IN THE OFFICE OF THE STATE ENGINEER OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF APPLICATION NUMBER 79914
FILED BY KOBEH VALLEY RANCH LLC
ON June 15, 20 10, TO APPROPRIATE THE
WATERS OF UNDERGROUND (EUREKA COUNTY)

PROTEST

FILED
AUG 20 2010
STATE ENGINEER'S OFFICE

Comes now TIM HALPIN
Printed or typed name of protestant

whose post office address is POST OFFICE BOX 530 EUREKA, NV 89316
Street No. or PO Box, City, State and ZIP Code

whose occupation is Rancher and protests the granting

of Application Number 79914, filed on June 15, 20 10

by KOBEH VALLEY RANCH LLC (c/o General Moly, Inc.) to appropriate the

waters of UNDERGROUND situated in EUREKA
Underground or name of stream, lake, spring or other source

County, State of Nevada, for the following reasons and on the following grounds, to wit:
SEE EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED HERETO.

RECEIVED
2010 AUG 20 AM 9:24
STATE ENGINEER'S OFFICE

THEREFORE the Protestant requests that the application be DENIED
Denied, issued subject to prior rights, etc., as the case may be

and that an order be entered for such relief as the State Engineer deems just and proper.

Signed
Agent or protestant

JARRAD C. MILLER
Printed or typed name, if agent

Address 50 W. LIBERTY STREET, SUITE 600
Street No. or PO Box

RENO, NV 89501
City, State and ZIP Code

775-329-5600
Phone Number

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19 day of AUGUST, 20 10

RICHARD WILLIAMSON
Notary Public - State of Nevada
Appointment Recorded in Washoe County
No: 07-2671-2 - Expires April 5, 2011

Notary Public

State of NEVADA
County of WASHOE

+ $25 FILING FEE MUST ACCOMPANY PROTEST. PROTEST MUST BE FILED IN DUPLICATE.
ALL COPIES MUST CONTAIN ORIGINAL SIGNATURE.

EXHIBIT "A"
Protestant: Tim Halpin
Application Nos. 79911 - 79942

1. Protestant owns water rights under Permit #29765, Certificate #8881, and uses those water rights to operate a successful hay farm on a half section in Diamond Valley. Protestant's isotope water chemistry in his well is very similar in isotope chemistry to water in the applicant's wells located in Kobeh Valley due to the underground flow from Kobeh Valley to Diamond Valley. Applicant's requested volume of pumping will impair Protestant's water rights due to the interconnectivity of Kobeh Valley to Diamond Valley.

2. The proposed use conflicts with or will impair and interfere with Protestant's existing rights and protectable interests in his underground wells and threatens to prove detrimental to the public interest. Kobeh Valley is a designated basin. The perennial yield of Basin 139 based upon GroundWater Resources Reconnaissance Series Report 30 by Rush and Everett (1964) is 16,000 acre feet annually (afa) and assumes that the natural groundwater discharge (phreatophyte evapotranspiration) from the basin can be captured. In Kobeh Valley, most naturally recharged groundwater is discharged by phreatophytic vegetation on the valley floor, with a reconnaissance-level evapotranspiration estimate by the USGS of 15,000 acre-feet per year. Hydrogeologic investigations and groundwater modeling by the applicant clearly conclude that the proposed use will take decades before it results in capture of a significant proportion of phreatophytic discharge. The valley floor phreatophytic vegetation will continue to occur notwithstanding the mine's pumping. The groundwater discharged in the Kobeh Valley hydrographic basin by phreatophytic vegetation and applicant's pumping will total approximately 26,300 acre per year. These total amounts are in excess of the perennial yield of the basin and result in mining groundwater from the basin, which is specifically prohibited in Nevada In addition, there is a consensus in many scientific reports that underflow from Kobeh Valley to Diamond Valley does occur. In dispute is the quantity of interbasin flow. Predictive modeling studies by the applicant's consultants suggest pumping in Diamond Valley has a potential to cause water-level declines in Kobeh Valley, suggesting a hydrologic continuum between the two basins. Granting the applications will cause the basin to be over pumped to the detriment of the basin and prior existing water rights holders.

