| Ref. No. | Date | Time | Location | Measured TSP Level | Unit | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-----------|------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|
| X_15A022 | 24-Sep-15 | 8:00 | CMA1b - Oil Street Site Office | 222.5 | 24hr TSP (ug/m³) | 176.7 | 260 | Possible reason: | Elevated TSP level in relate to local ambient condition around monitoring station |
| | | | | | (3) | | | Action taken / to be taken: | Reviewed the trend of air quality measurement across monitoring stations. Analysis of Contractor's working procedures. |
| | | | | | | | | | No construction activity was undertaken on the monitoring date at around Oil Street under Contractor of HY/2009/19, regular dust suppression measure including watering for haul road was implemented condition and the condition of haul road was observed be generally satisfactory during sample collection. In view of the above, the exceedance was considered to be non-project related and contributed by local ambient condition. Nevertheless, the Contractor was reminded to maintainregularly dust suppression measures for any potential dusty surface and dust generating operation around the concerned location to avoid any potential cumulative air quality impact. |

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|--|
| X_W5198 | 2-Sep-15 | Mid-flood | WSD19 | DO(mg/l) | 4.96 | 3.17 | | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 13.46 | 10.01 | 11.54 | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement to confirm the exceedances. Checking with Contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | ss | 9.00 | 16.26 | 19.74 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite loading of sorted public fill from barge to land and placing of levelling stones were conducted under contract HK/2012/08 on the monitoring date. Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in place. Silt screen maintenance has implemented properly under Contract HK/2009/01. In view of the above and no exceedance on the subsequent monitoring, it was considered that the exceedance was not project related. |
| X_W5198 | 4-Sep-15 | Mid-flood | RW21-P789 | DO(mg/l) | 4.11 | 3.17 | 2.63 | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 12.83 | 10.01 | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement to confirm the exceedances. Checking with Contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | ss | 11.00 | 16.26 | 19.74 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite loading of C&D materials at Portion 3 & 4 was conducted under contract HK/2009/02 on the monitoring date. Contractor mitigation measures including the provision of tarpaulin sheet was generally in place. Silt screen at monitoring station was generally in order. In view of the above and no exceedance on the subsequent monitoring, it was considered that the exceedance was not project related. |
| X_W5198 | 4-Sep-15 | Mid-ebb | WSD19 | DO(mg/l) | 3.92 | 3.17 | 2.63 | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 18.74 | 10.01 | 11.54 | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement to confirm the exceedances. Checking with Contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | ss | 6.50 | 16.26 | 19.74 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite placing of seawall blocks was conducted under contract HK/2012/08 on the monitoring date. Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in place. Silt screen maintenance has implemented properly under Contract HK/2009/01. In view of the construction area was located at the downstream of WSD19 monitoring station and no exceedance on the subsequent monitoring, it was considered that the exceedance was not project related. |
| X_W5198 | 7-Sep-15 | Mid-ebb | WSD19 | DO(mg/l) | 4.09 | 3.17 | 2.63 | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 10.8 | 10.01 | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement to confirm the exceedances. Checking with Contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | SS | 4.00 | 16.26 | 19.74 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite placing of levelling stones was conducted under contract HK/2012/08 on the monitoring date. Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in place. Silt screen maintenance has implemented properly under Contract HK/2009/01. In view of the construction area was located at the downstream of WSD19 monitoring station, it was considered that the exceedance was not project related. |

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | l imit l evel | Follow-up action | |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|----------|--------------|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| X_W5198 | 7-Sep-15 | | WSD19 | DO(mg/l) | 4.57 | 3.17 | | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 15.2 | 10.01 | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement to confirm the exceedances. Checking with Contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | SS | 18.50 | 16.26 | 19.74 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite placing of levelling stones was conducted under contract HK/2012/08 on the monitoring date. Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in place. Silt screen maintenance has implemented properly under Contract HK/2009/01. In view of the above and no exceedance on the subsequent monitoring, it was considered that the exceedance was not project related. |
| X_W5198 | 11-Sep-15 | Mid-ebb | RW21-P789 | DO(mg/l) | 4.58 | 3.17 | 2.63 | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 12.91 | 10.01 | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement to confirm the exceedances. Checking with Contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | SS | 12.00 | 16.26 | 19.74 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite loading of C&D materials at Portion 3 & 4 was conducted under contract HK/2009/02 on the monitoring date. Contractor mitigation measures including the provision of tarpaulin sheet was generally in place. Silt screen at monitoring station was generally in order. In view of the above and no exceedance on the subsequent monitoring, it was considered that the exceedance was not project related. |
| X_W5198 | 14-Sep-15 | Mid-ebb | WSD19 | DO(mg/l) | 4.07 | 3.17 | 2.63 | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 21.45 | 10.01 | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement to confirm the exceedances. Checking with Contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | ss | 14.50 | 16.26 | 19.74 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | No marine activity was conducted under contract HK/2012/08 on the monitoring date. Silt screen maintenance has implemented properly under Contract HK/2009/01. In view of no marine activity conducted, it was considered that the exceedance was not project related. |
| X_W5198 | 14-Sep-15 | Mid-flood | WSD19 | DO(mg/l) | 5.46 | 3.17 | 2.63 | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 10.65 | 10.01 | 11.54 | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement to confirm the exceedances. Checking with Contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | SS | 9.50 | 16.26 | 19.74 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | No marine activity was conducted under contract HK/2012/08 on the monitoring date. Silt screen maintenance has implemented properly under Contract HK/2009/01. In view of no marine activity conducted and no exceedance on the subsequent monitoring, it was considered that the exceedance was not project related. |

