road expansion while promoting commercial and social development and the Draft Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) provided in 2011by Development Policy and Management Consultants.

Opinion has been varied on the need for road expansion. While largely welcoming, stakeholders have expressed a number of concerns for the proposed length of such an undertaking and the challenges to safe road use management which a new corridor would present. Consultation meeting minutes in the last two years have recorded concerns for the direct impact which construction would have on businesses, livelihoods and the personal safety of pedestrian and driver alike.

The proposed project of Sheriff Street-Mandela Avenue development is peopled by competing interests, among others: of stakeholders who have adapted to their changing environment with sometimes unorthodox approaches; of business persons fearful of loss of frontage; an Embassy concerned with an encroaching road and implications for its security; of parents concerned for their children's safety when being taken to and from school and the inevitable changes to those arrangements. An effective Social Engagement Plan must account for these multiple interests while providing a vehicle for them to be aired and addressed effectively.

## **1.1 The Purpose of the SEP**

The SEP aims to set out the steps to anticipating and mitigating all possible impacts – social, environmental, cultural and economic – on stakeholder road users even as it establishes a cohesive vehicle for communicating their concerns and/or grievances. It must also provide a vehicle for monitoring the efforts of those contracted to execute the upgrade and expansion of the road way and to safeguard the interests of those on whose behalf the loan, LO2215/BL- GY was entered into with the Inter- American Development Bank (IDB).

## **1.2 SEP Objectives**

- To provide road users with a way to safeguard their various interests through a practical, reliable mechanism for handling the initial economic, social, environmental and cultural impact of a project aimed at improving their way of life in the long term
- To provide a means of tracking EA and contractor performance so that project objectives are met

- To ensure that an avenue for communication of concerns, feedback and redress is accessible to everyday users of the roadway
- To provide a forum in which stakeholders' views are used to impact the quality of the initial and final road design, so as to minimise fallout from their alleged or perceived exclusion.

#### 1.3 Methodology

This step seeks to identify the target audiences to whom the project must direct its effort at social engagement. Two distinct audiences have been identified as:

- The primary stakeholder: the national community of Guyana made up of road users who may not live directly along the roadway but who benefit from its continued service. This group has the power to dampen efforts at genuine engagement by the perception that it has been kept in the dark about the development of the roadway which its social and business networks may use each day
- 2. The secondary stakeholder those direct users of the roadway, inclusive of the many residents in large areas such as Campbellsville and South Ruimveldt; medium and large businesses along the route; small sole trader establishments; primary and secondary schools; a hospital; Botanic Gardens; the Chinese Embassy, to name a few. Stakeholders in this group who have already been interviewed in the studies of 2011 and 2012 will be revisited and presented with a Matrix of their past views. This Matrix will act as a Baseline for assessing possible changes to concerns, singling out areas which need immediate attention, critical as they might be to project success.

Strategies for effective engagement of **primary stakeholders** include a Press Conference hosted by the EA four weeks after the initial design for the road has been submitted. This Press Conference will bring the national audience up to date on the significant milestones that have brought the project to this stage: the years of solid preparation; cross-sectional interface with stakeholders and the ways in which their logged feedback and concerns have shaped the preliminary road design in 2013. Mechanisms for clearer communication - such as the role of the multi-stakeholder Road Users Group; a Community Liaison Officer attached to the Supervisory Project Office; a Grievance Mechanism with clear guidelines for lodging complaints; a 24 hour telephone Hotline service and ongoing construction site visits which are open to the public; monthly updates in the Press - will be outlined to the enquiring media.

Sheriff Street/Mandela Avenue Positioning the national community as primary stakeholder places an obligation for clear, consistent information on the shoulders of all the leading service providers of this roadway refurbishment and expansion. The hosting of this Press Conference is a first step in a Public Education programme which signals the commitment of the EA to providing information that is timely and relevant to the many users of the road.

**Secondary stakeholders** will be drawn more fully into the engagement process by being invited to comment on any final concerns they might have about the proposed plan to upgrade and/or expand the Sheriff Street-Mandela Avenue corridor. Stakeholders interviewed in earlier studies of 2010 – 2012 will represent a Baseline of opinion against which new concerns will be measured. An updated Stakeholder Matrix will then be used by the Road Design Team to reassess its proposed design against this list of stakeholders' concerns. It must be noted that the latter will have some reasonable expectation of amendments to the road design, if necessary. Two meetings of this nature will be held in close succession, giving attendees a choice of dates. Attendees will be invited to volunteer themselves or to nominate persons from the non-government sector who might be able and willing to serve on the MSC as gatekeepers of stakeholder interests once the corridor expansion/upgrade is approved. These names will be duly recorded for immediate follow up.

