

From: [REDACTED]
To: [ntepa.epa](#)
Cc: [Das.NTG](#)
Subject: Project Ares submission - referral and draft Terms of Reference
Date: Thursday, 13 August 2026 4:28:19 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 Barkly local and Have lived and worked in this region for 40 yrs mainly on cattle stations ., based in Pamayu, I am writing, with real concern, about the proposed Project Ares data centre and gas power station at Murrnaji Station.

The ground water is not an infinite resource . Using this water for agriculture in my mind is ok and the qualities are a fraction of what a data centre will use and we can't eat data . The territory is a unique place and this part of the Barkly has some flora and fauna found only here , why should we risk destroying part of the environment and the social fabric of the area for a data centre that will benefit Asia .

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. I am worried about this, and ask the NT EPA to require 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. 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.

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. I find this troubling, and ask that the NT EPA require a full, cumulative assessment of whether this level of groundwater extraction is sustainable before any approval.

Up to 19,150 hectares, a footprint about 14 km across, could be cleared or disturbed under what is proposed. I am worried 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.

John Mora
Pamayu

Sent from my iPhone