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|---------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|--|
| X_W5198 | 16-Sep-15 | Mid-flood | WSD19 | DO(mg/l) | 4.98 | 3.17 | 2.63 | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 12.25 | 10.01 | - | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement to confirm the exceedances. Checking with Contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | ss | 11.00 | 16.26 | 19.74 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite placing of seawall blocks was conducted under contract HK/2012/08 on the monitoring date. Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in place. In view of the above and no exceedance on the subsequent monitoring, it was considered that the exceedance was not project related. |

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Depth | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------|-------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|---|
| X_10D533 | 29-Aug-15 | Mid-ebb | Ex-WPCWA SE | Middle | DO(mg/I) | 3.03 | 3.55 | 3.00 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite excavated mud transhipment was conducted at Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, the construction works conducted was generally in order with provision of tarpaulin sheet and while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no dredging or reclamation works activity was conducted, the exceedance was considered not related to the Project works. |
| X_10D534 | 29-Aug-15 | Mid-flood | Ex-WPCWA SE | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 2.67 | 3.55 | 3.00 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite excavated mud transhipment was conducted at Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, the construction works conducted was generally in order with provision of tarpaulin sheet and while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no dredging or reclamation works activity was conducted and no exceedance was recorded on the subsequent monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to the Project works. |
| X_10D535 | 29-Aug-15 | Mid-flood | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 2.43 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite excavated mud transhipment was conducted at Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, the construction works conducted was generally in order with provision of tarpaulin sheet and while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no dredging or reclamation works activity was conducted and no exceedance was recorded on the subsequent monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to the Project works. |
| X_10D536 | 31-Aug-15 | Mid-flood | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 2.69 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite rock filling works for the function of vertical seawall at East side of TPCWAE was conducted on the monitoring date, the construction works conducted was generally in order while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no exceedance was recorded on the subsequent monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to the Project works. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Depth | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------|-------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|---|--|
| X_10D537 | 31-Aug-15 | Mid-ebb | C6 | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 2.59 | 2.60 | 2.00 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: Remarks/ Other Obs: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. No marine works was conducted under Contract HY/2010/08 on the monitoring date, and despite rock filling works for the function of vertical seawall at East side of TPCWAE was conducted under Contract HY/2009/15 on the monitoring date, the construction works conducted was generally in order. In view of no exceedance was recorded on the subsequent monitoring, the exceedance was considered not |
| | | | | | | | | | | related to the Project works. |
| X_10D538 | 4-Sep-15 | Mid-flood | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 2.49 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: Action taken/ to be taken: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite seawall reinstatement work was conducted at eastern of Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in order while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no exceedance was recorded on the subsequent monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to Project works. |
| X_10D539 | 7-Sep-15 | Mid-ebb | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 3.18 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: Remarks/ Other Obs: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. Despite seawall reinstatement work was conducted at eastern of Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in order while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no dredging or reclamation works activity was conducted and the construction works was conducted according, the exceedance was considered not related to Project works. Nevertheless, Contractor was reminded to ensure sufficient water circulation to eliminate any potential effect to the water quality within the area. |
| X_10D540 | 7-Sep-15 | Mid-flood | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 2.75 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: Action taken/ to be taken: Remarks/ Other Obs: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. Despite seawall reinstatement work was conducted at eastern of Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in order while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no dredging or reclamation works activity was conducted and the construction works was conducted according, the exceedance was considered not related to Project works. Nevertheless, Contractor was reminded to ensure sufficient water circulation to eliminate any potential effect to the water quality within the area. |

