

**STATE OF NEW MEXICO
ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION**

**IN THE MATTER OF APPLICATION FOR
COMPULSORY POOLING SUBMITTED BY
LONGFELLOW ENERGY, LP**

**CASE NO. 25804
ORDER NO. R-24279**

ORDER

The Director of the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division (“OCD”), having heard this matter through a Hearing Examiner on February 26 and 27, 2026, and after considering the testimony, evidence, and recommendation of the Hearing and Technical Examiners, issues the following Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On December 4, 2025, Longfellow Energy, LP (“Longfellow”) submitted an application (“Application”) to compulsory pool the uncommitted oil and gas interests within the spacing unit (“Unit”) described as in Exhibit A. Longfellow seeks to be designated the operator of the Unit.
2. On December 27, 2025, XTO Holdings, LLC filed an entry of appearance and notice of objection to proceeding by affidavit. XTO later withdrew this objection on December 29, 2025. Subsequently XTO refiled its objection to the case on February 4, 2026.
3. The Application was heard by the Hearing and Technical Examiners on the dates specified above, during which Longfellow and XTO presented evidence through testimony and exhibits. No other party presented evidence at the hearing.
4. Longfellow presented three witnesses in support of its Application:
 - a. Rebecca English, Landman
 - b. Jacob DeHamer, Geologist
 - c. David Mitchell, Engineer
5. XTO presented two witnesses in support of its objection to Longfellow’s Application:
 - a. Shelbi McKee, Landman
 - b. Paul Brown, Geoscientist
6. The Oil and Gas Act authorizes OCD to compulsory pool the lands or interests in a spacing unit. When the owners of the interests in a spacing unit have not agreed to voluntarily pool their interests, and when one owner, who has the right to drill, applies to OCD, OCD can pool

the lands or interests in the unit “to avoid the drilling of unnecessary wells or to protect correlative rights, or to prevent waste”. Section 70-2-17.C.

7. The Oil Conservation Commission (“Commission”) and OCD have developed several factors they “may consider” in evaluating competing compulsory pooling applications. Although XTO presented no competing compulsory pooling application the OCD will use these factors in reviewing the matter at hand. These factors are listed as follows:
 - a. A comparison of geologic evidence presented by each party as it relates to the proposed well location and the potential of each proposed prospect to efficiently recover the oil and gas reserves underlying the property.
 - b. A comparison of the risk associated with the parties' respective proposal for the exploration and development of the property.
 - c. A review of the negotiations between the competing parties prior to the applications to force pool to determine if there was a "good faith" effort.
 - d. A comparison of the ability of each party to prudently operate the property and, thereby, prevent waste.
 - e. A comparison of the differences in well cost estimates (AFEs) and other operational costs presented by each party for their respective proposals.
 - f. An evaluation of the mineral interest ownership held by each party at the time the application was heard.
 - g. A comparison of the ability of the applicants to timely locate well sites and to operate on the surface (the "surface factor").

Geological Evidence:

8. Longfellow presented exhibits and testimony regarding the Unit during the hearing which are summarized as:
 - a. The Unit is justified from a geologic standpoint.
 - b. There are no structural impediments, or faulting that would interfere with the horizontal development.
 - c. Each quarter-quarter section in the Unit will contribute more or less equally to production.
 - d. The planned west to east well orientation is consistent with horizontal development along the Yeso trend.
9. XTO testified that Longfellow’s plan was “*overly dense development, particularly for this area, where resource quality is degrading up to the north*” (Tr. 2/27/26 at 89: 21-23).

Risk:

10. Longfellow and XTO are both at risk of losing acreage in the Unit due to a federal lease set to expire in July 2026. This lease expiration is due to an unrelated operator who has filed for Chapter 7 bankruptcy and therefore leaving no operator currently able to restore production to the lease at the time of the hearing.

