

From: [REDACTED]
To: [ntepa.epa](#)
Cc: [Das.NTG](#)
Subject: Project Ares submission - referral and draft Terms of Reference
Date: Sunday, 16 August 2026 11:22:06 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

As a Territory resident, I am writing to object to the proposed Project Ares data centre and gas power station at Murrarji Station.

The project's creeks drain about 80 km to Lake Woods, a nationally important wetland that fills with up to 116,000 waterbirds. The referral admits the connection but has not assessed the downstream effect. The project should not proceed until the NT EPA requires assessment of the project's impacts on Lake Woods and the creeks that feed it.

Project Ares would run on a gas plant of about 1,000 MW, bigger than the Territory's main power station, yet the referral will not say where the gas comes from. In this region, new gas means fracked Beetaloo shale gas. I object unless the NT EPA requires that the source of the gas be disclosed and its full lifecycle emissions assessed, including the upstream fracking.

Threatened wildlife, including the Greater Bilby, has already been recorded here, and other listed species are likely present. The proponent has relied largely on desktop review rather than looking properly on the ground. The project should not be signed off until the NT EPA requires field surveys for these threatened species across the whole project footprint before any decision on impacts.

Up to 4 billion litres a year would be drawn from the Cambrian Limestone Aquifer for this one project, a large share of the region's allocation, on top of the demands of cotton, petroleum and a co-located ammonia plant on the same water. This must not be approved until the NT EPA requires a full, cumulative assessment of whether this level of groundwater extraction is sustainable before any approval.

Assessing the data centre on its own hides its true footprint: it relies on a gas pipeline and is tied to a neighbouring ammonia project, and splitting these apart understates the combined impact. The project should not be signed off until the NT EPA requires that the whole project and its connected parts, including the gas pipeline and the ammonia plant, be assessed together rather than piece by piece.

So far the environmental work is mostly desk research, done without surveying the creek lines or the country downstream in the seasons when it matters. I oppose this unless the NT EPA requires field surveys across the full project footprint, in appropriate seasons, before the scope and level of assessment are locked in.

Up to 19,150 hectares, a footprint about 14 km across, could be cleared or disturbed under what is proposed. The project should not proceed until the NT EPA requires that the assessment be carried out against the full maximum footprint, with any later reduction made a binding condition of approval rather than an assumption.

I do not believe this project should be approved until these matters are fully and independently assessed. I call on the NT EPA to require them in the Terms of Reference

before any decision is made. Thank you for considering my submission.

Rebecca

Get [Outlook for Android](#)