

Webinar Transcript: Derrimut Fields Drainage Workshop on 26 May 2026

Recording length 1h 58m 16s

Ava Rafatnejad 0:03

notes. And if you can, please help us with the sound quality and please remain on mute when you are not presenting. That would be very helpful. And we will be starting shortly.

Okay. We would like to begin by acknowledging the traditional owners of the land on which the Derrimut Fields study area is located, Bunurong, and pay our respects to their elders past, present, and emerging.

So on this slide, we are going to talk about the purpose of the workshop and why are we here today.

So I'm not sure if David Reginato, our senior manager, is here to discuss this or probably Ian Pham, our area manager.

Ian Pham 1:02

Yeah, I'll just jump in because Dave might jump in at some point and then take over. But I think just kind of a recap, as you're aware, that we've did this workshop or conclave process because we've identified a lot of drainage items for like

Ava Rafatnejad 1:07

Mhm.

Ian Pham 1:22

The Ravenport area, and then previously we've identified the two areas, and today we're going to focus on the Derrimut Field side in which the site trains. The goal is that this is to...

Our main goal is to discuss like the drainage assumptions and through our review, we've identified that there's potentially many ways to approach this, but we would like to bed down a few key assumptions in terms of how the drainage will function so that we could essentially design and progress with.

the scheme and that makes it easier for everyone to implement and plan out this area. And so I think there's a point here about the key assumptions. So today we'll go through the main areas that we have identified that we would like to discuss specifically.

a few other stakeholders will present elements from their end. And it's kind of like the starting off point in terms of really bending down their assumptions. So no questions too hard or today we will really want to get into the detail if possible, because essentially, hopefully we get some resolutions or next steps from here that can pretty much essentially

sum everything up and the goal is if everyone's agreed on assumptions, we'll document that formally and present that to everyone here so they continue on their work. And so today we'll be collecting, we're taking also a temperature check of the room to see

where everyone's at in terms of different stakeholders, the amount of work that they've done, and Melbourne Water is also here to provide that technical support too, to fill in the gaps. But again, today we would like to kind of present and discuss with the stakeholders the key assumptions. So really basic stuff like basic in a way that...

the catchments, how they function, where people would like to receive the flows or discharge the flows, and if everyone's doing on the same page. And it's okay if people aren't not, that is a key. This is what this process is for, to kind of really tease out all the details here in this forum.

So yeah, and thank you everyone for attending. So yeah.

Ava Rafatnejad 3:45

Thank you, Ian. I don't know if David, you may want to add something because I saw that you also joined.

David Reginato 3:53

Yeah. Hi, apologies, came in a little bit late and great summary. We are at a real critical point given the timelines for DTP and Durham at Fields PSP. And so

this workshop is really critical in getting to the detail around those assumptions of what

what water is going to come into the Derrimut Fields and where, so that we can then take that offline and work with the stakeholders directly with Derrimut Fields to finalise the PSP. So we'll be driving the conversation today around inputs and outputs around Derrimut Fields in particular, because that is the time critical.

A... Planning scheme amendment, we've done a little bit, yeah, a lot of work with upstream around some.

sort of work with Borrell and others around what's coming in, but we now need to get stakeholder feedback around where water's got to go into Derrimut Fields and through Derrimut Fields. It's not to design Derrimut Fields, that's a separate process, but the key assumptions for us to then be able to take our work and work with stakeholders directly affected within the PSP.

Iain MacInnes 5:00

Okay.

David Reginato 5:03

So, thanks, Ava, and...

Ava Rafatnejad 5:05

Thank you, David.

I will go to the next slide. Would you also like to talk about this one?

David Reginato 5:16

Yeah, certainly. So I think this is workshop 4 in our series. So the first workshop, we engaged a lot of you in the room around the whole of, I called the Ravenhall District, which was all the PSAs related to Ravenhall, Durham Fields, Chartwell East.

a few other landowners. And then we've separated from that point into two smaller working groups, what we call the Lebanon Creek Group, which is the catchments that drain to the east, and then this group, which is the

catchments that drain sort of south into Derriman Fields and further south. And so we've had two

Two, or a separate Liebetrau Creek meeting, which we're working through with the likes of Dexus and Boral and other key stakeholders of finalising drainage for that area. And then today is, or you can see today is really the priorities around the Truganina sort of Deramid Fields area to try and get.

some clarity around issues, drainage assumptions, et cetera, to then take that away and then...

separate into probably what we call the BAU, Derham and Fields PSP process with DTP, of here's all the assumptions, this is how much flow is coming in, where it's coming in, and work through that process with DTP and your cells, who's involved in that PSP process.

We may or may not get all the assumptions done. If we haven't, we'll set up a third workshop to refine any outstanding matters where required. But our goal is to start getting to the details, start hearing from yourselves around any critical issues that we need to be aware of. We'll present some of those.

criteria or assumptions and we want to hear from yourselves around either you support or you don't support and why you don't support particularly. So we can take that information and work out the most practical and best for community, or call it, outcome in relation to how we drain this whole area. So today's probably a little bit more technical than the previous ones.

It's a little bit more focused on location and asset and things like that, whereas previously it was more probably scene setting. Today is really getting to the nitty gritty and we want your feedback around what you see and those issues.

But the third option may or may not need to occur, depending on if we're all aligned or not.

Thanks, Ava.

Ava Rafatnejad 7:49

David.

So I will continue to discuss who is here today. I refer to this plan that we have, which shows the Daring Wood Fields outfall area. So we try to invite the key landowners and stakeholders and government agencies in this area.

And I also have to mention that the key public stakeholders are Melbourne Water, Department of Transport and Planning and Melbourne City Council.

So going to the next slide, on this one, this is just an overall plan showing the development services schemes or DSS boundaries. You can see the area and neighborhood DSS including Laverton Creek, Truganina DSS, Boots Road, Doherty's Drain and Neil Road DSS.

Also from PSP or pressing structure plan perspective, we have Deremut Fields, PSP and Raven Hall PSP, as well as some PSPs on the neighborhood like Mount Atkinson, Warravee, Chartwell East and Tierney Plains.

So at this stage, because we already discussed the pressing structure plan, I may stop sharing and ask if DTP can have a presentation for us. Cindy Tran, I believe you may be presenting for us.

Cindy Tran (DTP) 9:12

Yeah, thanks, Ava.

Yep, can everyone see?

Henry Kassay (DTP) 9:21

Yep.

Cindy Tran (DTP) 9:23

Yep. So hi everyone, my name is Cindy Tran. I am the strategic planner on the project and this will just be a quick overview of the precinct.

Ava Rafatnejad 9:23

Sam.

Cindy Tran (DTP) 9:35

I'm sure we're all familiar with where we are, but if not, this is the precinct area. Dermot Fields is planned as an employment PSP with some key features being Skeleton Creek running north to south through the middle and a transmission gas line that passes through the site.

In terms of where we're at with the PSP timeline, we finalised the pitching report last week after circulating it to landowners and agency for feedback.

Right now we're working on the vision and purpose report and wrapping up the procurement for the last of the technical studies.

And so on pitching, the final published report is available now on the VPA website with more details. So this is just going to be a short summary of what we heard in the sessions about drainage.

So pitching sessions were held in January with both landowners and agencies. Emerging theme number four is on drainage and it's to implement drainage solutions that maximize development potential while safeguarding environmental values and...

natural systems. From pitching, we also heard that landowners are ready to commence planning and development within the precinct. Landowners are also prepared with drainage concepts and CHMPs and are eager to collaborate with Melbourne Water.

And lastly, an update on the status of the technical studies. Eight out of nine tech studies have either commenced works or we have selected a supplier and are just finalising the procurement in our system.

The last one to be procured is the safety management study, and we're expecting the fee proposal for that to come in today. So soon we will have nine out of nine tech studies procured. The draft reports have started to come in as well. We've already received the draft post contact heritage report and the Archie report, and we're expecting

the draft land capability assessment to come in on Friday. Thanks very much.

Ava Rafatnejad 11:58

Thank you so much, Cindy, for the helpful presentation. Very much appreciated, and now. Start sharing again. Can you see my screen now?

Ian Pham 12:22

Yeah.

Ava Rafatnejad 12:23

Oh, good. Starting from here.

Okay. So on this slide, we are going to talk about the summary assumptions table from workshop one. I don't know if **David Reginato** or **Ian Pham** can talk about this one. Anyone who is here?

Ian Pham 12:44

Yeah, Dave just had to dash, but he'll be back later. But I think I'll just touch on this one quickly. I think before David mentioned about all the key assumptions that Melbourne Water is planning to

Ava Rafatnejad 12:46

Mhm.

Ian Pham 13:01

Planning to confirm and for the general field side, you can see here is A, B, and F. So you can see it's a lot of the interface items between like future areas and as well as how everything interacts with the major Hopkins Road there.

And we'll go to these in even more detail. So you can see here, we're going through the process of just essentially confirming these training assumptions and then detailing them out in more detail so that people will be able to design to it. So that was the outcome from the first workshop, and now we're going a level down.

And I believe there will be another plan that shows the exact areas that we're looking at in these interface areas, which will be presented throughout today.

That's back to Ava.

Ava Rafatnejad 13:53

Thanks, Sian. So David Lee is the project manager of Dairy Muthfields PSP. I'm going to ask him to talk about this slide.

David Lee 14:01

Okay. Yeah, so I suppose following workshop one, we've gone offline a little bit and had a chat to some of the specific landowners that were a little bit more impacted by the future assets in Durham Fields and the location of drainage. And some of them we'll be presenting later today.