# **1.4 Inception**

# **Road Design Milestones/ Consultation Meetings Timeline**

| Apr: Inception Report<br>submitted           | Two Stakeholder Recall<br>Meetings for updating of<br>Matrix   |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>May:</b> Week 3 (13/14/15 <sup>th</sup> ) | Exp meeting with all Utility companies   |  |
| May 31 Review meeting with WSG::             |  |  |
| June: Week 2                                 | EA Press Conference:<br>"Getting Ready for the<br>Road" – Public Education<br>Programme begins; Press<br>Releases follow; List of<br>public consultations<br>published in dailies.   | EA Environment and<br>Social Specialist –<br>(SAG)   |
| June: Weeks 3/4/5                            | Five (5) Community<br>Meetings along the<br>corridor in selected<br>community centres;<br>school or church halls.<br>Communities may be<br>twinned to facilitate<br>human resource<br>challenges.<br>Focus Group<br>consultations continue<br>with key audiences where<br>buy-in is especially | Exp presentations with<br>visuals; Q&A session.<br>Findings/feedback<br>collated and analysed –<br>(TH/BO)<br>Stakeholder feedback<br>aligned with road design;<br>amendments made<br>where necessary<br>(TH/BO) |

|  | sought: PTA; Taxi/Bus<br>Driver Association;<br>vendors on the reserves;<br>Private Sector<br>Commission; Utility<br>Companies. |   |
|--|---|---|
| June 30  |   |   |
| <u>Stakeholder Feedback</u><br><u>Deadline</u> |   |   |
| July: Week 4                                   |   |   |
| Draft Road Design<br>Report; WSG to input      | End of stakeholder input  |   |
| August: Week 3                                 |   |   |
| Final Design Report<br>submitted               |   | EA - News Release via<br>print and electronic<br>media of approval of the<br>new design for the<br>Sheriff/Mandela<br>Roadway (SAG) |

# **1.5 List of Stakeholders for Recall Sessions – (ESIA Report, 2010)**

| INSTITUTION/AGENCY   | REPRESENTATIVE           | DESIGNATION  |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| Ministry of Public Works and<br>Communications (MPW&C)<br>Works Services Group (WSG) | Mr. Nigel Erskine        | Mr. Nigel Erskine Traffic -Road Safety Engineer                        |
| Ministry of Housing (MoH),   | Mr. Fazal Wahab          | Senior Engineer  |
| Central Housing and Planning<br>Authority (CH&PA)                                    | Omar Bispat              | Civil Engineer   |
|  | Mr. Rawle Edinboro       | Chief Development and Planning Officer                                 |
| Ministry of Health (MoH)   | Mr. Hydar Ally           | Permanent Secretary  |
|  | Mr. George Watkins       | Principal Environmental Health Officer                                 |
| Ministry of Local Government<br>(MoLG)   | Mr. Nigel Dharamlall     | Permanent Secretary  |
| Mayor and City Council (M&CC)  | Mr. Gregory Erskine      | City Engineer  |
| of Georgetown  | Mr. Godfree Garraway     | Drainage Overseer, 3rd Class   |
| Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)<br>National Drainage & Irrigation<br>Authority (NDIA)  | Mr. Timothy Inniss       | Senior Section Engineer  |
| Ministry of Education  | Ms.Hazel Answick         | Principal Education Officer  |
| Chinese Consulate  | Ambassador Yu Wenzhe     | Ambassador of the People's Republic of China to the Republic of Guyana |
| Guyana Police Force  | Mr. Neil Semple          | Traffic Chief  |
| Guyana Lands and Surveys   | Mr. Enrique Monize       | Manager, Land Administration   |
| Commission (GL&SC)   | Ms. Andrea Mahammad      | Senior Land Use Planner, Land Use Planning and Policy Section          |
| Environmental Protection   | Teij Persaud             | Senior Environmental Officer   |
| Agency (EPA)   | Ms. Felica Adams         | Environmental Officer Industry Infrastructure & Energy Unit            |
| National Parks Commission (NPC)  | Ms. Yolanda Vasconcellos | General Manager  |
| National Cultural Centre   | Mr. Frederick Christian  | Manager  |
| Guyana Power & Light   | Ms. Shaun Hamlet         | Manager, System Planning & Design Department                           |
| Company (GPL)  | Mr. Horace Woolford      | Design Engineer  |
| Guyana Water Incorporated (GWI)  | Mr. Carlos Rodrigues     | Project Development Manger   |
| Guyana Telephone & Telegraph   | Mr. John Marshal         | Manager- Engineer Department   |
| Company (GR&T)   | Mr. Roderick Dyer        | Supervisor   |
| Guyana Tourism Authority<br>(GTA)  |                          | Deputy Director  |
| Private Sector Commission (PSC)  | Mr. Roubinder Rambarran  | Executive Director   |
| John Fernandes Ltd.  | Mr. Bernie Fernandes     | Marketing Director   |
| Edward B. Beharry & Company Ltd.   | Mr. Paul C. Cheong       | Director - International Marketing & Internal Control                  |
| CEO, Intra Serv  | Mr. Christopher Correia  | Member of Infrastructure and Transportation Committee                  |
| Banks DIH Limited  | Mr. Nandkumar Persaud    | Environmental Executive  |
|  | Mr. Carlton Joao         | Sales & Marketing Executive  |