Development:

11. Longfellow proposes to dedicate a total of eight (8) one-mile horizontal wells as described in Exhibit A (“Wells”) to the Unit. The Wells will cover both Longfellow and XTO acreage that is at risk expiring.
12. XTO does not have a counter case for development of the Unit, however XTO’s development plan calls for Mack Energy Corporation (“Mack”) to extend the lateral length of an already approved well in the S/2 of Section 32 by approximately 158 feet to penetrate XTO’s acreage in the SW/4 of SW/4 Section 33.
13. Mack did not enter an appearance or provide testimony on any matter in this case.
14. During the hearing OCD Technical Examiners questioned XTO on other development plans in addition to the Mack well, XTO did not provide specific details or timeframes related to the Unit. XTO only stated it may be an expeditious development within the next few years (2/27/26 Pg: 95-96 Tr: 21-9).
15. Therefore, the OCD must evaluate the current plans as they stand before OCD which are Longfellow’s eight one-mile wells vs XTO’s extended Mack well.
16. XTO geoscientist was questioned and answered as follows (Tr. 2/27/26 at 90-91: 22-2)

Question: (From Longfellow Counsel) *“Would you agree that perfing only the 158 feet of a 40-acre tract would result in economic waste”*

Answered: (XTO Geoscientist) *“Yes, if that were the only portion of the well - -”*

Negotiations:

17. Longfellow testified that Longfellow made extensive, repeated and well-documented efforts to negotiate a voluntary agreement with XTO prior to filing this Application. Longfellow exhibits show that Longfellow performed the following items (summarized) related to XTO:
 - a. August 1, 2025 - Sent out initial well proposals (delivered August 5, 2025)
 - b. August 19, 2025 - Corresponded with XTO on material items
 - c. October 15-16, 2025 - Term Assignment Offer

- d. October 28, 2025 - Longfellow Contacts XTO Regarding Lease Expiration
 - e. October 29, 2025 - Phone Call Regarding Lease Expirations
 - f. February 3, 2026 - In-Person Meeting
 - g. February 4, 2026 - XTO Notifies Longfellow of Intent to Re-file Protest
 - h. February 6, 2026 - Longfellow submits Formal Written Proposals
 - i. February 13, 2026 - Phone Call with XTO
 - j. February 16, 2026 - Acreage Trade Proposal
18. XTO testifies that Longfellow has not negotiated in good faith with XTO. XTO exhibits show extensive communication between the parties has occurred which is summarized as follows:
- a. August 8, 2025 - XTO received proposal letters
 - b. August 19, 2025 - Corresponded with Longfellow on material items
 - c. September 29, 2025 - XTO called Longfellow to request a term assignment
 - d. October 15-16, 2025 - Term Assignment Offer
 - e. October 29, 2025 - Phone Call Regarding Lease Expirations
 - f. January 8, 2026 - XTO responds with position to not be included in CP order
 - g. February 3, 2026 - In-Person Meeting
 - h. February 4, 2026 - XTO Notifies Longfellow of Intent to Re-file Protest
 - i. February 13, 2026 - Phone Call with Longfellow
 - j. February 16, 2026 - Acreage Trade Proposal

Ability to Prudently Operator:

19. Longfellow operates under OGRID 372210. As of the date of this order, Longfellow operates 118 wells and has zero inactive wells and zero wells in approved temporary abandoned wells. Therefore, Longfellow is in compliance with rule 19.15.5.9 NMAC and 19.15.25.12 NMAC.
20. XTO Holdings, LLC operates under OGRID 327330 and has no active entities on file with OCD under that OGRID. However, XTO operates under other OGRIDs for operational purposes. All relevant OGRIDs are in compliance with 19.15.5.9 NMAC and 19.15.25.12 NMAC.

Comparison of Cost:

21. Longfellow provided AFEs for the Wells which show cost to be \$6,096,876 per well with the exception of the 5H which had an updated AFE sent to XTO showing a cost of \$7,569,660.
22. XTO did not provide an AFE associated with the Mack well.
23. XTO provided exhibits and testimony stating that Longfellow's cost is excessive. XTO further asserts that the costs are excessive due to the following reasons:

- a. Wells contain approximately 2,000 feet of unproductive lateral due to the surface location in the adjacent Section 32.
 - b. Longfellow's costs are higher than other operators' in the Yeso trend.
 - c. Longfellow's costs are less capital-efficient than extended lateral wells of 1.5 miles or more across the three adjacent undeveloped sections 32, 33, and 34.
24. Longfellow testified that the surface location in Section 32 was selected after performing an environmental field study which confirmed that significant Desert Sage Brush Lizard ("DSL") habitat exists across Section 33.
 25. XTO depicted an exhibit which showed the area that XTO proposes could be developed more efficiently with extended laterals and fewer surface locations. XTO further stated that the lease could be preserved by either an initial lateral well or vertical well to later develop the area more optimally. However, XTO did not provide further exhibits or testimony regarding the cost, estimated recovery, or timeline of this more optimal plan. Therefore, OCD must only consider the costs it has at the time of hearing.

