

From: [REDACTED]
To: [ntepa.epa](#)
Cc: [Das.NTG](#)
Subject: Project Ares submission - referral and draft Terms of Reference
Date: Friday, 14 August 2026 3:08:38 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 An environmentally minded business person, based in Coconut Grove, I am writing, with real concern, about the proposed Project Ares data centre and gas power station at Murrarji Station. I lived in the Barkly and have been to see the water and shore birds. Was breath taking. Elove to great outdoors and future generations should also get to experience it. 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. This worries me, and I ask the NT EPA to require 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. This is a real concern, and I ask the NT EPA to require 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 am concerned about this, and ask the NT EPA to require field surveys for these threatened species across the whole project footprint before any decision on impacts. The studies supporting the referral are largely desktop-based and leave the creek corridors and downstream areas unsurveyed. I find this troubling, and ask that the NT EPA require 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. I am concerned about this, and ask the NT EPA to require 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 am worried these matters could be waved through. I ask the NT EPA to require them in the Terms of Reference and to assess them in full before any decision is made. Thank you for considering my submission. Michael Kuhl Coconut Grove

[REDACTED]