In this workshop. As a result of these discussions, it's really helped us to sort of understand the work that other stakeholders have been doing and the key priorities. And so we've used that to really refine, I guess, figure and really clear up those different assumptions and constraints that exist in the area. And so we're calling them focus areas.

but they'll be sort of the framework of the workshop today and really our key priorities that we want to discuss and get feedback from.

Ava Rafatnejad 14:57

Thanks, David.

David Lee 14:57

I can change to the next slide.

So we've simplified it to really about four key focus areas for Durham Fields, and they're as follows. The first one is really the flow coming from Mount Atkinson's Estate and across Hopkins Road, as well as how it interacts with the OMR, or the Outer Metropolitan Ring E6 Transport Corridor.

Some of you will be aware of it as a public acquisition overlay, but essentially a future major infrastructure project. Point 2, we're looking at the quarry specifically and how flow comes down from Ravenhall, which is to the north, through the potentially through the quarry site, and also

how are we going to drain that quarry in the future itself as a sub-catchment? And then point three, if you look at that area now with endurance fields more closely, we're talking more about consideration of Skeleton Creek, some of those major drainage corridors, and really looking at Troganina DSS.

more specifically. And the final point is looking at the balance of Derimet fields, which is around the assets within Woods Road DSS and Doidy Strain DSS. And so they're smaller type of assets, but we still need to clarify some of those assumptions. So we've kind of put into that final point, point 4. Yeah.

Ava Rafatnejad 16:22

Thanks, David. So. I just provide a summary of agenda. So far, we discussed the purpose of the workshop. We had a presentation from Department of

Transport and Planning, which discussed the investigation so far from DTP perspective. And then we also discussed the

summary tables since first workshop, and then we introduced the priority areas that we are going to discuss today. As David mentioned, there are four priority focus areas that we are going to focus more one by one, and then we are going to have some

presentations by the stakeholders in between. There is also a short break in the middle. And I will continue with the first focus area, or as David mentioned, flow coming from Mount Atkinson State as per this plan showing here. So David, would you like to talk about this one?

David Lee 17:29

Yeah, so I suppose, as we look into Durham Fields, we need to, I guess, clarify some of the assumptions about flow coming in from the upstream catchments, specifically the Mount Atkinson Estate towards the northwest corner of Durham Fields. And there's a bit of, I guess, a discrepancy between where everything's at. So, for example, Mount Atkinson's Estate,

They're well into development. They're no longer at the strategic planning, you know, phase. They're looking more statutory, so they're actually delivering halfway through the development. And so we're actually receiving certain, for example, design proposals from them for some of these scheme assets that we've been talking to them quite closely through. They haven't quite progressed down towards

that southernmost asset that you can see kind of hugging the OMI in the scheme there. But I guess as part of this, it's really important that we clarify these assumptions and these crossings of Hopkins Road, especially given the number of constraints, like we're well aware of gas mains within Hopkins Road that have the potential to limit

Tejas Deshmukh 18:21

Okay.

David Lee 18:32

how much flow can go under Hopkins Road, and etc. Do you want to just jump to the next slide quickly, Ava, and then we can come back to this one. But I'll just show a little slide. I think it's very important for us as well to recognize

that there's a difference between future crossings and existing crossings, and obviously constraints such as that over.

Tejas Deshmukh 18:32

But.

David Lee 18:51

will have a very big implication to what happens going forwards. So in this figure, you can kind of see some of the major sort of crossings that are sort of proposed and existing there that we're really keen to hear some feedback from. On the right side of the page is a little bit of a plan that we've received from Mount Atkinson's estate that sort of shows

some of the assets that they're proposing. I guess one of the key topics for focus area one is about that flow going from west to east and just kind of hearing, I guess, the perspective of different landowners and stakeholders as to how they see that playing out, how that affects potentially their property and their plans.

and collecting that information so that we can feed it into our process to develop training options. Do you want to go back now, Ava?

Tejas Deshmukh 19:41

Hello.

David Lee 19:45

Yeah, and I think we have to recognize as well that there may be a potential change to, you know, the existing flow regime. And so we're quite keen to, obviously, we have to balance the different inputs into the process, including, you know, background studies such as environmental, cultural heritage, etc. And obviously future developments such as the

Ken Nguyen (DTP) 20:04

Yeah.

David Lee 20:05

So a lot of constraints in this area, quite keen to hear. Ava, I'll hand it back to you to seek some of the feedback.

Nick Hooper 20:29

Yeah.

Ava Rafatnejad 20:30

Provide the access.

Nick Hooper 20:31

Hi Ava, Nick here, but Andrew Matheson will just share a plan. So if you can give Andrew authority to share that plan, he and I will then briefly talk to it. And the plan that you're going to see, and Ava, you and David have seen what's coming up,

but for the benefit of others, it's a very preliminary plan. And basically the purpose of it is to get people thinking about how this is going to be achieved, because there are various inputs that are going to be required for the VPA from yourselves at Melbourne Water.

There's going to be ecological, there's going to be cultural heritage things. But the important thing that comes out of this is that we end up with a development outcome that actually makes sense. And when we're dealing with industrial land, getting regular shape parcels that make sense becomes extremely important. You have a little more flexibility in a residential.

setting. So we're asking those that are inputting to what's going to occur here to be thinking about making sure that the development outcomes here are going to work because this site has become extremely constrained with the PAO and as David points out, that's going to play a role with things. So this first plan

is more or less just a situation now. It basically takes the creek reserve, we've given it a nominal 100 metres based upon what's happening further south of Boundary Road, and then the blue is approximately the drainage reserve required under the current DSS in about that location.

Tejas Deshmukh 21:56

Yeah. The.

Nick Hooper 22:17

Now, whether or not we get a culvert and a road going across that creek environment is still yet to be decided. But what it does do is it breaks our land into two separate developable areas, which is not ideal for a variety of reasons. Page 2, Andrew, if you

could please. A variation on that where the drainage reserve sits in slightly lower land, but we still end up with a similar sort of setup where we've got the separated land for development. Plan 3 is

Tejas Deshmukh 22:49

I.

Nick Hooper 22:56

an aspirational version that seeks to consolidate all of the developable land into one location and effectively move the creek, bearing in mind that at the moment the creek is not a substantial entity, it really is a low, minor water flow.

James Cappellari 23:11

Facebook.

Nick Hooper 23:15

And given the way that the land sits, it wouldn't take a great deal of work to be able to achieve its manoeuvring in, perhaps in a way that we've shown, moving the drainage reserve into that location shown with the blue. And then what we end up with is a consolidated

James Cappellari 23:17

This is Shiba.

Nick Hooper 23:36

development outcome. Now, there may be many reasons why this can't work, but what I'm asking everybody who's inputting into this process to do is to think beyond just your area of influence and think about how we can make sure that the development of this land is going to work and going to make sense.

Tejas Deshmukh 23:55

Yeah.

Nick Hooper 23:57

holistically. And for our friends at the VPA, Henry and STEAM, this might be one way of achieving an outcome that gets a better development outcome. Andrew Matheson, anything you wanted to add from an engineering perspective?

Andrew Matheson 24:16

Thank you, Nick. Now you've covered it well there. I guess the only comment holistically is the current DSS that's shown with the flow diversion north of the OMR. We're supportive of that. There's obviously there's major gas lanes in Middle Road and there's a city gate that sits on our client's land in the northeast corner on the

on the western side of Hopkins Road. Yeah, that's obviously going to impact on our client when the IMR comes through and the drainage, diverting that under Middle Road is going to be quite a challenge as well. So we're supportive of the flow diversion north of Middle Road.

Nick Hooper 24:54

So that's really it. Ava, thank you for the opportunity to present. But in summary, we're really just asking everyone who's inputting here to make sure that when we're looking at solutions, we're looking at how the land will be delivered in totality and making sure that we've got a good

A well-shaped land for industrial development, so thank you.

Ava Rafatnejad 25:19

Thank you very much, Andrew and Nick, for your presentation. So the next section is to seek stakeholder feedback. And one of the stakeholders we would like to hear from are Mount Atkinson landowners. So

As discussed, there is an area here on the corner of focus area one. We chose Mount Atkinson drainage asset and we would like you to understand what is the preferred drainage option from your end. If there is anyone from Mount Atkinson, any representative,

We would appreciate if you could raise your hand and share your thoughts with us. Please, Shiba, I can see your hands up.

Siobhan Anne Rehill 26:10

Yeah. Can you hear me?

Ava Rafatnejad 26:12

Yes, we can.

Siobhan Anne Rehill 26:13

Yes, my name's Siobhan Rehill. I'm Development Director at Mount Atkinson. Along with DPM are our engineers. Eric Wang is here today. We're currently working on the drainage options for that entire area north of Middle Road. And

We will, when we've more firmed up our position, we'll share with Melbourne Water what that position will be.

Ava Rafatnejad 26:43

Thank you, Shiba. So just from Melbourne Water perspective, our understanding is that probably conveying the flow from this area to eastern catchment would be preferred from Melbourne Water perspective, but we would be happy to also hear from you and receive your

drainage option when it was finalized. So I will continue with the next one. The next one is W bytons again, but I know that you already had the presentation and discussed about how you are going to manage the drainage. So probably go to the third land owners that I want to

Siobhan Anne Rehill 27:06

Yep.

Ava Rafatnejad 27:25

hear from CPG JAG and Sokmani landowners who own some of the land on this corner. And if there is anyone from these two landowners, we would like to hear more from and understand if the flow from your catchments is planned to go to

East, or is it going to another direction like South? We ask this question because it can help us to finalize our assumptions. If it is going to South, then we need to change the design. So if there is anyone from these landowners,

We would appreciate if you raise your hand.