| INSTITUTION/AGENCY                                 | REPRESENTATIVE   | DESIGNATION                                     |
|--|--|---|
|  | Mr. Shabir Hussain   | Building & Transport/Power Generation Executive |
|  | Mr. Gavin Todd   | Engineering Executive                           |
|  | Mr. Duke Gittens   | Property Maintenance Manager                    |
| The Taxi Association                               | Mr. Patrick Brassington,<br>Mr. Vibert Pooran<br>Mr. Emsley Baptiste<br>Mr. Stephen DeAbreu<br>Mr. Mohamed Baksh<br>Mr. Sunil Persaud<br>Mr. Azad Khan<br>Mr. Jeffrey Prag<br>Mr. Michael Bailey,<br>Mr. Travis Atwell<br>Mr. Dawn Alert | President<br>Executive Committee Members        |
| Guyana Public Transportation<br>Association (GPTA) | Mr. V. Bell<br>Mr. A. Bell   | Executive Committee Members                     |

# **1.6. Stakeholder Matrix of Concerns – Baseline (ESIA Report, 2010)**

| STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVE STAKEHOLDER RECOMMENDATIONS   |                              |       |                    |  |   |
|---|------------------------------|-------|--------------------|--|---|
| Potential Impact  | Stakeholder (s)              | Phase | Relevant<br>Option | Significance before mitigation/enhancement |   |
| Traffic Management (Vehicular) and  | d Pedestrian Safety          |       |                    |  |   |
| <ol> <li>Increased congestion due to<br/>reduced carriageway</li> </ol>                             | MPW&C, GTI, Banks DIH        | DC    | a, b and c         | -15  | <ul> <li>Establishment of alternative road routes, including<br/>public transportation routes (DC)</li> <li>MPW&amp;C, GPF<br/>GPTA, MoE, GPF</li> </ul>                |
|   |                              |       |                    |  | <ul> <li>Rehabilitation of perpendicular and parallel roads GLSC, MH, GTI<br/>(with possible upgrading parallel roads to right-of-Banks DIH,<br/>way status)</li> </ul> |
|   |                              |       |                    |  | way status) GLSC, MPW&C   |
|   |                              |       |                    |  | Enforcement of parking restrictions     MPW&C, GPF  |
|   |                              |       |                    |  | <ul> <li>Use of appropriate warning and instruction signageGTA</li> </ul>   |
|   |                              |       |                    |  | (DC) PSC, MoE, GPF  |
|   |                              |       |                    |  | <ul> <li>Execution of project in segments with work done<br/>outside of the peak transportation period</li> </ul>   |
| <ol> <li>Increased accidents as a<br/>consequence of speeding on a<br/>wider carriageway</li> </ol> |                              | PC    | a and b            | -13  | <ul> <li>Enforcement of Traffic Regulations including the MH, GPTA, GPF use of video surveillance</li> </ul>  |
| 3. Improved Pedestrian Safety   | GLSC, MoLG, MPW&C,<br>CH&PA, | PC    | a, b and c         | 17   | <ul> <li>Increase pedestrian crossing and the possible GTI, NCC utilization of over-head walkways</li> </ul>  |
|   | MoH, MoE                     |       |                    |  | Improved design of bus-stops     GTA, GPTA  |
| 4. Increased volume of traffic on carriage way with the restriction                                 |                              | PC    | С                  | -11  | <ul> <li>Review of the traffic light systems to allow for aMH, Banks DIH,<br/>more amicable discharge of traffic</li> </ul>   |
| of right turns  |                              |       |                    |  | <ul> <li>Extension of the Railway embankment Highway<br/>beyond the Sheriff Street Intersection</li> </ul>  |
|   |                              |       |                    |  | <ul> <li>Improved signage with the introduction of<br/>directional signage (take traffic to alternative roads)</li> </ul>   |
|   |                              |       |                    |  | <ul> <li>Let the road remain in its current state with the<br/>possible establishment of floating lanes</li> <li>Banks DIH<br/>PSC</li> </ul>                           |
|   |                              |       |                    |  | Establishment of Roundabout where technically     GTI, PSC     feasible   |

| STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVE  |                                    |            |                    |  | STAKEHOLDER RECOMMENDATIONS   |
|--|------------------------------------|------------|--------------------|--|---|
| Potential Impact   | Stakeholder (s)                    | Phase      | Relevant<br>Option | Significance before mitigation/enhancement |   |
|  |                                    |            |                    |  | <ul> <li>Development of a Model for Traffic Management /GLSC, PSC, GTA<br/>Municipal Traffic Management Plan</li> </ul>   |
| 5. Reduced Traffic Congestion with free flow facilitated with road expansion             | GLSC, MoLG, MPW&C,<br>CH&PA        | PC         | a&b                | 15   |   |
| Infrastructure (Carriageway and Util   | lity)                              |            |                    |  |   |
| <ol> <li>Reduced Drainage Capacity<br/>with the expansion of carriage<br/>way</li> </ol> | MoLG, EPA, MoH, NDIA,<br>Banks DIH | DC &<br>PC | a&b                | -16  | <ul> <li>Increased installation of culverts to facilitate more NDIA efficient drainage</li> <li>Construction of concrete drains which facilitate a M&amp;CC faster flow of water</li> </ul> |
| 2. Disruption of Utility Services  | MPW&C, GWI, GPL,<br>GT&T           | DC         | a &b               | -15  | <ul> <li>Provision of adequate funding for changes to the GWI, GPL, GT&amp;T<br/>utility infrastructure</li> </ul>  |
| 3. Improved road structure   | GLSC, MoLG, MPW&C,<br>CH&PA        | PC         | a, b and c         | 13   |   |
| 4. Upgrade in utility infrastructure   | GWI, GPL                           | PC         | a &b               | 13   |   |
| Parking  |                                    |            |                    |  |   |
| 1. Reduced Parking Area  | MH, MoLG, MPW&C, CH&PA, GTI, GPF   | DC         | a, b and c         | -12  | <ul> <li>Establishment of park and walk system</li> <li>GLSC, MH, GT</li> <li>GPF</li> </ul>  |
|  |                                    | PC         | a &b               | -17  | Establishment of onsite parking     GLSC, CH&P/ GTI   |
| 2. Regulated Parking Arrangement   | GLSC, MPW&C, CH&PA,<br>Banks DIH   | PC         | a, b and c         | 12   | Enforcement of parking restrictions     GLSC, MPW&C   |
| Environmental Health   |                                    | •          |                    |  |   |
| 1. Increased flooding due to reduced drainage capacity                                   | MoLG, EPA, MoH,<br>M&CC, Banks DIH | &DC        | a &b               | -15  | See recommendations above by NDIA AND M&CC in infrastructur<br>category   |
| 2. Disruption of Garbage<br>Collection Services  | MoLG,                              | PC<br>&DC  | a, b and c         | -12  | <ul> <li>Final plan should make provision for the execution MoLG<br/>of municipal services</li> </ul>   |
| 3. Dust Pollution  | EPA, MoH                           | DC         | a, b and c         | -11  | <ul> <li>Proper selection of location to store or rawMoH, EPA materials</li> </ul>  |
| 4. Noise Pollution   | EPA, MoH                           | DC         | a, b and c         | -10  | <ul> <li>Time restrictions on the operation of heavy-duty MoH, EPA materials</li> </ul>   |
| Stakeholder Conflicts  |                                    |            |                    |  |   |
| 1. Disruption of Commercial  | GLSC, MH, MPW&C,                   | DC         | a, b and c         | -14  |   |

| STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVE  | EHOLDER PERSPECTIVE                               |           |                    |  | STAKEHOLDER RECOMMENDATIONS  |
|--|---|-----------|--------------------|--|--|
| Potential Impact   | Stakeholder (s)                                   | Phase     | Relevant<br>Option | Significance before mitigation/enhancement | Recommendations to mitigate negative impacts and Stakeholder (s) enhance positive impacts                    |
| Activities and reduction of<br>parking facilities  | CH&PA, GWI, NPC,<br>GT&T, PSC, M&CC,<br>Banks DIH | PC        | a, and b           | -17  | Public and Stakeholder Consultation     MoLG, GWI, GPL,     GT&T, GPTA, GPF                                  |
| 2. Disgruntled road users  | MoLG, MoH   | DC        | a, b and c         | -9   |  |
| 3. Conflicts between WSG & utility<br>Providers  | GWI, GPL, GT&T                                    | DC        | a, b and c         | -11  | <ul> <li>Sharing of project plans (designs) with utility GWI, GPL, GT&amp;T companies</li> </ul>             |
| 4. Increased security threat with construction close to the property line(reduced buffer zone) | Chinese Consulate,<br>Banks DIH                   | DC<br>&PC | a&b                | -13  | <ul> <li>Minimal obstruction to commercial and sensitive MH, CC, Banks<br/>areas</li> </ul>                  |
| Bio-diversity  |   |           |                    |  |  |
| 1. Disruption of Bird Sanctuary at<br>Botanical Gardens and                                    | NPC   | DC<br>&PC | a&b                | -15  | Maintain road structure in its present state in the NPC, vicinity of the Botanical Gardens                   |
| reduction of Property Area   |   |           |                    |  | <ul> <li>Collaboration between government agencies for M&amp;CC<br/>land reclamation undertakings</li> </ul> |
|  |   |           |                    |  | Removal of Illegal Structures Only     GLSC, CH&PA,     PSC, M&CC  |

*Note:* **DC** – during construction, **PC** – post construction

| Banks DIH - Banks DIH Limited                   | GTI – Guyana Taxi Association                 | MoLG – Ministry of Local Government                |
|---|---|--|
| CC – Chinese Consulate                          | GT&T – Guyana Telephone and Telegraph Company | MPW&C – Ministry of Public Works and Communication |
| EPA - Environmental Protection Agency           | GTA - Guyana Tourism Activity                 | NCC – National Cultural Centre                     |
| CH&PA – Central Housing and Planning Authority  | GWI – Guyana Water Incorporated.              | NDIA – National Drainage and Irrigation Network    |
| GLSC – Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission      | M&CC – Mayor and City Council                 | NPC – National Parks Commission                    |
| GPF – Guyana Police Force                       | MoE – Ministry of Education                   | PSC - Private Sector Commission                    |
| GPL – Guyana Power & Light                      | MoH – Ministry of Health                      |  |
| GPTA – Guyana Public Transportation Association | MH – Ministry of Housing                      |  |

#### **1.7 Roles and Responsibilities**

**EA** – supervises and is accountable to the national community for the successful completion of this project. This agency will take the lead in the communications process back to its many stakeholders, ensuring that maximum use is made of all the agencies through which information will be communicated.

