

From: [REDACTED]
To: [ntepa.epa](#)
Cc: [Das.NTG](#)
Subject: Project Ares submission - referral and draft Terms of Reference
Date: Wednesday, 12 August 2026 4:50:34 PM

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, a birdwatcher, a parent and a scientist, based in Darwin, I am writing to object to the proposed Project Ares data centre and gas power station at Murrnji Station.

Birds and open space. We want a world that is lovable in not just e ironically and these developments DO NOT advantage the average Australian.

Lake Woods lies downstream of this project, in the same catchment, and supports enormous numbers of waterbirds and migratory shorebirds. Nothing in the referral examines what the project's runoff and creek crossings would do to it. The project should not be signed off until the NT EPA requires assessment of the project's impacts on Lake Woods and the creeks that feed it.

A gas power station of around 1,000 MW would be built to run this data centre, larger than the Territory's biggest existing station. Where its gas would come from is left unstated, but in this part of the NT that means fracking the Beetaloo. 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.

The Greater Bilby, a Vulnerable species and an Australian icon, is confirmed on the site, and the Grey Falcon and Yellow-spotted Monitor are expected here too. Yet the surveys so far are desktop-only and cover only part of the site. I oppose this unless 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. The project should not proceed until the NT EPA requires a full, cumulative assessment of whether this level of groundwater extraction is sustainable before any approval.

The project depends on an off-site gas pipeline and shares water and infrastructure with a separate ammonia project, yet these are being treated as separate matters. I object unless 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.

Up to 19,150 hectares, a footprint about 14 km across, could be cleared or disturbed under what is proposed. This must not be approved 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.

jane ramsay
Darwin

Sent from Gmail Mobile