It seems like probably no one is here from these two landowners. I will now continue with the next focus area to continue the discussion. The next area is focus area 2, as David Lee mentioned. You can see the location here.

which is existing query. I will hand over to David Lee to discuss the objective now.

David Lee 28:45

So I suppose the key assumptions that we're quite keen to clarify here, number one, how is flow from the Ravenhall catchment going to potentially move S through the quarry? And this is really probably looking at Hopkins Road itself, just slightly east of Hopkins Road.

I know we've seen some options from some stakeholders, but we're quite keen to hear from the quarry themselves about facilitating some of that flow from that northern catchment. You can see where it says Raven Hall Logistics in green, down from that north to south. So there's a bit of a key drainage connection, almost like an arterial.

Iain MacInnes 29:20

Yeah.

David Lee 29:24

that we're quite keen to get some clarity around. And then the second assumption is really, how are we going to drain this query? Is it going to be, you know, is flow from this query going to be consolidated to a single point? Where's the outlet? And also,

How is it going to interact with the OMR? Because if you look at that map there, you can see the OMR slightly to the south, and it kind of hugs the quarry. And so how many crossings, drainage crossings, are we going to need beneath the OMR? Because if we are consolidating the flow to a single point, you know...

potentially we only need one crossing of the OMR to facilitate that flow. So those are the key assumptions that we really want to clarify on.

Yeah, I think we've got a presentation now. Hand back to Ava.

Ava Rafatnejad 30:17

Yes, we are ahead of the time, which is a good news. So I was planning to have the break here, but I think if Andrew Green from WSB is ready, can you please start sharing your screen and have the presentation on behalf of Clean Away?

Green, Andrew 30:35

Sure, thanks. Ava for the chance to talk. So hopefully you can see my screen. It's Andrew Green from WSP. We're engaged by Clean Away who operate the existing landfill in the site. And I guess my first comment, Ian, is just to acknowledge that even though you

Ava Rafatnejad 30:43

Yes.

Green, Andrew 30:54

talking about an existing quarry in actual fact. There's quite a large landfill in the middle of that central area that you're talking about. So I'm just going to talk to the western side of this thing today. I know we've got a separate workshop for the eastern side, but just to set the scene. So this is what we call the southern

southern expansion landfill here. It's in the west of the sort of what you're referring to as the quarry area. So this is a little bit of an old drawing over, as you know, we're working on an updated stormwater management system for the site, but with respect to this, what we think of as Skeleton Creek catchment.

I guess this is what we're expecting will be happening. So, you know, this is a photo from back in 2015-ish before Mount Atkinson, but here's the mount at about 130 RL and a catchment that comes along to Hopkins Road. And there's a third catchment that comes in from the north, which is what you're referring to as Ravenhawk.

precinct, which Boral has spoken about in other meetings. We know from what Boral previously presented that they're talking about a portion of Catchment 3 coming down the Riding Boundary Road and heading down the west side of Hopkins, sorry, down Hopkins. And then our expectation and

Mount Atkinson has sort of already developed some of this infrastructure, is that the drain comes down the west side of the neighbouring land to the quarry site, and then this is really at the heart of the matter over this.

It's our understanding that SK7, sorry, I should say this is the Trug and you know DSS as it was at sort of 2018. So the key nodes that we think of is SK7 and SK8. Sorry that that's covered, but you get the general gist of it. It's the one that's

a little bit further north than where Nick Cooper was talking. So Nick was talking about this particular intersection, and our focus is actually up here, further up Hopkins Road, and this is Middle Road coming along. So you can see this is an intent. And so one and two are currently constructed, and the future landfill will come through here.

James Cappellari 33:08

Yeah.

Green, Andrew 33:13

There's a little small dam that will come off the west side of the site and throw water down Hopkins Road where it's going to join SK7. And it's our understanding that Clean Away need to build a little short section of drain to take account of the future development of the landfill.

So if I go to a blow up of that drain.

this is sort of what we're expecting would be happening, that water coming down from the Mount Atkinson development would be taken underneath Hopkins Road by pipe or whatever means, whatever that will be. And this light blue shading here is sort of a planning overlay.

and then the Trug and Inner DSS is the orange lines, but either way they sort of intersect the side of cell 4. Our understanding is that Clean Eway needs to build a portion of open channel swale drain that comes from the end of that pipe around the corner and joins into SK8.

James Cappellari 34:05

Yeah.

Green, Andrew 34:13

So that's sort of what all of the planning is around. And then coming back down to to David Lee's commentary about the nodes. So even though you think that this is a quarry, David, in reality, it's actually two larger landforms and a future.

So coming down, the water catchment will be in a series of ponds around the southern and southwestern corner. It's really important for us that we maintain the rights to take water out through node CH9.

And also just coming out through this pond to SKA. So clean away is, you know, wanting to maintain that ability to take the water out as planned, and then there'll be a future landform in this zone, so we want to be able to take water out through node A1 as well. And then, as discussed in the other workshop for sort of the eastern.

part of the site over as I previously flagged, there'll be water coming, a northern shed coming along Riding Boundary Road, coming down the side of Christie's, and I've sort of, sorry, it's a bit hard to see, but I've just thrown a couple of red arrows on for you, that there will be water coming down.

the east side of the existing landfill. We know it as existing MRL, and that'll be coming down to another node that sits down here. It's slightly off the picture, but I saw it on some of your earlier slides. So as far as we're concerned, we need all of these nodes to take the water away because there's restrictions on it. We've got to slow the water down.

James Cappellari 35:31

Support.

Green, Andrew 35:51

It's not these are very long distances involved, you know, for perspective that's.

Tejas Deshmukh 35:52

Bing.

Green, Andrew 35:57

two and a half, 3 kilometres from west to east. So just in your general thinking, we can't really kind of bring them all to one particular spot. We're relying on the scheme taking, you know, taking water out through 8 and 10, down into the area that

James Cappellari 36:16

Start.

Green, Andrew 36:16

Nick was talking about earlier, and then same for CH9, same for node A1, and same for the one that's, I don't have the number of it, sorry. So that's the sort of overall intent from Clean Way's point of view. We need to maintain that. And then there's just that question that's previously been raised over about whether it goes

whether this water on the northern edge goes east into the other workshop catchment or whether it and a portion of it regardless will come down the east side and join into that no.

Ava Rafatnejad 36:56

Thank you very much, Andrew. I can see John Matthew's hands up. Would you like to share something with us?

John Mathios 37:07

Just had a.

Sorry, I just had a quick question for Andrew, just about the catchments for the clean away site. Are they sort of generally in accordance with those scheme boundaries, Andrew, or will you be looking to modify some of those catchment boundaries, given obviously the clean away site has very different landforms to the natural topography?

Green, Andrew 37:31

Yeah, I guess, John, to this point, we've just been following the scheme. I guess in our minds, we've been assuming those nodes are there and that we're able to discharge to them. So everything's sort of being worked around that logic.

John Mathios 37:36

Shaw.

Cool, yeah, no problems.

Green, Andrew 37:44

Yeah, my key message is we need those four key nodes from our point of view at SK8, CH9, node A1 and this one, they're sort of part and parcel of taking the water in a suddenly.

John Mathios 37:52

Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, you need outlets. It was more just about whether one outlet's taking more than the other or there's movements across those boundaries, given the landform's not quite as got defined ridge lines and valleys as you would expect under a normal greenfield environment.

James Cappellari 38:00

Just want to make sure that.

Green, Andrew 38:00

Yeah. Yeah, the. Yeah. No, that's true, John. I mean, I wouldn't mind being able to negotiate with a little bit of more discharge at one and less at the other, but we're still kind of relying just because of the sheer distance involved. Well, that's my key message here is this is a kilometer of distance trying to get you, you know, in this sort of area. Looks great on the map until you see it.

John Mathios 38:15

The. Mm. Yeah. Yeah.

Green, Andrew 38:35

practical.

John Mathios 38:36

Yeah, yeah, yeah, absolutely. Yeah, cool. That answers my question. Thank you.

Ava Rafatnejad 38:42

Martin, would you like to go next?

Marteen Bouwmeester 38:46

Thanks Ava. A question for Andrew, if you don't mind. Martin Balmeister from Ava. Andrew, thanks for that. That was very helpful. Obviously, it highlighted that the desire is there to...

utilize all the nodes on the currently presented unwanted DSSs. I'm just, without going into detail, putting in the short presentation, are you retarding all the flows from into each of those outlets?

Is that the intent?

Green, Andrew 39:13

It'll be a combination, Martin. Yeah, because we're slowing it down, basically, our logic has been slowing it back down to green fuels rates. But I know that there's actual criteria on the node that's down here in the southeast. Oh, sorry, I'm not sharing. Let me just...

Pretty sure there's some criteria that's already been set.

discharge criteria on the node that comes down here. That system's actually separate from Skeleton Creek.

So these come together, but this other southeastern node actually ends up in the other catchment.

Martein Bouwmeester 39:45

Yeah. What about node 1A in the Woods Road, BSS?

Green, Andrew 39:55

Yeah, I think that does eventually join in a long way down with this catchment. Yeah.

Martein Bouwmeester 39:59

Yeah, and correct. So the thought was whether there was proposed retardation on your site ahead of node 1A, or is it all done downstream?