Working Interest:

26. Longfellow and XTO each own fifty percent of the Unit.

Surface Factor:

27. Longfellow testified that Longfellow has taken or will take the following steps in regard to surface:
 - a. BLM on-site inspections have been completed and sites approved
 - b. Performed an environmental field study which confirmed that significant DSL habitat exists across Section 33.

Conclusion:

28. In regard to Geological Evidence the OCD finds that there are no structural impediments, or faulting that would interfere with the horizontal development.
29. In regard to Risk the OCD finds that both Longfellow and XTO are at risk of their leases expiring in July 2026.
30. In regard to Development the OCD finds that XTO's proposed development plan (extension of the Mack well by 158 feet) will cause economic waste and will not protect Longfellow's lease from expiration. OCD further finds Longfellow's plan will drain more resources than XTO's while preventing both Longfellow's and XTO's leases from expiring.

31. In regard to Negotiations the OCD finds that Longfellow had extensive communications with XTO regarding the Unit and that Longfellow has offered various options including JOA and term assignments to XTO.
32. In regard to Ability to Prudently Operate, the OCD finds that both Longfellow and XTO are prudent operators in the State of New Mexico as of the date of drafting this order.
33. In regard to Comparison of Cost, the OCD finds that Longfellow is the only party which presented AFE's. Further Longfellow presented evidence and reasoning rebutting XTO's claim of excessive cost related to the unproductive lateral, citing the Desert Sage Brush Lizard habitat constraints.
34. In regard to Working Interest, the OCD finds that Longfellow and XTO own equal percentage of the Unit.
35. In regard to Surface Factor, the OCD finds that Longfellow's Application will avoid disturbing the DSL habitat.
36. OCD finds that Longfellow's Application shall be approved for the above reasons.
37. Longfellow proposes the supervision and risk charges for the Wells described in Exhibit A.
38. Longfellow identified the owners of uncommitted interests in oil and gas minerals in the Unit and provided evidence that notice was given.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

39. Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the OCD makes the following Conclusions of Law:
40. OCD has jurisdiction to issue this Order pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 70-2-17.
41. Longfellow is the owner of an oil and gas working interest within the Unit.
42. Longfellow satisfied the notice requirements for the Application and the hearing as required by 19.15.4.12 NMAC.
43. OCD satisfied the notice requirements for the hearing as required by 19.15.4.9 NMAC.
44. Longfellow has the right to drill the Wells to a common source of supply at the depth(s) and location(s) in the Unit described in Exhibit A.
45. The Unit contains separately owned uncommitted interests in oil and gas minerals.

46. Some of the owners of the uncommitted interests have not agreed to commit their interests to the Unit.
47. The pooling of uncommitted interests in the Unit will prevent waste and protect correlative rights, including the drilling of unnecessary wells.
48. This Order affords the owner of an uncommitted interest the opportunity to produce his just and equitable share of the oil or gas in the pool.

ORDER

49. The uncommitted interests in the Unit are pooled as set forth in Exhibit A.
50. The Unit shall be dedicated to the Wells set forth in Exhibit A.
51. Longfellow is designated as operator of the Unit and the Wells.
52. If the location of a well is unorthodox under the spacing rules in effect at the time of completion, Longfellow shall obtain the OCD's approval for a non-standard location in accordance with 19.15.16.15(C) NMAC.
53. If the Unit is a non-standard horizontal spacing unit which has not been approved under this Order, Longfellow shall obtain the OCD's approval for a non-standard horizontal spacing unit in accordance with 19.15.16.15(B)(5) NMAC.
54. Longfellow shall commence drilling the Well(s) within one year after the date of this Order and complete each Well no later than one (1) year after the commencement of drilling the Well.
55. This Order shall terminate automatically if Longfellow fails to comply with the preceding paragraph unless Longfellow requests an extension by notifying the OCD and all parties that required notice of the original compulsory pooling application in accordance with 19.15.4.12.B and 19.15.4.12.C NMAC. Upon no objection after twenty (20) days the extension is automatically granted up to one year. If a protest is received the extension is not granted and the Operator must set the case for a hearing.
56. Longfellow may propose reasonable deviations from the development plan via notice to the OCD and all parties that required notice of the original compulsory pooling application in accordance with 19.15.4.12.B and 19.15.4.12.C NMAC. Upon no objection after twenty (20) days the deviation is automatically granted. If a protest is received the deviation is not granted and Longfellow must set the case for a hearing.
57. The infill well requirements in 19.15.13.9 NMAC through 19.15.13.12 NMAC shall be applicable.