**ESS** – part of the EA, this person will liaise with all of the key players to ensure that all components of the communications, information and engagement process are working smoothly. Under her watch, access to a website should be made available to the Road Users Group/ Multi Stakeholder Committee for storing all updates on MSC activities. Polling of public opinion will not be conducted online or stored on this website but will be managed independent of the Ministry of Public Works and Communication.

**RE** – Resident Engineer, Supervisory Firm will be expected to manage the project implementation and construction phases on behalf of the EA; will also conduct participatory meetings with contractors; EA; his own technical staff to ensure a fair balance in addressing both social and environmental; will head the Crisis Committee which as the name implies, will act to mitigate critical threats and risks.

**EM** – Environmental Manager/ Contractor firm point person for all environment and social engagement matters; to work closely with Project Environment Officer; to supervise all contractor obligations tabled in the wider Environmental Social Management Plan (ESMP). As manager, he/she is expected to have a team comprising point persons for health and safety; traffic management; drainage, to name a few.

**PCLO** – attached to the Supervisory Agency, this person will be positioned to answer the concerns of stakeholders in matters large and small. His or her role will be to address all grievances or concerns in a timely manner, working closely with the contractor's Environmental Specialist; furnishing credible answers on requests for assistance; managing the recording and distribution of minutes arising out of Road Users Group/MSC meetings. This role includes the responsibility for supervising the communications efforts of contractors, supporting them with the placement of print and electronic material where necessary. The PCLO will also conduct a monthly telephone poll of random stakeholder opinion along the corridor, recording feedback and flagging its results to the EA; MSC and Resident Engineer where relevant.

Admin Support – will assist the PCLO in monitoring requests for information; will support and track the turnaround time of the Supervisory firm's PCLO in addressing stakeholder concerns; the number and nature of grievances lodged and the steps taken to redress them; will monitor and flag media commentary about the project. He/she will work closely with all contractors and the PCLO to maintain a consistent Grievance Log/database throughout the life of the project, managing the 24-hour Hotline and referring all concerns logged to the PCLO.

## **1.8 Communications Vehicles**

#### Road Users Group/MSC Meetings

Stakeholder satisfaction is often an elusive target and one more readily achieved however by providing every opportunity for enquiry and feedback. Two key strategies involve the hosting of issue management meetings in which stakeholders are invited to participate. As such, this document goes one step beyond the predecessor SEP recommendation of multi-stakeholder meetings to suggest that these be held in a consistent time and *location to which the general public has ready access*. These meetings will be chaired by the EA Consultant Social Specialist who will lead all members through a participatory approach to problem solving. Fifteen stakeholders critical to the execution of the roadway - among them 5 resident representatives from along the corridor - will engage in roundtable discussion of the issues addressed in the Stakeholder Matrix. The wider audience is free to comment and/or seek clarity in ways that do not detract from the productive output of the meeting.

The Project Community Liaison Officer attached to the Supervisory Engineer's firm will record the minutes and contribute to sharing relevant, accurate information about the project as requested. Any significant milestones achieved should be aired in the press as a quarterly advertorial entitled: *Eye on Sheriff/Mandela*. The transparent, participatory nature of this approach will act as a safeguard against the notion that there is anything less than above board about this project. It will also provide an avenue for public accountability, forcing all participants to raise the bar on the quality of contribution they make at each roundtable meeting.

#### Grievance Mechanism

A 24-hour telephone Hotline; written correspondence; a visit to the construction site or the office of the Supervisory firm are but a few ways in which grievances – those matters of perceived aggravation for which stakeholders seek redress – may be recorded and tabled for follow up. Complainants may opt for the more confidential route of an anonymous phone call. Care should be taken that those willing to be identified still be given the option of an available, confidential complaints process.

Each complaint should be formally logged by the Information Unit at the Supervisory Firm with feedback to the complainant who within 14 days must be advised in writing via email or registered mail of the status of the attempts at resolution up to that time. In matters where the complainant desires total anonymity, a telephone call should be the PCLO's last resort in terms of feedback but that too should be logged in a follow up contact report.

The complaint is weighed for its level of risk to the project and filed for immediate intervention and later audit. Failing this, the complainant is free to take the matter up

with the Works and Services Group more directly - holding the Information Officer to strict accountability for the quality and speed of response.