Green, Andrew 40:11

We'll be doing a combination and I assume we'll have to ***** on site plus, you know, we'll be looking to get whatever we can from your southern retarding as well. I guess the general philosophy has been that we slow it down to its greenfields rate. It's no different from what was originally in. envisaged.

Martein Bouwmeester 40:34

Obviously, we'd be very...

Asking them water to to that to be back reduce flows from your side into node one, because it's going to end up heading S catches on the woods at the bottom of ASR's land holding.

Green, Andrew 40:53

One thing I'm not clear on Ava is whether or not there is already a criteria set on node A1. So that's something I would like to know out of this meeting as well is what's the current restrictions at node A1.

Ava Rafatnejad 41:08

This is also one of the priority focus areas that we are going to discuss the rest. So, but our understanding is that there will be flow coming from quarry, existing quarry to downstream. But we also know that there will be OMR on the area. So

The crossing should be discussed.

David Lee 41:34

Yeah, I think Andrew.

Green, Andrew 41:35

Sorry, just for my benefit, is OMR the road? Is that the freeway? Yeah, sorry, I just wasn't up on your acronym.

David Lee 41:40

Yeah, it's East West, major freeway type rd.

David Reginato 41:44

Yeah.

David Lee 41:45

Yeah. But yeah, with, I suppose, the scheme as it is, it's all under review due to the Durham Fields PSP. And so as part of that, we'll expect that, for example, even in our key assumptions earlier, we've been talking about how many crossings of the OMR are needed. And so

we have, you know, whatever is currently assumed at node A1 will need to be updated. And so it's really helpful to see that there's these individual crossings that it sounds like from operational perspective are needed for the landfill. And

so it's good for us to take that feedback away and then plan for it, I suppose, as we develop options, because this will have implications.

to Woodsboro DSS and the other one off the top of my mind, but the other one in the middle as well, because obviously those assets will need to receive that flow coming in. As you said, you know, it will be ***** and I assume traded due to planning and conditions, etc. before discharge.

David Reginato 42:32

SD.

David Lee 42:45

But it gives us a bit of, I guess, understanding as to where that volume goes. And you know, that assumption we talked about earlier, would it be consolidated to one point or something like that? I think we've had, we have quite a few different stakeholders that have been working under a few different assumptions. And so that's the whole point of the workshop today, to get everyone together and to make sure we're all on the same page.

so that we can have clarity moving forward. So thank you for the presentation, Andrew. I think as, yeah.

Green, Andrew 43:11

David, just one last point I wanted to make, sorry, is if it suits people to move node CH9 laterally, we can look at that with you. It's not, we're not particularly hung up on that particular location for CH9. You can see there's a pond here, an expectation coming through. So there's a bit of leeway on

laterally on where you do that, but it's more about this is a really key water outlet point for us, node CH9. So somewhere in this zone, we need the ability to take the water out. And I think, I can't speak for Cleanway, but I'm sure that we'd be able to work together on that one as long as we've got an outlet point.

David Lee 43:51

Yeah, so I think at the end of the day, we need to take a balanced perspective once we complete all our background studies, looking at everything. But obviously, that's an outlet to serve the quarry and landfill site. So if there is a

preference, then we can work with that. I can see from the contours that does look like the lowest point, which is probably why we've

David Reginato 44:07

Yeah.

David Lee 44:10

We've chosen it. But yeah, if there's any updated plans or if we can have further discussions offline, I know Ava has been trying to have this meeting with cogency and clean away for some time. And so I think work's been done in the background and it's good to see that, you know, something's been presented. But yeah, if we can have some more discussions to sort of refine some of this information, I think that'd be really beneficial.

But yeah, thanks for the input into the workshop. Appreciate it.

Green, Andrew 44:37

Thanks, David.

Ava Rafatnejad 44:38

Thank you, Ian. Would you like to go next?

Ian Pham 44:41

Yeah, going back to those four node points, I think this is something that we need to, as part of the scheme, we want to allocate the exact requirements of objectives for those locations exactly. So we need, you know, and right now it's open based on this process.

David Reginato 44:47

Chew.

Ian Pham 44:59

But I think questions that we'll be asking is like, do you expect like the queue, how the queue gap will function? Like, would you potentially want to divert the larger flows to the waterways? Or would you retire back to like that minor existing pipe event? Does that means you need to do like a basin on your site?

things like that. So we will be interested to know, because if there is some, even some Q gap diversion into the waterways, then it's the time that we potentially increase the waterway size to kind of get those efficiencies done. So I'm not saying that needs to be ironed out in this meeting.

David Reginato 45:20

S.

Ian Pham 45:38

But we definitely will be hopefully discussing in a lot more detail about these four locations because we need to determine the assumptions and what can be set through this process because things might change in the future. So we might need to work through those. We will be working through those in more detail.

Oh, yeah. Dave, if you've got your hand out, I might pass it to you.

David Reginato 46:04

Yeah, apologies, I've double dip today in terms of meetings. I've come in a little bit late, but I think it was Andrew who had that up on the screen, and I'm assuming we're talking about four crossings, Ian, based on your conversation. What we really need to understand is Darren McField is probably going to go first before we resolve the quarry and clean away, and so...

What we need, particularly for Mandrew and Clean Away and other stakeholders, is that they're happy that we've allowed for.

enough flexibility for that site to work long term. So when we're sizing downstream infrastructure and splitting catchments, that there's flexibility to be able to do what you need to do in that land over its life. We just don't want to have it that we haven't thought about all those different scenarios you're talking about, Ian, and then we've put not enough flow in a certain catchment.

because that was where we could have allowed for it. So we really need to understand really long-term catchments of what wants to go where and then

have a lens on the short term. But ultimately, once it's all built, everyone's agreeing that it's reasonable what we've come up with in relation to the sizing of assets downstream.

Because they will be built first, and they'll be put into the scheme and funded, and land budgets and other things set through the PSP, so...

We don't have to get it exact, but for Andrew and others, it's more that you're happy that there's enough flexibility there for you to give water to it, that it's going to work longer term as an option, that it hasn't created perverse outcomes for anyone of having to fill adversely or whatever it is to get to drain to certain outlets because we haven't thought about it.

We don't really need everything, sort of just more of a catchment plan sort of scale of we're going to *****, but it's this much hectare to this outlet, this much hectare to that outlet, and any level of issues that you need that we can support, and we can then do the work through different fields of the actual sizing of those assets and work with stakeholders with them.

The endurment fields around what those assets look like.

Thanks, Ian.

Green, Andrew 48:07

David, who's our point of contact for a bit more of the detailed conversation that we've been talking about? Who do I talk to? Is it to Ava or?

David Reginato 48:13

That's Ian and David. That's Ian. Ava is coordinating all of Ava and Ian and David. We're certainly happy to, and we're happy to chat around technical matters, around what you're trying to do, what it means. But the scheme catchments that you've seen that Ava put up earlier in the session are up for change. We're happy to look at changing them, but we're trying to do that transparently through this group and others that if we do

Green, Andrew 48:16

Okay.

David Reginato 48:38

change it. People know why. There's a bit of evidence based around what we've done. But the original scheme catchments were probably based on a pre-quarry site. And so they're not, you can see those sort of north-south country boundaries, they're not really natural boundaries. And so we're happy to look at changing those.

But Deremit Fields, landowners in particular and the DTP need to understand, well, if we're pushing water to somewhere else while we're doing it, and that's where your work comes in of explaining how you want to drain the land, you know, all those issues of managing a quarry and managing a tip site and those sort of things, we need to be able to share that transparently across the group.

If we do change it significantly, and why we're changing it.

But yeah, certainly go through Ava and then we're happy to set up smaller groups as we need to to resolve some of these inputs.

Ava Rafatnejad 49:32

Thank you, David and Ian. Martin, I can see your hands up. Is there anything you want to add?

David Reginato 49:32

Ava.

Martein Bouwmeester 49:38

Yeah, sorry, my hand's up again. Obviously, directly downstream of this, so I have some opinions and thoughts, and definitely thoughts because we've been thinking about this parcel for a while. The Skeldon Creek line, which is obviously the diagonal one that heads up

Ava Rafatnejad 49:42

No problem.

Martein Bouwmeester 49:58

towards Hopkins Road. That's going to be the primary outfall for the majority of what we're talking about. At the moment, and I think pretty much everyone that's looked at this in any detail knows right now. Yes, it may be the low point

in the land, but it's essentially doesn't even operate as a creek, so we'll be forming it up.

to something that realistically functions, probably in using it for gap flow. Is there any reason why we can't push the gap flow from the quarry into that part of Skeldon Creek and pipe the, what was it, CH9 outfall?

pipe that down, say the Clark Road, which is the centre, the road running down the centre, immediately to the east of those two tributaries. I mean, still gives an outlet from the quarry that they are asking for, but avoids building multiple channels.

David Lee 50:57

I might answer this one, Ava, but I think, yeah, we're probably getting into a fair bit of the detail, and that's probably the next stage, which is developing drainage options. Just even from the discussion we've had, you can tell that some of that flow, you know, based on what the query and tip sites inputs have, you know.

Martein Bouwmeester 50:58

But that's, yeah, yeah. Yep.

David Lee 51:16

been provided, kind of split that catchment up so some of it goes into the other catchments a little bit more. And that just changes the dynamic even a little bit more. So we need to firm down on the assumptions first before we start going to further detail. But we will be exploring further details as we go just by just that, you know, even that discussion just then reduced the amount of catchment and the amount of water.

coming to that point. So I suppose I'm just worried that we're not going to resolve, you know, detail in this workshop specifically. And there'll be a process for that as we keep going and developing. But really, the point of today's workshop, I think, is to clarify those assumptions and get that input, because it really helps with that process.