58. Longfellow shall submit each owner of an uncommitted working interest in the pool (“Pooled Working Interest”) an itemized schedule of estimated costs to drill, complete, and equip the well (“Estimated Well Costs”).
59. No later than thirty (30) days after Longfellow submits the Estimated Well Costs, the owner of a Pooled Working Interest shall elect whether to pay its share of the Estimated Well Costs or its share of the actual costs to drill, complete and equip the well (“Actual Well Costs”) out of production from the well. An owner of a Pooled Working Interest who elects to pay its share of the Estimated Well Costs shall render payment to Longfellow no later than thirty (30) days after the expiration of the election period, and shall be liable for operating costs, but not risk charges, for the well. An owner of a Pooled Working Interest who fails to pay its share of the Estimated Well Costs or who elects to pay its share of the Actual Well Costs out of production from the well shall be considered to be a "Non-Consenting Pooled Working Interest.”
60. No later than one hundred eighty (180) days after Longfellow submits a Form C-105 for a well, Longfellow shall submit to each owner of a Pooled Working Interest an itemized schedule of the Actual Well Costs. The Actual Well Costs shall be considered to be the Reasonable Well Costs unless an owner of a Pooled Working Interest files a written objection no later than forty-five (45) days after receipt of the schedule. If an owner of a Pooled Working Interest files a timely written objection, OCD shall determine the Reasonable Well Costs after public notice and hearing.
61. No later than sixty (60) days after the expiration of the period to file a written objection to the Actual Well Costs or OCD’s order determining the Reasonable Well Costs, whichever is later, each owner of a Pooled Working Interest who paid its share of the Estimated Well Costs shall pay to Longfellow its share of the Reasonable Well Costs that exceed the Estimated Well Costs, or Operator shall pay to each owner of a Pooled Working Interest who paid its share of the Estimated Well Costs its share of the Estimated Well Costs that exceed the Reasonable Well Costs.
62. The reasonable charges for supervision to drill and produce a well (“Supervision Charges”) shall not exceed the rates specified for each well in Exhibit A, provided however that the rates shall be adjusted annually pursuant to the COPAS form entitled “Accounting Procedure-Joint Operations.”
63. No later than within ninety (90) days after Longfellow submits a Form C-105 for a well, Longfellow shall submit to each owner of a Pooled Working Interest an itemized schedule of the reasonable charges for operating and maintaining the well (“Operating Charges”), provided however that Operating Charges shall not include the Reasonable Well Costs or Supervision Charges. The Operating Charges shall be considered final unless an owner of a Pooled

Working Interest files a written objection no later than forty-five (45) days after receipt of the schedule. If an owner of a Pooled Working Interest files a timely written objection, OCD shall determine the Operating Charges after public notice and hearing.

64. Longfellow may withhold the following costs and charges from the share of production due to each owner of a Pooled Working Interest who paid its share of the Estimated Well Costs: (a) the proportionate share of the Supervision Charges; and (b) the proportionate share of the Operating Charges.
65. Longfellow may withhold the following costs and charges from the share of production due to each owner of a Non-Consenting Pooled Working Interest: (a) the proportionate share of the Reasonable Well Costs; (b) the proportionate share of the Supervision and Operating Charges; and (c) the percentage of the Reasonable Well Costs specified as the charge for risk described in Exhibit A.
66. Longfellow shall distribute a proportionate share of the costs and charges withheld pursuant to the preceding paragraph to each Pooled Working Interest that paid its share of the Estimated Well Costs.
67. Each year on the anniversary of this Order, and no later than ninety (90) days after each payout, Longfellow shall provide to each owner of a Non-Consenting Pooled Working Interest a schedule of the revenue attributable to a well and the Supervision and Operating Costs charged against that revenue.
68. Any cost or charge that is paid out of production shall be withheld only from the share due to an owner of a Pooled Working Interest. No cost or charge shall be withheld from the share due to an owner of a royalty interests. For the purpose of this Order, an unleased mineral interest shall consist of a seven-eighths (7/8) working interest and a one-eighth (1/8) royalty interest.
69. Except as provided above, Longfellow shall hold the revenue attributable to a well that is not disbursed for any reason for the account of the person(s) entitled to the revenue as provided in the Oil and Gas Proceeds Payment Act, NMSA 1978, Sections 70-10-1 et seq., and relinquish such revenue as provided in the Uniform Unclaimed Property Act, NMSA 1978, Sections 7-8A-1 et seq.
70. The Unit shall terminate if (a) the owners of all Pooled Working Interests reach a voluntary agreement; or (b) the well(s) drilled on the Unit are plugged and abandoned in accordance with the applicable rules. Longfellow shall inform OCD no later than thirty (30) days after such occurrence.

