PERMITTING AUDIT REPORT
July-October 2026

Marathon Oil Company / Bakken Assets

Prepared By:

Hanna Warlick – Managing Consultant
Mark Heggan – Consultant
Ari Matrajt – Consultant

TRINITY CONSULTANTS
1999 Broadway
Suite 820
Denver, Colorado 80202
720.638.7647

November 2026

Project 240601.0123

Trinity Consultants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PERMITTING AUDIT 2

APPENDIX A. APPLICATIONS REVIEWED: JANUARY-JUNE 2026 A

APPENDIX B. NON-COMPLIANCE ITEM DESCRIPTIONS B

INTRODUCTION

The Marathon Oil Company Consent Decree (Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-136) ("Consent Decree") requires third-party audits for facilities on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota and New Well Pads as defined by the Consent Decree. Such audit shall be consistent with the Third-Party Audit Work Plan Version 1.0 and shall include reviewing (a) Marathon's permit applications for all Air Permit Facilities (the "Permitting Audit").

Following the Permitting Audit, Trinity has prepared the attached Third-Party Audit Report ("Audit Report"). The Audit Report includes the following: (a) description of the work completed; (b) the number of permit applications with identified non-compliance with the Emissions Calculations SOP; and (c) recommended corrective action for the identified non-compliance.

This Audit Report covers the period ending October 31, 2026.

This Permitting Audit is based on an approved Third-Party Audit Plan provided by Marathon and is detailed as noted below:

- Obtain copies of each Part 2 Registration and Permit application subject to the Scope of this Audit (defined in Third-Party Audit Plan) along with supporting documentation including:
  - Anticipated oil, water and gas production rates;
  - Anticipated flare volumes;
  - Anticipated oil loading volumes;
  - Anticipated VRU availability;
  - Site specific or representative samples used;
  - List of onsite equipment and operating conditions;
  - Process flow diagrams;
  - Planned maintenance list (for activities listed in the Emissions Calculation SOP); and
  - Documentation for any other model input or information used for the Permit application being reviewed.
- Review all inputs to emissions process models and emissions calculations to ensure compliance with approved Emissions Calculations SOP including:
  - Use of acceptable decline curve;
  - Anticipated oil, water and gas production values;
  - Anticipated flare volumes;
  - Anticipated oil loading volumes;
  - Anticipated VRU availability;
  - Equipment operating conditions used in process models;
  - Site specific or representative sample data accuracy in model;
  - Any other inputs to the process model; and
  - Overall compliance with the Emissions Calculations SOP.
- Review all emissions calculations completed for Permit application.

As part of this Permitting Audit, Trinity reviewed the information listed above as provided by Marathon for four (4) permit applications covering six (6) facilities, listed in Appendix A. Calculations were checked for consistency with the Emissions Calculations SOP version 4.0, dated January 26, 2026. Two (2) of those applications had identified non-compliance items. Specific non-compliance items are described in Appendix B, including the recommended corrective action.

APPENDIX A. APPLICATIONS REVIEWED: JULY-OCTOBER 2026

Marathon Bakken Permitting Audit
Applications Reviewed

ID Number	Air Permit Name	Facility Name	Date Review Completed	Number of Non-Compliances
4.12	GOLDPOINT / KUDRNA 10 CTB	Goldpoint / Kudrna 10 CTB	8/10/2026	2
4.12.2	GOLDPOINT / KUDRNA 10 CTB [Update]	Goldpoint / Kudrna 10 CTB [Update]	8/18/2026	0
4.13.1	LINCOLN USA 16-1H AND HOPKINS USA 15-2H	Lincoln USA 16-1H	8/19/2026	1
4.13.2	LINCOLN USA 16-1H AND HOPKINS USA 15-2H	Hopkins USA 15-2H	8/19/2026	1
4.13.1.1	LINCOLN USA 16-1H AND HOPKINS USA 15-2H [Update]	Lincoln USA 16-1H [Update]	8/23/2026	0
4.13.2.1	LINCOLN USA 16-1H AND HOPKINS USA 15-2H [Update]	Hopkins USA 15-2H [Update]	8/23/2026	0