Martein Bouwmeester 51:58

Okay, thanks, David. Yep.

Ava Rafatnejad 52:02

Thank you so much, everyone. I feel like we're still ahead of the time, 5 minutes, but I suggest we go to break, like a 10 minutes break until 11, 5. And then after we all are back, we can have, if on behalf of Boral,

If you can have James Caballeri's presentation, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

And feel free to turn off your camera if that's easier for you to ring Grech.

Mark Avery 57:36

T.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:02:50

I don't know if James Capillary is here, but if he is, would you like to start presenting on behalf of Borrow?

James Cappellari 1:03:01

Yep, sure, no problem.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:03:07

Hopefully, by then, most of the people will also be joining and can appreciate the presentation.

James Cappellari 1:03:13

No worries. Thank you, Ava.

So I guess just in terms of the Boral site, I think most parties on the call may be aware, but I guess just for everyone's benefit, the delivery of the Boral site will now be through a JV partnership with Boral and Dexus. That partnership is now finalised and it's been

made public. So both those two parties have come together and are really looking to progress these works quite quickly. They are quite conscious that it

does have a flow on effect to some of the downstream properties. So they are working to ensure that there are no delays to

others through the dermot fields. So I guess just on screen you can see we've got a bit of an existing conditions plan just showing where flows currently go through their respective catchments, through the master planning works to date and through the currently proposed developed condition.

We'll be sending just one one catchment down south through the Traganina scheme and via the clean away site. So that's that catchment in red, so A1 to A11. This is still subject to some minor tweaking. So this was developed prior to the JV partnership being formed. So we're probably around 90 to 95%.

complete in terms of finalising our catchment boundaries and we should have that resolved really in the next few weeks and we can pass that information through to the Melbourne Water team in terms of what we're proposing to discharge and into which locations. I guess probably what we can confirm in terms of the

outfall one or catchment A, that outfall there is proposed to be restricted back to pre-development levels. So that's been something that's been consistent in all our works to date. The discharge rate will be back to those pre-development levels. I think probably one area which we do need to probably...

workshop a little bit and it's probably more with the team at Cleanaway and WSP really is the outfall from the Boral site. I guess we do have quite a large catchment that does need a discharge S into that Truginina scheme and I guess through some of our

modelling works and concept designs. I guess what we're proposing at this stage would be a secondary constructed waterway located on the eastern side of Hopkins Road. And I guess from our review to date, that really is probably the most feasible and cost effective option for the scheme.

It looks like it can be integrated as well with what's currently proposed through the clean away site and may actually eliminate some of those drainage cross connections below Hopkins Road for the clean away facility. So I think it's probably something that could be a benefit.

To the Greta area, and...

So I guess what you can see on the bottom left of the screen there is just a proposed cross section. It's A 45 metre wide constructed waterway through there. That is still subject to, I guess, finalisation of the upstream modelling and finalising those scheme boundaries. But I think that's something that

That may work for this area, and again, that's something that we'd still need to discuss with Clean Away and does require some further workshopping there.

I guess, yeah, that's really the update from our side for the Traganina scheme. I guess, yeah, probably the message that Dexus and Boral just wanted to reiterate is that we are working quite swiftly and hoping to have all this resolved in the next few weeks.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:07:10

Thank you so much, James, for the presentation. I can see Andrew's hands up. Would you like to share anything with us?

Green, Andrew 1:07:20

Yeah, just a quick one, James, that waterway you're showing on the left of the drawing, is that in the road easement, is it, rather than in the quarry property?

James Cappellari 1:07:31

I believe that one, a portion of that is actually within the quarry property through that buffer up against Hopkins Road. I guess from the information that we had early on was that that may be possible to be facilitated through that area.

Green, Andrew 1:07:49

Oh yeah, we need to, we need to talk offline then.

James Cappellari 1:07:52

Yep.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:07:55

Thank you very much, both. I think I may now start sharing my screen. We'll continue the discussion.

Okay, I believe you already had two presentations for the focus area to continue with this speaking stakeholders feedback. I had Clean Away and WSP

and I was going to ask, I mean, the presentation was very helpful, but as you mentioned that there will be some update.

date. Is there any development plan that you're planning to have sometime soon or what is the status? Is that something that you can share with us?

James Cappellari 1:08:45

Sorry, Ava, is that for the borrow side itself?

Ava Rafatnejad 1:08:48

It's actually for Andrew Green on behalf of existing quarry, if there is any development plan is being prepared or what is the status for quarry, existing quarry site.

James Cappellari 1:08:50

Sorry.

Green, Andrew 1:09:04

Yeah, Ava, I'll let Cleenaway respond to you direct on that. I know that there's something fairly imminent that will be coming out. Perhaps I'll just stay in my lane.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:09:07

Mmh. Yeah. Okay.

Okay, all good. If there isn't anyone from Clean Away,

to discuss this, we can discuss later. And then I've understood from Boro's presentation that because on outfall one, you have already had some different amounts of flow coming down, downstream. So my understanding was that you already

calculated the flow around 10 Q mix going to South, I mean, on the proposed channel on your presentation. So do you think this is something, I mean, the amount is something around 10 Q mix? Am I right? Can you please confirm that?

David Lee 1:10:07

I think Ava, that's probably a little bit detailed, but I think it's been a good discussion. I think that presentation from Boral has really, you know, highlighted the key assumption that needs to be, you know, I think so far we've agreed to take, it's been agreed to take, you know, had offline as a discussion, but

really, it's that north-south connection that, you know, we are concerned with. It sounds like we've got a good resolution with the number of crossings and, you know, how much, how we're going to break down the sub-areas of the quarry to drain, but there's still a little bit unresolved on that north-south connection. So I think if we can have a separate offline discussion between

Ava Rafatnejad 1:11:05

All good.

David Lee 1:11:06

Everyone, if all the parties are happy to continue that discussion offline, yeah.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:11:10

Oh, good. Please feel free to share anything with us about this area later and we can always discuss or have some separate meetings and discussions. I will continue with focus area 3 as shown on the plan here with the Skeleton Creek. I hand over to David Lee to discuss the objective for this area.

David Lee 1:11:33

Yeah, and I also just want to raise as well, back on focus area too, that our job is really to get clarity around these assumptions. We do have timelines that we need to move ahead with. And so, yeah, if we if we don't get that input or we can't, you know, reach agreement or get some sort of consensus, then

At some stage, you know, if we have to make high level assumptions, we'll have to make those high level assumptions to proceed with planning. But ideally, you know, we're holding these workshops to get as much goodwill as we can to work together and, you know, coordinate an agreeable approach forwards. But at the same time, you know,

completely understand that we weren't always see completely eye to eye, but where we can find, you know, similar ground or alignment, then I think that really works well for us going forwards. I'll jump on to focus area 3 now, which is really looking more internally into Skeleton Creek. Most of those focus areas so far have been looking external.

To the Durham Fields, and so now, well, this is probably more, you know, the major trunk of it, which is Skeleton Creek, and I guess the challenges are really, Milan Water has to balance, you know, our objectives with, I guess.

different values and also, I'll call it positive development outcomes, but really trying to get the right balance between everyone and really understand the different constraints and opportunities that we can, that we need to, you know, I guess,

work through as we start developing drainage options for the area. I guess as part of this, this is probably a little bit more high level in terms of trying to get more of that input and understand if there are potentially preferential locations of, for example, drainage, water quality assets, if there's any configurations that

that can be helped, that, you know, can help to optimize certain development potential outcomes. An example is, you know, we've heard from some of these sites that they have issues with access, with the sites being separated, concerns like that, that potentially we can address.

would be fantastic. And existing supplementary background study. So for example, you know, we've talked to Martin and he's provided us with survey, like they were ahead of us and they did survey of Boundary Road and they provided it and that was very helpful as well as some other background flora fauna studies. So if there's any information we're not aware of, this is really a chance to provide it so that we can feed it into our process.

and that can help, you know, inform a better outcome. So I think I'll hand it back to Ava now.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:14:23

Thanks, David. So for the next section, we have ESR's presentation. I'm going to stop sharing and not sure if Martin is going to present on behalf of ESR. If you just let me know, I can give you the presentation access.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:14:41

Yeah, it's Ava, it's me, yes, and I do need to share access, please.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:14:44

Yeah. Yes, of course.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:14:51

You guys will be sick of my voice by the time we finish.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:14:54

No problem at all. I'm sorry, I'm still trying to find the.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:15:12

Have you? No, no.

All right, I thought it was me, Ava. I was looking at one of, what haven't I done?

Ava Rafatnejad 1:15:24

Are you with the same name on the lease? Okay, I think you have the access now.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:15:40

Oh, there we go. Got it.