71. OCD retains jurisdiction of this matter for the entry of such orders as may be deemed necessary.

**STATE OF NEW MEXICO
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION**



ALBERT C. S. CHANG
DIRECTOR
AC/jag

Date: 3/27/26

Exhibit A

Received by OCD: 3/3/2026 3:19:55 PM

Page 6 of 156

A		B	
1	COMPULSORY POOLING APPLICATION CHECKLIST		
2	ALL INFORMATION IN THE APPLICATION MUST BE SUPPORTED BY SIGNED AFFIDAVITS		
3	Case: 25804	APPLICANT'S RESPONSE	
4	Date	February 26, 2026	
5	Applicant	Longfellow Energy, L.P.	
6	Designated Operator & OGRID (affiliation if applicable)	Longfellow Energy, L.P., 372210	
7	Applicant's Counsel:	Spencer Fane, LLP (Sharon T. Shaheen)	
8	Case Title:	Application of Longfellow Energy, L.P. for Compulsory Pooling, Eddy County, New Mexico	
9	Entries of Appearance/Intervenors:	XTO Holdings, LLC (Hardy McLean LLC)	
10	Well Family	Van Halen 33CD	
11	Formation/Pool		
12	Formation Name(s) or Vertical Extent:	Yeso Formation	
13	Primary Product (Oil or Gas):	Oil	
14	Pooling this vertical extent:	Yeso Formation	
15	Pool Name and Pool Code (Only if NSP is requested):	N/A	
16	Well Location Setback Rules (Only if NSP is Requested):	N/A	
17	Spacing Unit		
18	Type (Horizontal/Vertical)	Horizontal	
19	Size (Acres)	320 acres	
20	Building Blocks:	Quarter-quarter section (40 ac)	
21	Orientation:	West-East	
22	Description: TRS/County	S/2 of Section 33-16S-31E in Eddy County, New Mexico	
23	Standard Horizontal Well Spacing Unit (Y/N), If No, describe and is approval of non-standard unit requested in this application?	Yes	
24	Other Situations		
25	Depth Severance: Y/N. If yes, description	No	
26	Proximity Tracts: If yes, description	Yes, N2 S2 of Section 33-16S-31E in Eddy County, New Mexico	
27	Proximity Defining Well: if yes, description	Yes, Van Halen 33CD Fed Com 005H well	
28	Applicant's Ownership in Each Tract	Tract 1: 100%; Tract 2: 0%; Tract 3: 0%	
29	Well(s)		
30	Name & API (if assigned), surface and bottom hole location, footages, completion target, orientation, completion status (standard or non-standard)	Add wells as needed	