#### **Contractor Obligations**

An Open House will be held at the site - which is readily identified by large billboard/signage for which he is responsible - as soon as Traffic and Water Management Plans have been approved by the Supervisory Firm. Stakeholders will be formally invited by any of the following devices: press release; meeting notices; fliers and mobile announcements. Contractors are obliged to have a technical team ready to address the concerns of attendees. PCLO and Stakeholder Consultant will capture concerns and update Matrix.

Contractor or his representative will attend all MSC/Road User Group meetings and all ad hoc Crisis Committee meetings.

Another Open House will be hosted midway or at the end of the project at contractor's discretion.

#### **Opinion Poll**

A monthly random sample telephone poll of 20 stakeholders should be conducted along the length of the corridor from project inception to delivery. Care should be taken to avoid recording names. Instead, stakeholders' responses should be logged by geographical area and age only. Two questions should be polled: 1) "How do you feel about the current effort to improve the roadway?" and 2) "How can we do better?"

#### Public Education Programme

#### *New road; new moves...get with the programme...!*

#### Rationale

Commuters and pedestrians along the Sheriff Street-Mandela Avenue corridor for whom this upgrade and expansion are intended, are indeed varied in the extent of their road use. Their shared concerns however are about road quality; accessible parking; ease of access to other streets; timely delivery of a new road and for a specific distance at least - an end to traffic congestion. Approximately two years since this project was first signalled to the commuting public, WSG finds itself challenged by the need to attempt to match behaviour change to new infrastructure – admittedly no easy task.

This corridor is an exceedingly popular one and along with their measured approval of its planned expansion, stakeholders have expressed the fear that a new road will simply exacerbate already poor road use behaviours by pedestrian and driver alike. Thus it is that a public education programme must aim at consensus around different behaviour on the road. Road users must be encouraged in safer behaviours along this new 7km long roadway which will increase their personal safety with good lighting; signage and pedestrian friendly design, among other measures. This document contains a few proposed measures to secure the approval and desired cooperation of road users and a wider audience of intermittent ones - their irritation at such initial inconvenience, notwithstanding.

The approach to public education will focus on an awareness of: *New road; new moves* - *get with the programme...!* Every attempt should be made to encourage a new code of behaviour by singling out errant drivers and pedestrians as locked in the past. Positive comparisons should be made between old moves and the 'new moves' required by the new corridor for an improved quality of life.

#### Target Audiences

- Private vehicle drivers and passengers
- Drivers of vehicles for hire and passengers
- Pedestrians
- Commuters to East bank and East Coast access points
- Roadside vendors
- Motor cyclists
- Electronic and print media

#### Media Strategy

Every attempt should be made to contact the national stakeholder audience more consistently. As such, a three (3)-week burst of information on the Sheriff Street/ Mandela upgrade and expansion is recommended followed by two (2)-week bursts of information bi-monthly for three months. Budget permitting, this approach may be extended throughout the life of the project at critical intervals.

#### Vehicles

#### Press Conference

#### Theme: New road; new moves - get with the programme...!

The EA must be seen to keep faith with its primary stakeholders – the wider national audience of Guyana. As such, a technical team made up of 3 representatives of the EA; 2 members of the Design Team and the EA's consultant Stakeholder Specialist should allow the media to question them on the project after a brief summary of the history and direction of the project by the EA lead. Prior role play for the team, as a team, is suggested on how to remain centred in the face of challenging questions. A supporting press release should be placed by GINA about the just concluded event.

#### Press Ads

These will take the form of a monthly advertorial to all users of the corridor on what to expect as the project unfolds. A black and white (b/w) full-page press ad should be placed in the 4 existing dailies for 3 consecutive Sundays, one month before construction begins. The 2-week information bursts which follow intermittently will feature a smaller press ad of 25cmx5cols to be published on Wednesdays only with the title: *Eye on Sheriff-Mandela*. These monthly updates can feature short stories of persons who are ready to embrace the: *New road; new moves* that the completed roadway will require in the near future.

#### **Television**

Copies of a prepared press release will be placed on as wide a selection of stations for maximum outreach during or immediately before newscasts. Recorded television spots (as per sample) will appeal to those who wish to be thought of as ready for anything...full of new moves...ready for the new road.

#### <u>Radio</u>

Press releases may be used for paid announcer-read spots or as source material for newscasts. Dramatized spots (sample included earlier) will reinforce the: *New road; new moves...get with the programme* campaign.

#### **Creative Content**

Sample, 20-second TV spot follows...

SFX: Strident sound of car horns

Voice #1: Like he gon kill we on this road or wha?

SFX: Tires screech with a long bang...

Voice #2: Not me! Guh lang....Something better coming...!

Brand new bus pulls up with smiling conductor who ushers them in with a polite wave of his hand (gestures exaggerated).

Anncr's voice: New road; new moves - get with the programme....!

## Sample Radio Spot follows...

Voice #1(male): "You see dat? Allyuh see dat?"

Voice #2: "See wha, Bannas?"

Voice #2: "Two cars stop to let 5 children cross – 5 - and not a man vex!"

Voice # 1: "Ting changing; like it changing fuh real..."

Anncr's voice: New road; new moves – get with the programme!