Tell me when you got a picture of the, call it the interface document that we've all been, I'm going to zoom in a little bit more. Okay, so look, no fancy pictures here, but in essence, a markup of the plan that we are all

Ava Rafatnejad 1:15:51

Yes, we can see.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:16:06

familiar with, hopefully at this point in time. And I've got some six points here. Amazingly, in the first hour we've been together, we've actually answered some of these already, but I'll still touch on them all just to give the flavor of ESR's

position on where we're at. We're definitely pushing ahead and as David said, we've provided a fair bit of background information that's already occurred at ESR's in terms of survey and cultural heritage for Dana foreign fauna assessment. So we're definitely chomping at the bit to get

Going on this, and to be honest, the quicker we can clarify some of these assumptions that are better for us at ESR, particularly being and that in line of what David Reginato said about being the main downstream, because, as you can see from the Denmark Fields PSP.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:17:04

Richard.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:17:04

a couple of the main retarding basin that lands actually sit in both ESR land holdings. So we're really, really keen to get this sorted early as possible and lock in some of the least understanding of the flows that are coming in. So we

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:17:15

Sorry. Shane.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:17:23

we can figure out what we're doing regarding footprint in that regard. So just running through the points on the screen. So item one, which relates to income from the quarry lands, and we already touched on that, that there was a desire for discharge to occur at that.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:17:23

Yes. Yeah. But.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:17:44

That was one of our queries. We weren't sure whether that was going to be a requirement or not. Sounds like that's on the wish list from Andrew. So thank you for that clarification. And then it just opened up the idea if that was actually not needed, whether that tributary.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:17:58

I think a lot of this needs to be.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:18:03

would be there at all. ESR will be pushing to and hopefully working with Melbourne Water that if we do connect in here with discharge from the quarry site, we could actually run an outflow along the existing easement. There's a

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:18:09

I actually think it would have been better to 12.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:18:23

a large easement that runs diagonally through the corner here essentially makes that land essentially useless in terms of the shape. So discharging a drainage channel or pipe along that alignment would maximize the minimal impact, I suppose.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:18:33

Yeah. Like, I think we just need to, like, I don't think we need to, like, work. Stop.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:18:44

make it best outcome and then lie and connect it back into the Skeldon Creek as fast as possible. Still ends up in the wetlands retarding basin, but it just gets there as our quickest route. So that's something we'll be hopefully

working with in order to achieve. And that's my point to there if the tributary is required.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:18:46

On issues. Yeah. Barry. So we can retain the train. It's providing. Like.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:19:06

can we realign to Skullen Creek via the existing easement? That's point 2. Point 3 is regarding Skullen Creek itself. I touched on my earlier comments today that at the moment Skullen Creek is essentially non-existent. You could walk through our site and

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:19:10

Chicks. Exit.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:19:25

barely noticed that you had crossed it because it's only about 300 mill deep. So it has no real existing capacity. Based on that, we are very confident we'll probably be building a formalized channel as opposed to utilizing the existing natural terrain.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:19:31

Yep. Yeah, definitely. Okay.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:19:46

So that's just more of a FYI for Melm Water. And if there is a difference of opinion on that, we better quickly talk about that because I can't understand why. And then item 4 and item 6 are actually the same. We want to work with Melm Water to consolidate the wetlands layout.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:19:50

Oh, okay. Tracy.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:20:06

to optimize the usable land and the most suitable layout for our industrial sites. So that would probably be pushing everything across to one, to the western boundary in this case, and in terms of the wood creeks across to

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:20:08

Yeah.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:20:26

the eastern boundary. So that's essentially our points. I had touched on.5 before in discussions with Andrew about confirming that there was flows coming in from here and that they would be ***** to pre-developed flows. So we've already talked about that in an earlier comment that I

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:20:35

I don't know. Sorry, I... Sam.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:20:46

raised. So that's pretty much what ESR is looking at trying to achieve. In the outcome, it doesn't differ in intent from the current ESS in terms of it captures all the capture points. It's just trying to optimize outcomes.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:20:47

Any specifics? issues with the landscape.

Think some of it. Yeah.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:21:05

That's me, thank you.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:21:09

Thank you very much, Martin. Yes.

For the presentation, so I'll go back to the main presentation now.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:21:13

But I think so much.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:21:20

Um, okay, um, so...

I think a little bit ahead, okay.

Green, Andrew 1:21:24

Sorry, Ava, could I just ask one more question before you move on?

Ava Rafatnejad 1:21:27

Yes, please. No, no, no, all good. Please go ahead.

Green, Andrew 1:21:30

Could we just re-share that presentation, Martin, just to...

Martein Bouwmeester 1:21:35

Chew.

Yeah, yeah.

Yep, tell me when you got it.

Green, Andrew 1:21:46

Martin, does your land go right down to the southeast corner of Durham Fields PSP?

sort of next to where it says number six.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:21:55

No, it stops, it stops at the the wetlands I've drawn in blue.

Green, Andrew 1:21:57

No, OK.

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:21:58

Yeah, yeah. Yeah.

Green, Andrew 1:22:02

Yeah, no, that's fine. Great, thanks.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:22:03

Yeah, yep, yep, yep. That's the limit of our, that's our eastern most boundary. Yep.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:22:16

Hub.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:22:17

Anyone else have any questions about the image?

Any comments on my on my on my position?

Ava Rafatnejad 1:22:25

David Grech, would you like to go?

David Reginato 1:22:29

No, I'd like some comments, I think. Typically from Melbourne's perspective, waterways have two requirements. One, it's a flow requirement. Generally, we start building constructive waterways or using open system because the

catchment's big enough that you can't safely pipe it and use overland flows in a safe manner.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:22:29

Yeah. Haha.

David Reginato 1:22:49

For us, that's one driver of when it's an open waterway, when it's not, is a flow requirement, and the other is an environmental requirement of is the current creek, the values, significant enough that we need to maintain it in its current form. And so I think there's probably work that David will talk about around us doing the background information around that to confirm the latter.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:23:11

Yeah.

David Reginato 1:23:12

So if the values are low, then generally we look to realign creeks and do things that are logical for good planning outcomes. But if the science says that there's critters or other things there that we need to protect, then realignment of creeks is not always supported. So at this point,

that's understood that you need depth as well. We're also cognizant of you're doing significant industrial land and you're probably going to be two to three metres deep by the time you drain your sites because of pipe sizes and getting things underground. So we've got to understand that you've got to create outfalls that are of a logical.

configuration to support development. So the latter of round, you know, can you realign that, you know, the creek and do the blue shape or something similar? That's really based on the science work that we're doing around background. Can we do that? Is it the right thing to do from a community perspective or?

Do we need to protect any of the original form of the original creek, whatever that is? I'll use the scientist to tell me that, but ultimately, if the values are low, then generally, historically, we've channelised creeks to suit the planning outcome, whether it's a residential or in deployment land in this perspective.

That'll be driving a decision making outside of anything else. I just want to put that on the table for everyone. It's consistent with what we should be doing is we're a science and evidence-based sort of group that if it's low value, then we should be, you know, planning should probably drive some of the thinking in particular. You can engineer out 1000 different ways.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:24:34

Yep.

David Reginato 1:24:53

The only other thing I will put on the table for yourself, Martin and others, is, yeah, we're treating Derrimat Fields as its own little local catchment. As you can tell from the conversation, you know, Boral's going to be treating and retarding in their own. Yeah, Matt Atkinson through the original PSP is doing the same at the upstream end of Skelton Creek. The quarry will be doing its own thing in the future.

So the location of assets, yeah, those blue blobs I call it, needs to be able to service both sides of the creek potentially to treat and ***** the local catchment. So the final form of where they sit and how big they are will be a, you know, in particular local catchment type.

scenario. So we just want to put that on the table that, you know, with evidence, can you drain enough of the eastern catchment of, or the western catchment of Dermot Fields into those assets? How do you get water through the creek, you know, right through the middle of that square BLOB? All those things will work through in the PSP process. But that's the positive of what we're doing in this is Dermot Fields is really its own little small

Martein Bouwmeester 1:25:51

Yeah.

David Reginato 1:25:54

sub-catchment from a retarding treatment perspective because everyone else is already doing it.

Upstream. Thanks, Ava.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:26:03

Thank you, David. Probably before I go to my slides, now that you are sharing, Martin, I may ask if there is anyone from DTP Roads. We have a question regarding the location CH9 outlet point CH9 that

because it will be located on OMR, whether the location of a channel or an entrance is included there within OMR. Is there anyone from DTP roads, probably Daniel Zaslona or any of the colleagues that can help with that?

Nigel G Smith (DTP) 1:26:46

That level of detail is probably not in the OMR design. It's at a concept design at the moment. It's not at a detailed design. That would have to be considered as part of a future upgrade when we do detailed design and get funding for the project.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:27:00

Thanks, Nigel.

Okay, is there any other question for this area on Skeleton Creek and from ESR?

Marteen Bouwmeester 1:27:16

No, I just want to thank David for that clarification and totally understand what he's saying.

Obviously, depending on the outcome of all the investigations, our wish list optimal outcome drainage functionality, but yeah, noted David about, and the PSP is clearly capturing the need for us to actually investigate those areas for.

For significance, as well. So, yep, I will, thank you for that input.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:27:48

Thank you, Martin. Thank you very much.

Okay, we discussed focus area 3 and I will continue with focus area 4 to discuss the last point in the remote fields PSB. It is shown here. I will hand over to David Lee to discuss the objectives.

David Lee 1:28:09

Yes, so I think some of this, there's quite a bit of interaction between the focus areas and some of this has probably been answered. You know, again, we've talked about clarifying the number and location of outlets from the quarry site and the number of crossings of the OMR. This is more, I suppose, we'd call it local drainage.

rather than sort of regional drainage. So we're looking at sort of more of these local assets on these properties in the balance of Durham Fields. And they probably haven't given these assets as much attention as some of the other areas. And so we really want to create a focus area just for these to make sure that we're capturing

all the input and preferences. I think we've had some emails back and forth with IFM, which is the very southeast pocket, but it would be very good to hear from, you know, all the stakeholders here and see if there are any preferences. I know we've had some back and forth correspondence with, I think, DPM and others, so.

Um, yeah, that's it. I'll hand back to Ava.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:29:09

Thank you.