Released to Imaging: 3/4/2026 8:14:50 AM

A	B
Well #1	Van Halen 33CD Fed Com 001H, API No. 30-015-XXXXX SHL:1,802' FEL & 2,251' FSL of Section 32-16S-31E BHL: 20' FEL & 2,310' FSL of Section 33-16S-31E Completion Target: Yeso Well Orientation: West to East Completion location expected to be standard
Well #2	Van Halen 33CD Fed Com 002H well, API No. 30-015-XXXXX SHL: 1,800' FEL & 2,231' FSL of Section 32-16S-31E BHL: 20' FEL & 2,158' FSL of Section 33-16S-31E Completion Target: Yeso Well Orientation: West to East Completion location expected to be standard
Well #3	Van Halen 33CD Fed Com 003H well, API No. 30-015-XXXXX SHL: 1,798' FEL & 2,211' FSL of Section 32-16S-31E BHL: 20' FEL & 1,784' FSL of Section 33-16S-31E Completion Target: Yeso Well Orientation: West to East Completion location expected to be standard
Well #4	Van Halen 33CD Fed Com 004H well, API No. 30-015-XXXXX SHL: 1,796' FEL & 2,191' FSL of Section 32-16S-31E BHL: 20' FEL & 1,409' FSL of Section 33-16S-31E Completion Target: Yeso Well Orientation: West to East Completion location expected to be standard
Well #5	Van Halen 33CD Fed Com 005H well, API No. 30-015-XXXXX SHL: 1,780' FEL & 1,117' FSL of Section 32-16S-31E BHL: 20' FEL & 1,249' FSL of Section 33-16S-31E Completion Target: Yeso Well Orientation: West to East Completion location expected to be standard
Well #6	Van Halen 33CD Fed Com 006H well, API No. 30-015-XXXXX SHL: 1,791' FEL & 1,101' FSL of Section 32-16S-31E BHL: 20' FEL & 874' FSL of Section 33-16S-31E Completion Target: Yeso Well Orientation: West to East Completion location expected to be standard
Well #7	Van Halen 33CD Fed Com 007H well, API No. 30-015-XXXXX SHL: 1,803' FEL & 1,084' FSL of Section 32-16S-31E BHL: 20' FEL & 500' FSL of Section 33-16S-31E Completion Target: Yeso Well Orientation: West to East Completion location expected to be standard
Well #8	Van Halen 33CD Fed Com 008H well, API No. 30-015-XXXXX SHL: 1,814' FEL & 1,068' FSL of Section 32-16S-31E BHL: 20' FEL & 339' FSL of Section 33-16S-31E Completion Target: Yeso Well Orientation: West to East Completion location expected to be standard

A	B
Horizontal Wells First and Last Take Points	See Exhibit A-1
Completion Targets (Formation, TVD and MD)	See Exhibit B, ¶ 11
AFE Capex and Operating Costs	
Drilling Supervision/Month \$	\$12,000; see Exhibit A, ¶ 19
Production Supervision/Month \$	\$1200; see Exhibit A, ¶ 19
Justification for Supervision Costs	See AFEs at Exhibit A-4
Requested Risk Charge	200%; see Exhibit A, ¶ 20
Notice of Hearing	
Proposed Notice of Hearing	Submitted with online filing of Application
Proof of Mailed Notice of Hearing (20 days before hearing)	Exhibits D, D-1, D-2, and D-3
Proof of Published Notice of Hearing (10 days before hearing)	Exhibit D-4
Ownership Determination	
Land Ownership Schematic of the Spacing Unit	Exhibit A-2
Tract List (including lease numbers and owners)	Exhibit A-2
If approval of Non-Standard Spacing Unit is requested, Tract List (including lease numbers and owners) of Tracts subject to	n/a
Pooled Parties (including ownership type)	Exhibit A-3 and Exhibit A-6
Unlocatable Parties to be Pooled	See Exhibit D-2
Ownership Depth Severance (including percentage above & below)	n/a
Joinder	
Sample Copy of Proposal Letter	Exhibit A-4
List of Interest Owners (ie Exhibit A of JOA)	Exhibits A-2, A-3, and A-6
Chronology of Contact with Non-Joined Working Interests	Exhibit A-5
Overhead Rates In Proposal Letter	Exhibit A-4 at 2
Cost Estimate to Drill and Complete	See AFEs at Exhibit A-4
Cost Estimate to Equip Well	See AFEs at Exhibit A-4
Cost Estimate for Production Facilities	n/a
Geology	
Summary (including special considerations)	See Exhibit B, ¶ 11
Spacing Unit Schematic	Exhibit A-2
Gunbarrel/Lateral Trajectory Schematic	Exhibit B-4
Well Orientation (with rationale)	Exhibit B, ¶ 11(d)
Target Formation	Exhibits B-3 & B-4
HSU Cross Section	Exhibit B-3
Depth Severance Discussion	n/a
Forms, Figures and Tables	
C-102	Exhibit A-1
Tracts	Exhibit A-2

	A	B
76	Summary of Interests, Unit Recapitulation (Tracts)	Exhibit A-3
77	General Location Map (including basin)	Exhibit B-1
78	Well Bore Location Map	See Exhibit A-1, Exhibit B-5
79	Structure Contour Map - Subsea Depth	Exhibit B-2
80	Cross Section Location Map (including wells)	Exhibit B-2
81	Cross Section (including Landing Zone)	Exhibit B-3
82	Additional Information	
83	Special Provisions/Stipulations	n/a
84	CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that the information provided in this checklist is complete and accurate.	
85	Printed Name (Attorney or Party Representative):	Sharon T. Shaheen
86	Signed Name (Attorney or Party Representative):	<i>Sharon T. Shaheen</i>
87	Date:	Feb. 19, 2026