APPENDIX B. NON-COMPLIANCE ITEM DESCRIPTIONS

Marathon Bakken Permitting Audit
Noncompliance Items

Item Number	Equipment or Process	Facility Name(s)	Emissions SOP or Management System SOP Requirement	Description of Non Compliance with SOPs	SOP Reference	Underestimates PTE or Actual Emissions (Y/N)	Suggested Corrective Action	Date Marathon was Notified	Corrective Action Taken	Explanation if Corrective Action Differs from Suggested Corrective Action	Target Completion Date	Actual Completion Date
1	Facility-Wide PTE - Production Basis	Goldpoint / Kudrna 10 CTB	PTE production rates for oil, water, and gas must be based on the highest forecasted aggregate 30-day average production rate developed from the well flowback schedule (i.e., the average of 30 consecutive days of forecasted daily production).	The production forecast file determines each 30-day window as a two-point average of the first and last day of the window (Day 1 + Day 30, Day 2 + Day 31, Day 3 + Day 32, etc.) rather than the arithmetic mean of all days within the window (Day 1 through Day 30, Day 2 through Day 31, etc.). Independently verified, the corrected 30-day rolling averages are 7,969 BOPD, 16,296 BWPD, and 5,081 MSCFD, compared to 7,921 BOPD, 16,168 BWPD, and 5,075 MSCFD produced by the current formula.	5.1 Production Basis for PTE Determinations (pg 17-19)	Y	Correct a typo in the 30-day rolling average cell references (e.g., cell E31 and subsequent rows), where a comma appears in place of a colon such that only the first and last day of each window are averaged (e.g., =AVERAGE(B2,B31) rather than =AVERAGE(B2:B31)). The averaging methodology itself is consistent with the SOP; this is a clerical error in the cell reference only.	8/10/2026	Corrected typo in the 30-day rolling average cell references (e.g., cell E31 and subsequent rows).	Corrective actions taken were consistent with the auditor's suggested corrective actions.	9/9/2026	8/18/2026
2	Heater Treater / High Pressure (HP) Flare - Process Simulation Input	Goldpoint / Kudrna 10 CTB	Flare gas volumetric flow rate inputs are based on process simulation results consistent with the facility's production basis.	The maximum 30-day average gas rate calculated in the production forecast is 5,075 MSCFD. The Heater Treater Gas stream modeled in ProMax (Material Stream (ProMax), cell D129), used in the HP Flare Hourly, HP Flare Annual, and Prod Data tabs, reflects 506 MSCFD. Marathon confirmed the production model's gas column is reported in MSCF and indicated the revised production values reflect the 30-day maximum; the response did not address the difference between the calculated 30-day maximum gas rate and the value used in ProMax.	7.24 LEAF Flaring – PTE, hourly average volumetric flare gas rate parameter (pg 102)	Y	Update the Heater Treater Gas stream in ProMax to reflect 5,081 MSCFD, consistent with the calculated maximum 30-day average, and update dependent calculations (Material Stream (ProMax), HP Flare Hourly, HP Flare Annual, Prod Data) accordingly.	8/10/2026	Updated the Heater Treater Gas stream in ProMax to reflect 5,081 MSCFD and updated dependent calculations (Material Stream (ProMax), HP Flare Hourly, HP Flare Annual, Prod Data) accordingly.	Corrective actions taken were consistent with the auditor's suggested corrective actions.	9/9/2026	8/18/2026
3	Vessel Depressurizatio n	Lincoln USA 16-1H, Hopkins USA 15-2H	Vapor space volume is based on the radius and height of the largest purged vessel.	The total vapor volume space is using the incorrect value and is underestimated (1,000 ft3 compared to 1,005 ft3).	7.28 Planned MSS: Pressure Vessel Depressurization Events – PTE Equation 161 (pg 118)	Y	Correct the reference in cell C9 on the New Vessel Depressurization tab of both workbooks from 'Facility Info'!C55 to 'Facility Info'!C54 so that the total vapor volume space uses the volume of the largest depressurized vessel (1,005.31 ft3).	8/19/2026	Corrected the depressurization volume to the volume of largest vessel, reperformed the calculations and the application and sent it to audit on 8/19/2026	Corrective actions taken were consistent with the auditor's suggested corrective actions.	9/18/2026	8/19/2026