Thank you very much, David. So I will continue with seeking stakeholders feedback. I'm going to start with Vic Track, probably if Ian or Kate from Vic Track are in the meeting. And just to let everyone know, there is a railway line here passing through the eastern boundary of the remote fields PSB. So is there any

concerns or anything that we need to know about the railway crossing here that Ian, you would like to share with us?

Iain MacInnes 1:29:46

Probably not so much a concern, just we know it's there. There's a bridge that was built in when they built the line. So on one side has nothing leading into it and the other side has a creek or a waterway going away. So I gather it would need to be dug out.

Like, like some of the other ones, so it's just a matter of going through that process of talking to us, talking to the Dylan.

Yeah, you guys are Melbourne Water between all of us and DTP. So at the moment, it's DTP.

It actually might be. It's coming over, that whole line is coming over to Vicki tracks, so it's in state of flux. So, yeah.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:30:34

Again, Martin, I can see your hands up. Please ask any questions. Yeah.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:30:37

Sorry, quick question, and this is more of a higher level workshop type question. Focus area 4, is there any way we could break that into focus area 4 for the Woods Road DSS and focus area 5 for the Doughty's Drain?

DSS with two separate outfalls. They actually essentially have two separate upstream catchments. We could solve.

one while working on the other still. Is that possible? It's a bit of a selfish request because obviously the Woods Road is the bottom of ESR's land, but that's also our first stage. We're trying to get off the ground and would love to essentially lock that down and move forward on.

I'm trying to lock in some assumptions on that one.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:31:31

Thank you. Thank you, Martin.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:31:31

Thoughts?

Ian Pham 1:31:34

I think.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:31:34

So.

Ian Pham 1:31:35

I was going to say that could be a goal. I think we're still confirming those upstream assumptions. So we want to make sure everything's connected so that no, like we include all assumptions of upstream catchment. But I think, yes, when we get to a point, we'll probably, they probably will be separated because once we confirm that they're.

function independently and yeah I think that's a good idea we can do.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:32:03

Cheers, thank you.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:32:03

Thank you, Ian. Andrew.

Green, Andrew 1:32:08

Sorry, there's a common theme here. We're both very interested in this, Martin and I. Can I just register an interest in the right hand side of...

Ava Rafatnejad 1:32:09

Yes.

Green, Andrew 1:32:18

Focus area 4, and in particular, I didn't quite follow what Ian McGinnis just said around the...

the intent to cross underneath the VicTrack future property if it's not theirs at the moment. Are we saying that there's not currently a drain underneath the VicTrack line or is it that it's there and it needs to be cleared out and modified in some way?

Iain MacInnes 1:32:45

Yeah, it's a bridge that's been built as part of the project. So Melbourne Water will have, pardon me, participated in that design. So it's quite large.

See it from space type thing, but it does look like some of the other ones that have been put in that they.

Dig it down, but then they backfill it, and then they come out and clear it out later; they're doing one further down the down the line at the moment.

Green, Andrew 1:33:14

Okay, because that's a really key bit of downstream infrastructure for us. As we talked about earlier, over the water that's coming down the east side of the existing quarry, which is actually a landfill coming down Christie's Road, needs to join into.

Iain MacInnes 1:33:31

Mhm.

Green, Andrew 1:33:33

where the red text saying 4088 is, yeah. So even though there's not currently a drain showing there, there's a very clear intent. There certainly was when all the permitting happened for the landfill back in 2018. There's a connection from the southeast corner of the existing quarry to

Iain MacInnes 1:33:38

Yeah.

Green, Andrew 1:33:52

where your red note thing is there over. So I just want to make sure that everyone's still thinking about that and not forgetting that little important link.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:34:05

Thank you, Andrew. John Matthews, would you like to raise anything?

John Mathios 1:34:10

Just to ease your concerns there, Andrew, I'll be talking about IFM site, which is IFM investors site, which is in that southeastern corner shortly. And I've addressed that and there's a few topics around that. So maybe hang around for that.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:34:30

Would you like to present for us?

John Mathios 1:34:35

Yeah, sure. No, happy to happy to share our stuff, I Pham.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:34:36

Yeah, of course. Yeah, yeah, all good. Sorry, that was not on our agenda, but if you're happy to have your presentation, I will just give you access.

John Mathios 1:34:45

Thanks, Ava.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:34:52

Your presenter now, please go ahead.

John Mathios 1:34:55

Thanks, Ava, yeah.

So I'll keep it brief, guys. It's just a concise slide deck. And I think David and Ian both mentioned this, that the workshop is more about just flagging some key issues, high level concerns, assumptions at this point in time. The intent of this presentation is not to resolve anything to the nth degree.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:34:59

Thank you.

John Mathios 1:35:18

That's going to be a case for down the track once we've firmed down some assumptions and have got a bit of an understanding of how the catchment's behaving. So what we've really done is look at the work completed by Melbourne Water today, which is just that presentation that was shared about a month ago, as well as some existing asset information along the rail corridor on the east side of the

PSP, which Ava you kindly provided some existing information there for us, which was helpful. So, without further ado, I'll just share my screen for everybody.

So let me just put this in presenter mode so you guys can see. Can everyone see that?

Yeah, cool.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:35:55

Yes, we can see that.

John Mathios 1:35:56

Yeah, great. So our site, we're representing IFM investors who control this land holding in the southeast corner of the PSP. That's referred to as 744 Boundary Road is the site address. And for context purposes, that's where it's shown in the overall mix of drainage schemes that we have in this area.

For context, the site is really well positioned from a servicing perspective and a delivery perspective with direct rd access to Boundary Road. And we're fortunate enough to have a number of existing services at our boundary, which puts us in a good position from an early start perspective as one of the key developers and parcels in this PSP with

a number of existing services at the boundary. That's what's existing proximate to our site. So we do have, I think it was correctly outlined earlier on in the meeting about a sewer outfall. Just for context, obviously, we're here to talk about drainage, but just to let everybody know, there is an existing branch sewer that sits on the east side of the railway line.

which this site would need to connect into, as well as provision for servicing some upstream properties. There's existing water mains as well on Boundary

Road. The key one is the existing VicTrack rail crossing. That exists today. This is just a 3D image from Google Maps that you can see along here.

It's just worth noting that consistent with all the rail culverts that we've seen in this corridor by the RRL, it's a bridge crossing. The ultimate profile of the waterway was excavated out during the construction of the RRL and that's what's shown in this blue line here. But obviously the RRL was built

over a decade ago now, if not longer. So there was essentially a soft backfill that was provided underneath the rail to basically just chattelise any surface flows. So the intent is that when this land eventually develops, this backfill will need to be removed so we can actually drain the site based on ultimate depths and levels.

We've been able to source this information from VicTrack, which've been really helpful in getting us to this point. So just an item of note, it's existing, it's very large, and the depths to us appear sufficient to actually gravitate this site as well as upstream catchments.

Moving on promptly, just for everybody's notice.

A big question for our site, and I'll look out for hands, but if I don't see any hands, just yell out if you want to ask me any questions. A big question for our site is how this catchment is dealt with, which is the cleaner waste site, which I think Andrew spoke to earlier in some good amount of detail.

So for us, the main assumption is obviously to hold what the drainage scheme is assumed. And I think this was marked on Andrew's plan earlier, which is it's basically assumed that this catchment discharges to this location here in the southeast corner and continues to head south along the railway line, culverts along the railway line.

on the west side of the rail and continues to form that discharge. It's probably worth noting that there are, I suppose, opportunities for alternative discharge points for this green catchment, which is upstream of our site and upstream of the PSP area, appreciating that it will eventually be...

bisected by the OMR, as well as some existing water main infrastructure that's there, which I'll get to in the next slide. So one key item that we've identified is that there are a series of circular culverts that exist roughly at this location here. So one property up

north of us in the Dermot Fields PSP area, approximately to this drainage scheme node here, where it says A4. So there is about 6 barrel drains there that exist at the surface. There, unlike the bridge crossing that I shared earlier, obviously that's got a soft backfill.

that will get removed and excavated out for future drainage works or developed drainage. These culverts obviously sit at the surface and potentially drain a lot of surface runoff. But I suppose what I'm outlining here is that there might be opportunities to consider the splitting of flows if it works.

potentially running some overland flows through here or sending some flows east of the culverts and crossing the railway line and coming across here into this existing drainage network. It is worth noting that there is an existing drainage line on the east side of the railway line that runs along here.

which starts as a 1200 diameter drain all the way up here and continues due south and turns and discharges as an 1800. That obviously discharges a bit of development to the east of the railway line, which is, this is Agar Drive, so it discharges a lot of that Agar Drive industrial estate.

and takes it due south to the waterway down here, which eventually discharges our site. So I suppose the purpose of this is just to highlight that there are alternative discharge routes for this site, as opposed to continuing down south and taking it here, or potentially opportunities to split the flow that we'd

we think it would be worthwhile considering. It's also worth noting that, obviously, the cleaner way site does have a major water main that runs along its southern boundary. So that's the St Albans to Werribee water main, which runs along here.

That sits at a really good depth of 2 1/2 to 3 metres, so it clashes nicely with any drainage that you want to build, which is, I think David correctly mentioned, that we're expecting drainage to be in the order of 2 to 3 metres, so it's certainly correct there. So any drainage crossings,

of the regional rail link will need to consider that, because obviously that sits at a depth that will definitely conflict with any major stormwater drain that you take through here, unless you...

consider taking any all flows over the top of it, of course. Just for clarity, this alignment through here is a horizontal deviation. It's not a vertical deviation of the water main. So it's not something that's

being future-proofed for a drainage crossing. It's very much a horizontal deviation. The vertical geometry remains at sort of that depth. So again, something to consider.