| Datas | Data | Tidal | Lagation | Danah | Deverates (Unit) | Manauman | Antion Lovel | Limait Laural | Fallow up action | |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| Ref no. X 10D541 | Date 9-Sep-15 | Tidal | Location Ex-WPCWA SW | Depth Middle | Parameters (Unit) | Measured 3.14 | Action Level 3.19 | Limit Level | Follow-up action | Describle in relation to the unstroom erganic discharge |
| X_10D541 | 9-Sep-15 | Mid-ebb | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 3.14 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite seawall reinstatement work was conducted at eastern of Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in order while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no dredging or reclamation works activity was |
| | | | | | | | | | | conducted and the construction works was conducted according, the exceedance was considered not related to Project works. Nevertheless, Contractor was reminded to ensure sufficient water circulation to aliminate any potential effect to the water quality within the cree. |
| X_10D542 | 9-Sep-15 | Mid-flood | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 2.87 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite seawall reinstatement work was conducted at eastern of Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in order while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no dredging or reclamation works activity was conducted and the construction works was conducted according and no exceedance was recorded on the subsequent monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to Project works. Nevertheless, |
| | | | | | | | | | | Contractor was reminded to ensure sufficient water circulation to eliminate any potential effect to the |
| X_10D543 | 16-Sep-15 | Mid-ebb | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 2.89 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite seawall reinstatement work was conducted at eastern of Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in order while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no dredging or reclamation works activity was conducted and the construction works was conducted according and no exceedance was recorded on |
| | | | | | | | | | | the subsequent monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to Project works. |
| X_10D544 | 18-Sep-15 | Mid-ebb | Ex-WPCAWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 2.61 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | Despite seawall reinstatement work was conducted at eastern of Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date, Contractor mitigation measures including the use of silt curtain was generally in order while upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no dredging or reclamation works activity was conducted and the construction works was conducted according and no exceedance was recorded on the subsequent monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to Project works. |
| | | | | | | | | | | • |

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Depth | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------|-------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|--|
| X_10D545 | 24-Sep-15 | Mid-flood | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 3.10 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | No marine activity was conducted at Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date. Upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no marine activity was conducted, the exceedance was considered not related to the Project works. |
| X 10D546 | 26-Sep-15 | Mid obb | Ex-WPCWA SW | Middle | DO(mg/l) | 1.76 | 3.19 | 2.10 | Possible reason: | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| A_10D546 | 20-3ep-13 | IVIIQ-EDD | EX-WPGWA SW | Middle | DO(IIIg/I) | 1.76 | 3.19 | 3.10 | Possible reason. | Possible in relation to the upstream organic discharge. |
| | | | | | | | | | Action taken/ to be taken: | Repeated the measurement to confirm the result. No odour nuisance was noted during the DO monitoring. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | | | | | | Remarks/ Other Obs: | No marine activity was conducted at Ex-WPCWA on the monitoring date. Upstream discharge from nearby culvert was observed. In view of no marine activity was conducted and no exceedance was recorded on the subsequent monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to the Project works. The DO level at concerned location was subsequently resumed on 28 September 2015 during ebb tide. |

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|---|
| X_10C632 | 14-Sep-15 | | C7 | DO(mg/l) | 4.71 | 3.02 | | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water abstraction location for the water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 15.31 | 11.35 | 12.71 | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement had conducted to confirm the exceedances. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | SS | 6.00 | 18.42 | 27.54 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | No marine work was conducted in the vicinity of the water quality monitoring station under Contract HY/2009/15 and Contract HY/2010/08 on the monitoring date. In view of no marine activity was conducted on the monitoring date and no exceedance was recorded in subsequence monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to Project. |
| X_10C633 | 18-Sep-15 | Mid-flood | C7 | DO(mg/l) | 5.00 | 3.02 | 2.44 | Possible reason: | Natural variation or changes of water quality in the vicinity of water abstraction location for the water quality monitoring station. |
| | | | | Turbidity | 22.52 | 11.35 | 12.71 | Action taken/ to be taken: | Immediate repeated in-situ measurement had conducted to confirm the exceedances. Checking with contractor works and review previous monitoring data. |
| | | | | SS | 15.00 | 18.42 | 27.54 | Remarks/ Other Obs: | No marine work was conducted in the vicinity of the water quality monitoring station under Contract HY/2009/15 and Contract HY/2010/08 on the monitoring date. In view of no marine activity was conducted on the monitoring date and no exceedance was recorded in subsequence monitoring, the exceedance was considered not related to Project. |

| Ref. No. | Date | Time | Location | Measured TSP Level | Unit | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-----------|------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--|
| X_15A023 | 24-Sep-15 | 8:00 | CMA1b - Oil Street Site Office | 222.5 | 24hr TSP (ug/m³) | 176.7 | 260 | Possible reason: | Elevated TSP level in relate to local ambient condition around monitoring station |
| | | | | | | | | | Reviewed the trend of air quality measurement across monitoring stations. Analysis of contractor's working procedures. |
| | | | | | | | | Remarks / Other Obs: | Thermal barrier preparation works within a section tunnel area with no considerable dust impact to the area outside of the tunnel section was conducted under the Contract of HY/2011/08 on the monitoring date while no exceedance was recoreded at other monitoring station on the same date at location nearer to the tunnel opening. In view of the above, the exceedance was considered not related to the Project and contributed by local ambient condition. Nevertheless, the Contractor was reminded to maintain the regularly dust suppression measures for any dust generating operation above ground around the concerned location to avoid any potential cumulative air quality impact. |