3. The applicant's own investigations show most of the water sought to be appropriated by these applications will be derived from basin storage. The State Engineer has previously denied applications seeking to appropriate water from basin storage. Diversion of groundwater above the annual recharge may unreasonably lower the static water in the subject basin and could negatively affect hydraulic gradient influences and adversely affect the quality of the remaining groundwater. Groundwater modeling by the applicant's consultants show that the effects of the applicant's groundwater extractions will continue for decades after mine operations cease.

4. Existing USGS reports suggest that Kobeh Valley may provide underground flow to Diamond Valley. However, it is the USGS's opinion that current data is insufficient with which to determine the amount of interbasin flow with any level of certainty. In light of the applicant's most recent groundwater model, there are regions of suspected high hydraulic conductivity in the mountains between Diamond Valley and Kobeh Valley that provide potential conduits for groundwater flow between the basins. Sustained over pumping in Kobeh Valley is likely to reduce that amount and affect prior existing irrigation water rights held by Tim Halpin that supplies his agriculture operations and makes them viable.

5. Currently, there are other pending applications to appropriate groundwater and pending change applications in the Kobeh Valley basin filed by this applicant pertaining to the Mt. Hope Mine Project. These outstanding applications seek to appropriate an additional approximately 16,120 acre-feet of water rights per year and seek changes to an additional 2,829.72 acre-feet of water rights per year. The applicant does not appear to intend to place the water sought to be appropriated in the other pending

the water supply exploration activities in Diamond Valley are outside the Plan of Operations project boundary but within the proposed place of use listed in the applications.

15. Any further changes to points of diversion for a proposed future well field shall require the filing of additional change applications subject to the same regulatory process as the current applications, that is, they must be published in the local newspaper, are subject to protest, and must meet the statutory requirements for approval.

16. Some of the subject change applications seek to change a previously filed change application that changed the manner of use from irrigation at a consumptive use duty of 2.3 acre feet/acre. The limitation of the consumptive use duty of 2.3 acre-feet per acre should be maintained if the change applications to the base irrigation applications are granted.

17. Any proposed management, monitoring and mitigation plan to address potential impacts from the applicant's proposed pumping must be developed to a reasonable degree with supporting analytical data prior to any approval of the applications. A plan for monitoring and mitigation of potential impacts to water rights holders and threatened species must include specific, realistic measures to mitigate adverse impacts. The proposed mitigation measures must be clearly defined and demonstrated to have the desired affect. Overly broad proposals are not acceptable

18. Applications 79911 — 79942 seek to change water right applications previously protested by Tim Halpin and approved by the State Engineer in Ruling 5966 issued March 26, 2009. The Seventh Judicial District Court vacated Ruling 5966 in its Order entered April 21, 2010 and ordered a new hearing on the applications. Based upon the Court's Order entered April 21, 2010, the representations of the applicant that it was not opposed to a new hearing on the previously filed applications at the prehearing conference held on May 24, 2010, and the fact that these are new applications for which no hearing has ever been held, the State Engineer needs to conduct a full and fair hearing on change applications 79911 - 79942.

19. The locations of some of the points of diversion for these change applications suggest that significant secondary permeability exists in the rocks separating Kobeh and Diamond Valleys, otherwise there would be little reason to propose constructing wells at these locations. Furthermore, the current iteration of the regional groundwater model developed by the Applicant's consultants shows a region of high hydraulic conductivity in the mountains north of Mount Whistler that is likely associated with the development of secondary permeability related to deformation of the rocks due to faulting. If the proposed points of diversion are based on new data that support moderate to high values for hydraulic conductivity in the mountains, as opposed to low hydraulic conductivity, the impacts of groundwater extractions so close to Diamond Valley need to be specifically assessed. Given the extent of the deformation of the rocks and multiple episodes of faulting, it is unlikely that high secondary permeability is limited only to one area in the mountains.

20. Granting change applications that are not supported by adequate proof of beneficial use will cause the basin to be over pumped to the detriment of the basin balance, prior water right holders and in direct conflict with the forfeiture provisions of Nevada water law.