And obviously you have the OMR going through here, hence why there might be opportunities to consider heading east as well, and maybe look at what that does to the floodplain further east in the Laverton Creek outfall area, which we

understand is heavily flood prone. So again, another option that could be looked at.

or a hybrid of the two. Back to this slide, the assumption that we've held, of course, is that for the time being, sorry,

The assumption that we've held is that the pre-developed flows discharge at this location and continue south and feed into this wetland here. And that wetland, though Tarling Basin, has an outlet at the railway culverts. We've developed an initial concept for that wetland on that assumption.

which picks up the catchment coming from the north with the sediment pond here, as well as catchment coming in here through the Forsyth Road drain extension. So Forsyth Road drain extends through here. So there will be a bit of catchment that comes in from the west, that will be intercepted by Forsyth Road, the Forsyth Road Road Reserve, which is a

I think a connector or a secondary arterial rd. So it sort of makes sense for that to intercept a significant amount of catchment and take it into this settlement pond and then the residual catchment bound by Forsyth Road and the railway line would get picked up in here. We've also identified that the wetland is

where it's located on our site layout is a bit detached from the railway culverts. So there might need to be provision for a short channelised outlet along here from the southeastern corner of the wetland to the culverts. So just something to identify.

That's really it for our site. I thought I'd just try and keep it as quick as possible, leaving time for questions. There are a couple of next steps here and questions that we've outlined, but happy to share this with Melbourne Water once we've come after this meeting and we can talk about those things further. But

Yeah. Just wanted to highlight those options and also just caveat that this work has been very high level and it's just based on the information we've received to date. So it's subject to technical reports and any site constraints that get uncovered during the course of the PSP process.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:45:16

Thank you very much, John. Is there any question or can we continue to the next section?

I will start sharing the screen again. So I will continue because I will, I'm a little bit mindful of time. So we had a discussion about status of background studies and I hand over to David Lee to discuss about this one.

David Lee 1:45:48

Yeah, so I guess just separate to this whole workshop, we are undertaking works in the background as well. So we have reached out to a number of landowners. You've probably received emails from me bugging you about access for our surveyors to go on to sites and pretty much to survey all sort of drainage crossings of surrounding roads of dermot fields.

We are doing proving of APA gas mains and also the St. Albans to Werribee water main, which has come up a bit in this workshop as well, in particular the crossing of Skelton Craig. But we're strategically proving a few different locations that we think might be important going forwards.

There's a separate environmental background study, that of which we're expecting a draft report in early June, so very soon. In terms of flood study and modelling, we're currently reviewing the Skeleton Creek road model and cleaning that up. We expect to put together quite a refined scope.

There are, there's quite a bit of information that is being provided from different stakeholders, such as Matt Atkinson Estate and others, that we see as valuable in updating that model. Obviously, there's a lot of moving parts, but we'll be looking to get that started shortly. And finally, the development of drainage options.

That is a big piece of work and we're looking to feed everything into that. So it'll be dependent on the survey, environmental flood study, and the outcomes of these workshops and stakeholder engagement. So we're looking to provide all the discussions that we've had as part of these workshops and bring them all in and

Obviously, there's a bit of a balancing act for our consultants and others to review that information and respond to it. So that's a bit of a status update as to what we're doing in the background. Do you want to move to the next slide, Ava?

Ava Rafatnejad 1:47:49

Yes, of course. I'm now going to provide a summary of all of the discussions, including all of the priority areas that we discussed from #1 to #4. We

discussed Mount Atkinson as the first location, and we would appreciate to hear more from them about their

drainage preference, noting that the preference from Melbourne Water is to convey the flow from west to east. And then we also talked about existing quarry site. We had a presentation and I think we can have some conversation to see if we can receive a development plan later.

And then I think the third location was about ESR land and Skeleton Creek. And we can have further discussion as the next steps to confirm the location of the assets and the configuration. And about the 4th area, there

we can separate the two areas, the ESR land and also the IFM investors land, because the two of them have drainage assets. And then we also had IFM investors presentation, and then we heard about the drainage asset status. So

David Lee 1:49:11

Ava, I might jump in as well and just provide a bit of my understanding just to confirm some of the outcomes of this workshop that we've arrived at and just everyone, anyone feel free to clarify if you disagree. I guess with focus area one, what I've sort of heard from the landowners is that they're supportive of that diversion, the move of flow from west to east.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:49:12

Yes, please. Yeah, yeah. Mhm.

David Lee 1:49:33

north of the OMR. Now, obviously, there's all those background studies that still need to feed into the process, but it sounds like they're on board with that. It also sounds like we may hear from Mount Atkinson Estate in relation to those drainage crossings of Hopkins Road going forwards.

Focus area 2, I'm hearing from the quarry and landfill that it's preferable to have multiple crossings of the OMR and multiple outlets, as Andrews presented earlier, split across the different DSS or development services schemes. And I think there's a little bit there unresolved about that north to south.

drainage connection through the quarry site, or you know, whether it's east or west of Hopkins Road, that needs a continued discussion between Boral Dexis

and Cleanaway offline. In terms of focus area 3, I'll just say as well with focus area 2 that that is probably our largest priority.

for Dexus, I mean for Durbin Fields at the moment to clarify that north-south connection. So we'll be following that one up shortly. With focus area 3, I think we've heard quite a bit from ESR in terms of what sort of impacts them, what their priorities and constraints are. Sounds good. And the same thing with focus area 4 as well. We've heard that

That's probably the first stage, and so very keen for that to go ahead. Also heard from IFM investors in relation to the amount of work they've done, which was looking really positive, and it sounded like there was some interaction with the quarry site as well, with that catchment to the north, as well as some of those constraints that have been identified, such as that water main. So very helpful for us to

to get our heads around. So that's a bit of a summary as to all the different takeaways that we've gotten for these priority focus areas. And it's been very, very productive and helpful. So thanks for all the input. I'll just put it out there in case I've made any errors or anything, and anyone wants to clarify that a bit better.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:51:37

Thank you very much. Is there any additional point?

David Lee 1:51:38

No, whatever.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:51:41

Sorry, David, what was that?

Oh, good. Thank you.

David Lee 1:51:47

Point and we summarize the workshop there, yeah.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:51:49

Thank you, Martin. Is there anything you would like to add?

Martien Bouwmeester 1:51:51

I.

Yeah, those focus areas. Did I take from that that you were focusing on focus area 2 ahead of any other?

Like, is there any have you got an order or of or what and what is gonna put the effects on?

In that priorities, or is there a random order, or is it all at once?

David Lee 1:52:13

They're all priorities, I think, Martin, and we've been really keen to get the input. I just think that there's one, I think focus area 2 has a certain item in there that's unresolved that I think is really a key assumption around how that flow is coming from Raven Hall down south.

And there's a bit of unclarity, you know, between the different assumptions that everyone's adopting. And so that's something that just still needs to be resolved. Whereas I think with other focus areas, we've heard quite a lot of information and it sounds quite positive. So we just need to go back and process that and work with all the rest of the information that we received.

But I think focus area too, there's a little bit there unresolved. So we just need to follow up on that and get all the main parties together to really hash that out. And yeah, there might not be a resolution. It might be something that we might have to proceed with an assumption, for example. But we need to sort of take that, bring that to a head.

A little bit, so I describe it, yeah.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:53:16

Thank you, David. I will continue with the next steps from our end. I think from now on, we will work together based on what we discussed today to understand the next steps. Please feel free to share your feedback with us anytime. You can always email me or we are happy to discuss with you further if there was any questions or you needed to have more discussion.

Martein Bouwmeester 1:53:17

The.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:53:40

And then from our end, we're also working on a list of assumptions, and then we will hope to share them with you probably through Let's Talk page. And as David also mentioned, background studies are ongoing from our end, which includes the environmental studies and also the survey.

Um... Okay, I will go to the last slide. Is there any final question that you would like to raise? Any questions or anything to share with us?

Jamie Fowler 1:54:17

Sorry, Ava, just one question for me. Jamie Fowler from ASR. Just wondering about timing on the next workshops, if there's any indication of what we could be looking ahead for.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:54:19

Yes, please. Mm. I think it's still to be confirmed if we need to see if we need another workshop or is that something that we can resolve by separate meetings with the landowners and not specifically workshops, but we will be working from our end to

to understand what is the best approach based on the today's discussion.

Jamie Fowler 1:54:56

Thank you.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:54:57

Thank you. Is there any other questions?

All good. Thank you very much, everyone, for joining us today. Very much appreciate the presentations during the workshop. And please feel free to raise your feedback or send us anything or questions from now on. Thank you.

David Lee 1:55:17

I might just add in as well, Ava, that we will be putting together a bit of a summary just of this workshop. It might just be like one or two pages just to provide the outcomes of what we've discussed, in particular to the focus areas. Yeah, just wanted to add that in. Okay, thank you, everyone. Appreciate it.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:55:19

Yes, please. Thank you, David. Thank you, everyone. Thanks so much.

Ian Pham 1:55:37

Thanks, everyone. Thanks. Thank you, too.

Marteen Bouwmeester 1:55:38

Thanks, Mum. Water team. Cheers. Thank you.

Andrew McDonald 1:55:38

Is that it? Thanks, Ava. Thanks, Ava. Thanks.

Ava Rafatnejad 1:55:40

Thank you, bye. Thanks, guys.

Andrew Matheson 1:55:42

Thank you.