

Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (Initial)

Report No: AC137

Section I - Basic Information

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 06/30/2003

A. Basic Project Data (from PDS)

I.A.1. Project Statistics

Country: ALBANIA	Project ID: P078949
Project: TRANSPORT	Task Team Leader: Cesar Queiroz
Authorized to Appraise Date: March 5, 2004	IBRD Amount (\$m):
Bank Approval: March 24, 2005	IDA Amount (\$m): 20.00
Managing Unit: ECSIE	Sector: Roads and highways (100%) Theme: Infrastructure services for private sector development (P); Access to urban services for the poor (S)
Lending Instrument: Specific Investment Loan (SIL)	
Status: Lending	

I.A.2. Project Objectives (From PDS):

The project development objective is to improve traffic flow and reduce transport costs and accident rates on priority sections of the main road from the port of Durres to Kukës and the Kosovo border at Morinë as well as on selected road sections in Tirana.

I.A.3. Project Description (From PDS):

The main project component will be a section of the Durres Kukës Morinë Road to be selected after completion of a feasibility study prepared by a consulting team comprised of Technic/Mott MacDonald. At this stage, the proposed section is not yet known. Lesser amounts of project funds will be directed at assisting GRD and the PIU to manage the project as well as providing some needed equipment.

Within Tirana most project investment will be directed at the Middle Ring Road. This street lies at the edge of the traditional city with squatters and irregular road development – the fastest growing portion of the city – lying outside. The Middle Ring, which is in very poor condition and congested, accordingly provides an important distributor function around the center of the city. Beyond this distributor function the Middle Ring serves large numbers of commercial establishments and provides access to 5 hospitals, the city railway station and several informal bus terminals. Lesser amounts of project funds will be directed at assisting the City in addressing traffic management needs in response to the rapidly growing motor vehicle fleet and in developing appropriate staff capabilities in traffic management.

The project will include the following components (cost excluding VAT):

Components:

1. DURRES KUKES MORINE ROAD

- 1a. Rehabilitation of xx km of roads connecting Durres to Morinë (US\$31.3 million)
- 1b. Equipment for road survey (pavement management), office supplies and vehicles
- 1c. Technical support, training

2. TIRANA COMPONENT

- 2a. Rehabilitation of 3.5 km of the Middle Ring Road in the city of Tirana

2b. Pilot Traffic Management Program -- including traffic signals, intersection improvements including pedestrian crossings, and road signing and pavement marking

2c. Transport Department Strengthening Program -- including (i) technical support of traffic management, (ii) technical assistance in support of public transport, and (iii) office equipment and furniture

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

There are two basic locations associated with the physical components of the project: the road section from Durres to Morine and the Tirana Middle Ring Road. For the road section from Durres to Morine, the route from Durres to Milot has been established however, from Milot to Morine, the feasibility study currently being performed is considering three alternatives. These alternatives are being evaluated on the basis of engineering, economic, financial, social, environmental and institutional factors. The Tirana Middle Ring Road is a main city arterial, which carries roughly 25,000 vehicles/day. It acts as a demarcation line between the old inner city and the newer outlying areas. For the purposes of rehabilitation, the middle ring road has been divided into roughly seven segments along its entire length, all of which will eventually be reconstructed. To date, the City of Tirana has financed reconstruction of two of the segments, and will be financing a third. The World Bank has financed reconstruction of a fourth segment under the existing Road Maintenance Project. The remaining three segments (south and southwest area) are to be financed as a subcomponent of the proposed Albania Transport Project.

B. Check Environmental Classification: A (Full Assessment)

Comments:

If the Tirana Middle Ring Road component of the proposed Albanian Transport Project was to be financed as a stand alone project, then it would be rated as a Category B project under the Bank's environmental screening criteria. This is because the project primarily involves rehabilitation of an existing road network that is constructed entirely within an existing road right-of-way. It will not involve any involuntary resettlement (although there will be removal of illegal kiosks) or land acquisition, and is unlikely to generate any significant adverse environmental or social impacts. However, the Durres to Morine Section may involve new construction (depending upon the outcome of the feasibility study). If this is the case, Category A may be appropriate. Therefore the Category has been tentatively assigned as Category A pending the outcome of the feasibility study. **The TOR for the EA will be reviewed and cleared by the Bank.**

Key issues associated with construction aspects of the project are primarily related to the movement of men, machines and materials, and include noise, dust, excavation of borrow pits, environmental practices of material suppliers (e.g. asphalt, gravel, etc.) removal of ground cover, and traffic disruption. There may also be issues after project completion including altered runoff patterns, increased water pollution associated with traffic contaminants being washed downstream during precipitation, increased noise levels. Issues will be identified from consultations with NGOs and affected groups, as well as from field visits conducted by the team preparing the environmental assessment. Issues so identified will form the framework for the environmental management plan (EMP).