#### Knowledge Fair

In the interim period between road design and actual construction or midway through construction, stakeholders along the corridor will be invited to the National Park to learn about road upgrade and expansion – and their role in it. Participants will be able to view 3D images of the road design and ask questions pertaining to their stretch of the road – particularly around issues of traffic management and implications for wider access to adjacent streets.

This public education programme in behaviour change will also have a fun component. Road Safety demonstrations will allow for participation by onlookers. Samples of road signage will be displayed and stakeholders invited to identify them for a prize. Dee jays will play themed music around national pride: "I am a Guyanese" while creating excitement about the upcoming road; Caribbean entertainer, Bunji Garlin's "We ready for the road...!" among others choices (including the possibility of his band's live performance at the Fair).

Food vendors will be allowed to ply their trade. Car dealers might be approached to have new vehicles on display. Role playing on a mock stretch of 'road' with participants acting as pedestrians wanting to cross; busy taxi driver approaching and so on, are all tools in driving home the point that the time has come for new road behaviour: *New road; new moves – get with the programme....!* 

#### Public Education Programme Budget

To be allocated by the EA; rule of thumb for an undertaking of this nature is: **.25% of** total project costs.

# **1.9 SEP Activities – Early Inception**

| Item  | Budget(US)  | When                | Who   | How   | Output   |
|---|---|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Stakeholder Recall<br>Meetings (2); same<br>venue; different<br>dates; MSC<br>members sought                          | \$3,000.<br>Ads: 600;<br>Refreshment:<br>600;<br>Mike: 200;<br>Fliers: 300;<br>Mail: 250;<br>Transcription:<br>500. | May<br>13/14/15     | EA's<br>SS (VR)   | Letter sent by<br>EA to all of the<br>previous<br>stakeholders<br>(Please see list) | Updated Matrix;<br>findings sent to<br>road design firm            |
| Public Education<br>programme begins:<br>Press Conference:<br>New Road. New<br>Moves –Get with the<br>Programme!.     | TBD   | June<br>Week 2      | EA  | Formal interface<br>with media;<br>Panel: WSG: SS<br>EXP;CEMCO;                     | Press releases; media<br>commentary; clippings<br>filed            |
| Formal presentations<br>in 5 communities;<br>Resident volunteers<br>sought for MSC                                    | \$1000.<br>Fliers;<br>loudspeaker<br>announcements;<br>Press notices of<br>meetings                                 | June<br>Weeks 2,3,4 | Exp makes<br>formal<br>presentation;<br>EA<br>Stakeholder<br>Specialist to<br>arrange | Held in schools<br>or community<br>centres; road<br>design shown                    | Feedback to impact<br>road design where<br>possible                |
| Focus group<br>meetings with<br>informal sector –<br>special interests -<br>roadside vendors;<br>owners of carts; PTA | \$500.  | July<br>Weeks 3,4,5 | EA<br>Stakeholder<br>Specialist to<br>arrange   | School hall; late afternoons  | Feedback on concerns<br>addressed on the<br>spot by design<br>team |

| etc.  |  |                             |  |  |  |
|---|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| 15-member MSC/<br>Road Users Group<br>Members identified<br>and invited to SEP<br>Orientation session<br>along with contractor<br>pool; EA staff; road<br>design team; utility<br>companies | \$1500.<br>Refreshments-<br>500; hall and<br>mike rental- 700;<br>rapporteur –<br>300. | August<br>Week 1            | Team Social<br>Engagement<br>Consultant to<br>lead process;<br>EA<br>Stakeholder<br>Specialist to<br>co-facilitate     | To be<br>determined by<br>EA Stakeholder<br>Specialist | Registration<br>forms; minutes of<br>meeting |
| Public Education<br>Programme<br>continues  | EA   | September                   | Media Release<br>for print and<br>electronic news<br>– Road Design<br>approved after<br>careful<br>consultation        | EA   | Samples of<br>published press<br>releases    |
| PRE -<br>CONSTRUCTION   |  |                             |  |  |  |
| EA Tender process<br>for road construction<br>begins  | EA   | September<br>to<br>December | Press Ad –<br>Invitation to<br>Tender; Media<br>Release to<br>announce<br>award of<br>contract and<br>date of start up | EA   | Tender Bid<br>documents                      |
| MSC/Road Users<br>Group Orientation<br>Meeting; first of<br>quarterly sessions<br>closed to public; to  | \$600<br>Hall – 500<br>Refreshments -<br>100; recording<br>secretary                   | September<br>Week 1         | Social<br>engagement<br>Consultant/EA<br>Stakeholder<br>Specialist to  | EA Stakeholder<br>Specialist to<br>arrange             | Meeting Minutes                              |

