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The Wonorejo Dam was the 20th dam constructed in the Brantas River basin → Wonorejo Village, Tulungagung Regency, East Java, Indonesia.

It has a height of 100m and inundates an area of about 3.85 km² with an effective storage of 99,040,000 m³ (2008).

Dam development projects → the involuntary resettlement of a number of people, (Fujikura, Nakayama, & Takesada, 2009).

Wonorejo Dam project → those residing in the reservoir area became subject to an involuntary resettlement programme.
Based on a topographical survey, the area of reservoir was predicted to cover 210 ha and would directly affect 668 HHs (households).

Another 909 HHs would be isolated by the reservoir.
Options for resettlers

- Transmigration scheme (A)
- Partial resettlement scheme (B)
- Reclamation area (C)
Opted by resettlers
Past Survey on Resettlement Issue

about 20 residents were invited to a meeting to give voices and opinions on the resettlement process and their current lifestyles.

The perception of former residents is important for sustainable project management → to evaluate and to monitor the long-term consequences of resettlement programme.

The objective of this study → to attempt a more detailed investigation of the perceptions of former residents by considering residents who opted to move upstream and downstream of the reservoir.
The synthesis of opinions → field survey, questionnaire-based interview.

Randomly selected households (total of 88):
### Number of respondents among sub-villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-village</th>
<th>1st Generation</th>
<th>2nd Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boro</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawuhan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suruh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwaloh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODOLOGY

Number of respondents per period of resettlement
The structure of the Questionnaire

- focusing on differences in the livelihoods before and after resettlement programme (occupation/income, land ownership and farming activities, fishing, property, convenience in daily life, their children’s educational opportunities, health, social community, and general satisfaction).
METHODOLOGY

....contd.
FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Resettlement programme

why did you accept the resettlement programme?

- better place: 22%
- land ownership: 24%
- money: 18%
- new house: 7%
- new job: 10%
- kids future: 10%
- better education facilities: 5%
- other: 4%
Resettlement programme

why did not participate in the transmigration scheme?

This study found that former residents had strong emotional reasons for choosing to remain in the surrounding villages.
how did you spend the compensation money?

- new house: 33%
- meal: 29%
- livestocks: 13%
- vehicle: 1%
- education: 7%
- agriculture: 6%
- other: 11%
- other: 11%
Transmigration scheme

• might change the perception of the transmigration scheme as an option in the resettlement programme.

• but it could not change their emotional reasons for remaining nearby.

Residents who opted transmigration scheme

- success: 59%
- na: 38%
- fail: 3%
Respondents’ views on the resettlement programme

To date, almost all of the respondents were satisfied with the education facilities provided in the resettlement programme.

The second generation suggested that their income was more stable in their present setting.
Respondents’ views on the resettlement programme

Most of the respondents expressed that their current situation posed greater difficulty in obtaining suitable jobs → this is reasonable since farming was their major former job and most current jobs require greater skills and younger staff.
### FINDING AND DISCUSSION

#### Main indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relocation area</th>
<th>Relocation period</th>
<th>Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upstream</td>
<td>Downstream</td>
<td>1st stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Income stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Land ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Social community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Compensation scheme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

...contd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main indicator</th>
<th>Relocation area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Relocation period</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Generation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. General satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of respondents</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


General satisfaction

The majority of respondents indicated that they are satisfied with their living conditions.

In general, they were satisfied with their advantages and disadvantages.

Regarding the adaptation, the respondents reported no major difficulty living in the resettled area.
CONCLUSIONS

1. The Wonorejo Dam project involuntarily relocated many families from the dam site. These resettled individuals opted to move into surrounding villages rather than to follow the transmigration scheme → processes were fair enough.

2. Although the former residents were moved involuntarily, many of them are found to be content with their current situation and conditions.
3. The findings of this study may help appropriate authorities to enhance their social responsibility and to evaluate their respective resettlement programmes.
access road to upstream village (June, 2011)
Upstream village (June, 2011)
In order to make a comprehensive assessment of the perceptions of former residents, it is recommended that further study should incorporate the perceptions of those who resettled using the transmigration scheme.
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