C. Safeguard Policies Triggered (from PDS)

(click on  for a detailed description *or* click on the policy number for a brief description)

Policy	Triggered
Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01, BP 4.01, GP 4.01)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> TBD

Natural Habitats (OP 4.04, BP 4.04, GP 4.04)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> TBD
Forestry (OP 4.36, GP 4.36)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> TBD
Pest Management (OP 4.09)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Cultural Property (OPN 11.03)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input checked="" type="radio"/> TBD
Indigenous Peoples (OD 4.20)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Safety of Dams (OP 4.37, BP 4.37)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Projects in International Waters (OP 7.50, BP 7.50, GP 7.50)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD
Projects in Disputed Areas (OP 7.60, BP 7.60, GP 7.60)*	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No	<input type="radio"/> TBD

Section II - Key Safeguard Issues and Their Management

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

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

- OP 4.36 – Forests – This policy might be triggered depending on the selected alternative for the Durres-Morine component. Both Alternatives #1 and #2 would involve reconstructing roads along existing rights-of-way, which were established by harvesting whatever trees still stood along these routes, to create the road alignments decades ago. The access to local timber resources provided by these two routes has long ago resulted in removal of this timber. It is unlikely that this policy will be triggered by Alternatives #1 or #2. The situation may be different for Alternative #3, however, which involves constructing a new section of road into a previously undeveloped area. In addition to potentially having to remove strips of forest to create the road right-of-way up the Fani i Vogel River valley, there is the potential that such a new road will provide access to existing undisturbed stands of forest that could be harvested, legally or illegally, such that the quality of forests in the area may be adversely affected. Thus the policy may be triggered by Alternative #3. The reference to remote mountain pine forests beyond Rereshen made in the Interim Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Assessment Report indicate that there is the potential for Alternative #3 to affect forests in this area. However, until a proper reconnaissance survey of this area is carried out, or recent air photos of the area are reviewed, to determine the extent of forest cover remaining in this area, this cannot be stated with any certainty.
- OP 4.04 – Natural Habitats – There are wetland habitats located along the first section of Alternative #2 on the braided river system of the Matit River. These wetlands are reported to be of local importance with gravel spits, islands and alluvial scrubland dominated by willow. The remote mountain pine forests beyond Rreshen are very likely to support large raptors and possibly wolves. Alternative #3A would result in new construction along a section of the Fani i Vogel River valley, along which additional wetland ecosystems may be situated. Likewise, Alternative #3B would involve connecting an existing local road situated high above the Fani i Vogel River valley to Kukes. This route may have the potential to affect remaining stands of mountain pine forest. Because the consultants have not had an opportunity to access this area due to snow conditions at higher elevations, at this time the potential for triggering this policy cannot be ruled out.
- OP 4.12 – Involuntary Resettlement – The interim report prepared by the Consultant indicates that resettlement may be an issue where farmland and houses are required for road widening and for quarries/borrow pits associated with all three project alternatives.

- OPN 11.03 – Cultural Property – The interim report prepared by the Consultant indicates that there are a number of Byzantine era structures at Rubik, a location common to both Alternatives #2 and #3. In addition, Alternative #2 runs through the villages of Poshqesh, Gjegjani and Gojani, all of which show classic examples of Mirdita mountain village architecture. Based on this limited information, it appears that there is the potential for the project to affect cultural property and, therefore, there is the potential for this policy to be triggered.

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

Depending on the alternative chosen, there may be cumulative effects from any forest cover removal on natural habitats. This would be analyzed carefully in the environmental assessment if the alternative selected generates these issues.

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

The project would ease traffic flows, and thus in the long term contribute to reduced air emissions and improved traffic safety. New road may lead to induced developments and altered land use patterns.

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

This aspect will be addressed in the environmental assessment.

II.D.3. Describe arrangement for the borrower to address safeguard issues

A comprehensive environmental assessment report and management plan (EMP) will be prepared, including an evaluation of alternatives from environmental considerations, in accordance with OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment. The EA/EMP will cover both the Durres to Morine Road and the Tirana Minddle Ring Road components, and identify and address all significant safeguard issues, including physical cultural resources, associated with the project. As a condition of the loan, the Borrower will agree to implement this EMP to the satisfaction of the Bank.

If the alternative selected involves land acquisition or resettlement, the government would be required to prepare a Resettlement Action Plan, Resettlement Policy Framework or Land Acquisition Plan, depending on the extent and nature of the acquisition, which will be based on adequate consultation, disclosed in country and approved by the Bank prior to appraisal. The Resettlement Action Plan / Land Acquisition Plan and the appropriate sections of the EA that deals with physical cultural resources will be **reviewed and cleared by the Bank**. Appropriate provisions for dealing with chance physical cultural finds will be included in the agreements with the contractors.

II.D.4. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

The key stakeholders in the project are the road users, GRD, GDPW, private sector contractors, the road transport operators' association, and the chambers of commerce. Public consultations will be carried out during the preparation of the EA at two stages (and more, if necessary) - the TOR stage and when the draft is ready. If land acquisition is required, the appropriate World Bank rules will be followed, including stakeholders' meetings to determine public reaction to the planned works. The EA will be disclosed in the country and at the Bank's Infoshop prior to Appraisal.

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

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

F. Disclosure Requirements

<i>Environmental Assessment/Analysis/Management Plan:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	9/30/2003	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	9/30/2003	
Date of submission to InfoShop	10/10/2003	
Date of distributing the Exec. Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors (<i>For category A projects</i>)		
<i>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	9/30/2003	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	9/30/2003	
Date of submission to InfoShop	10/10/2003	
<i>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Date of “in-country” disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop		
<i>Pest Management Plan:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Date of “in-country” disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop		
<i>Dam Safety Management Plan:</i>	<u>Expected</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Date of “in-country” disclosure		
Date of submission to InfoShop		

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

Signed and submitted by

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>
Task Team Leader: Cesar Queiroz	5/1/2003
Project Safeguards Specialists 1: Bernard Baratz	5/1/2003
Project Safeguards Specialists 2: Radhika Srinivasan	6/24/2003
Project Safeguards Specialists 3:	

Approved by:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>
Regional Safeguards Coordinator: Jane E. Holt	6/26/2003

Comments

Cleared by Emilia Battaglini

Sector Manager

Eva Molnar

6/26/2003

Comments

Cleared by Henk Busz