| progress to monthly<br>open meetings as<br>project unfolds<br>Public Education  | EA   | January  | co-facilitate;<br>rapporteur<br>EA to   | Radio and   | Focus of public  |
|---|------|--|---|---|--|
| Programme ramps<br>up( Sample plan<br>attached); periodic<br>bursts of advertsing   |      | Week 3 –<br>road<br>completion<br>2015   | allocate<br>resources;<br>suggested<br>closer ties<br>between ESS<br>and PCLO | television spots;<br>press releases;<br>notices;<br>advertorial: Eye<br>on<br>Sheriff/Mandela   | comment; unpaid<br>media coverage; ad<br>samples filed   |
| Contractor<br>mobilisation of<br>resources; holds<br>Open House at start<br>and one at end of<br>project; billboard<br>erected on site;<br>stakeholder concerns<br>addressed through<br>MSC | 3000 | January to<br>June 2014  |   | PCLO to<br>support; MSC to<br>attend<br>Contractor Open<br>House  | Super. Firm's<br>Reports<br>reflect<br>Contractor<br>Endorsement<br>of MSC support                                   |
| MSC meetings right<br>up to end of<br>construction period;<br>informed by PCLO<br>Grievance Report<br>report.   |      | January<br>2014;<br>Second<br>quarterly<br>MSC<br>meeting in<br>March;<br>thereafter to<br>meet each<br>month. This<br>period is<br>expected to<br>be long and | MSC Road<br>Users Group;<br>ESS; PCLO   | Open door<br>session at<br>Cultural Centre,<br>same date,<br>same time to be<br>agreed upon by<br>members; large<br>table with chairs;<br>extra chairs for<br>audience; water<br>cooler | Minutes of Meeting,<br>written periodic<br>unannounced<br>evaluation by IDB<br>steering committee<br>of gate-keepers |

|  |    | hectic   |  |  |
|--|----|--|--|--|
| CONSTRUCTION   |    |  |  |  |
| Crisis Committee of<br>8 members; operates<br>intermittently but<br>reports findings to<br>MSC   |    | As needed<br>for any<br>major crises<br>– oil spills;<br>explosions;<br>serious<br>injury etc. | Consisting only<br>of persons<br>critical to project<br>operations; Res<br>Eng to call at a<br>moment's notice;<br>member;<br>contractors'<br>ESS; Safety<br>Officers; PCLO;<br>WSG; | Report<br>Findings sent in writing<br>to   |
| Public Education<br>continues; Radio and<br>TV ads prevail on<br>users of the road to<br>adopt: <i>New Moves</i> –<br>different road use<br>behaviour  | EA | Midway<br>through<br>construction<br>period –<br>Knowledge<br>Fair                             | EA; Supervisory<br>Firm;<br>Contractors;<br>PCLO – A team<br>effort which EA<br>leads  | Polls conducted each<br>month refer to<br>perceived changes in<br>people's behaviour;; |
| Public Education<br>programme allows<br>for press<br>conferences; press<br>updates as needed.<br>Radio spots may be<br>complimented by<br>radio call in<br>programmes.to test<br>the 'pulse' of the<br>stakeholder. Schools<br>engaged in poster | EA | Ongoing in<br>intervals<br>until the<br>road is<br>completed.                                  | EA   |  |

| competitions on theme etc.   |    |  |    |   |
|--|----|--|----|---|
| Road constructed;<br>evaluation period;<br>MSC final report<br>tendered; Crisis<br>Committee Report<br>tendered; | EA | Ends in<br>MSC/EA<br>joint Press<br>Conference;<br>formal road<br>opening<br>ceremony.<br>Budget<br>permitting,<br>public<br>education<br>programme<br>should<br>evolve into<br>award<br>mechanisms<br>for new<br>moves on<br>the road | EA | Consider: <i>Hero</i><br><i>on the Road</i> – good<br>road behavior<br>highlighted;<br><i>New Move to</i><br><i>Safety</i> : Road users<br>share their new<br>behaviours on radio<br>call-in programmes |

Social Engagement Plan (Draft)

# 1.10 Lessons Learned

The East Bank 4-Lane experience has provided invaluable guidance on what is critical to social engagement effectiveness. These lessons are as follow:

- Ownership by the EA of the stakeholder engagement process that allows for consistent functioning of the Multi-Stakeholder Committee.
- Ongoing support of contractor efforts at communicating with the public. Such communication should be consistent but not onerous for the contractor. PCLO Unit should work closely with executing arm of contractor.
- The MSC needs to be seen to be working. Its meetings therefore should be held in the public domain with updates on its performance lodged as statements in the press.
- The Grievance Process should be implemented as laid out in the Mangal Report of 2011 as it will prove invaluable as a safeguard against negative claims and possible inaction on the part of the contractor. A Log Book or database of Grievance Reports must be available on request for tracking purposes by the IDB, EA, Supervisory Firm or contractor company. This may be updated on a monthly basis while Risk Assessment Sheets are shared by all on the Project team, contractors included, as necessary. Concerns need to be logged according to the level of risk and point persons triggered for specific tasks. The PCLO is expected to manage the flow of information around this process but the responsibility for incident intervention should reside with the Supervisory Firm and contractor technical teams.
- Extra vigilance is required of the Supervisory Firm's Environmental Manager/Unit to ensure that contractors submit their traffic plans as priority for sharing with communities during ongoing stakeholder meetings.