

DENBURY RESOURCES INC
Form DEF 14A
April 13, 2017

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549

SCHEDULE 14A

Proxy Statement Pursuant to Section 14(a) of the Securities
Exchange Act of 1934 (Amendment No.)

Filed by the Registrant
Filed by a Party other than the Registrant

Check the appropriate box:

- Preliminary Proxy Statement
- Confidential, for Use of the Commission Only (as permitted by Rule 14a-6(e)(2))
- Definitive Proxy Statement
- Definitive Additional Materials
- Soliciting Material Pursuant to §240.14a-12

Denbury Resources Inc.
(Name of Registrant as Specified In Its Charter)

(Name of Person(s) Filing Proxy Statement, if other than the Registrant)

Payment of Filing Fee (Check the appropriate box):

- No fee required.
- Fee computed on table below per Exchange Act Rules 14a-6(i)(1) and 0-11.

(1) Title of each class of securities to which transaction applies:

(2) Aggregate number of securities to which transaction applies:

(3) Per unit price or other underlying value of transaction computed pursuant to Exchange Act Rule 0-11 (set forth the amount on which the filing fee is calculated and state how it was determined):

(4) Proposed maximum aggregate value of transaction:

(5) Total fee paid:

Fee paid previously with preliminary materials.

Check box if any part of the fee is offset as provided by Exchange Act Rule 0-11(a)(2) and identify the filing for which the offsetting fee was paid previously. Identify the previous filing by registration statement number, or the Form or Schedule and the date of its filing.

(1) Amount Previously Paid:

(2) Form, Schedule or Registration Statement No.:

(3) Filing Party:

(4) Date Filed:

NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS
TO BE HELD WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2017

To our Stockholders:

You are hereby notified that the 2017 Annual Meeting of Stockholders of Denbury Resources Inc., a Delaware corporation (“Denbury” or the “Company”), will be held at the Company’s corporate headquarters at 5320 Legacy Drive, Plano, Texas 75024, at 8:00 A.M. Central Daylight Time (CDT) on Wednesday, May 24, 2017, for the following purposes:

- (1) to elect eight directors, each to serve until their successor is elected and qualified;
- (2) to hold an advisory vote to approve named executive officer compensation;
- (3) to hold an advisory vote on the frequency of the stockholder vote to approve named executive officer compensation;
- (4) to vote on the amendment and restatement of the Company’s 2004 Omnibus Stock and Incentive Plan, principally to increase the number of reserved shares and for Internal Revenue Code Section 162(m) performance-based compensation qualification;
- (5) to ratify the Audit Committee’s selection of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP as the Company’s independent registered public accounting firm for 2017; and
- (6) to transact such other business as may properly come before the annual meeting or any adjournment or postponement thereof.

Only stockholders of record at the close of business on March 27, 2017 are entitled to notice of, and to vote at, the annual meeting.

Beginning on or about April 13, 2017, the Company mailed a Notice Regarding the Internet Availability of Proxy Materials to its stockholders containing instructions on how to access the proxy materials and vote via the Internet. Instructions for requesting a paper copy of the proxy materials are contained in the Notice Regarding the Internet Availability of Proxy Materials.

By order of the Board of Directors,
Mark C. Allen
Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer and Assistant Secretary
April 13, 2017

Stockholders of record are urged to vote their proxy promptly, whether or not they expect to attend the annual meeting in person.

IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING THE AVAILABILITY OF PROXY MATERIALS FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS TO BE HELD ON MAY 24, 2017:

We have elected to take advantage of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission rules that allow us to furnish proxy materials to our stockholders via the Internet. These rules allow us to provide information that our stockholders need while lowering costs, accelerating the speed of delivery and reducing the environmental impact of our annual meeting. This proxy statement, along with the Company’s Annual Report to Stockholders, which includes our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2016 are available via the Internet at www.proxydocs.com/DNR.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Internet Availability of Proxy Materials</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Record Date and Common Stock Outstanding</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Voting of Common Stock</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Voting by Stockholders of Record</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Voting by Beneficial Owners</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Quorum; Required Vote; Treatment of Abstentions and Broker Non-Votes</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Persons Making the Solicitation</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Proposal One: Election of Directors</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Governance of the Company</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>Board Leadership Structure</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>Presiding Director</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>Corporate Governance Guidelines</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>Risk Oversight</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Identification of Director Candidates</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Director Independence</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Code of Conduct and Ethics</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Related Party Transactions</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Communication with the Board</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>Board Meetings, Attendance and Committees</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Audit Committee</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>Compensation Committee</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>Reserves and Health, Safety and Environmental Committee</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Risk Committee</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>Security Ownership of Certain Beneficial Owners and Management</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>Management</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>Executive Compensation – Compensation Discussion and Analysis</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Executive Summary</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Summary of Executive Compensation Practices</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>Say on Pay Results and Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>Objectives and Philosophy</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Roles in Setting Executive Officer Compensation</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Use of Peer Survey Comparisons</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>Compensation Components</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>Results of Performance-Based Compensation for Year-Ended 2016</u>	<u>42</u>
<u>2017 Compensation Changes</u>	<u>44</u>

<u>Change in Control and Severance Benefits</u>	45
<u>Perquisites and Other Benefits</u>	45
<u>Stock Ownership Guidelines</u>	45
<u>Risk Assessment Related to Our Compensation Program</u>	45
<u>Policy on Recovery of Compensation and Clawbacks</u>	46
<u>Deductibility of Executive Compensation</u>	46
<u>Compensation Committee Report</u>	46
<u>Executive Compensation – Compensation Tables</u>	47
<u>Summary Compensation Table</u>	47
<u>CEO Realized Compensation</u>	49
<u>2016 Grants of Plan-Based Awards</u>	50
<u>2016 Outstanding Equity Awards at Fiscal Year-End</u>	52
<u>Option Exercises and Stock Vested During 2016</u>	54
<u>Potential Payments Upon Termination or Change in Control</u>	54
<u>Executive Compensation – Proposals</u>	57
<u>Proposal Two: Advisory Vote to Approve Named Executive Officer Compensation</u>	57
<u>Proposal Three: Frequency of Advisory Vote on Named Executive Officer Compensation</u>	58
<u>Compensation of Directors</u>	59
<u>2016 Director Compensation</u>	59
<u>2016 Director Compensation Table</u>	60
<u>Director Stock Ownership and Retention Guidelines</u>	60
<u>Equity Compensation Plan Information</u>	61
<u>Proposal Four: Approval of the Amendment and Restatement of the Company’s 2004 Omnibus Stock and Incentive Plan</u>	62
<u>Audit Matters</u>	71
<u>Audit Committee Report</u>	71
<u>Independent Auditor Fees</u>	72
<u>Proposal Five: Ratify the Audit Committee’s Selection of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP as the Company’s Independent Registered Public Accounting Firm for 2017</u>	73
<u>Section 16(a) Beneficial Ownership Reporting Compliance</u>	74
<u>Stockholder Proposals for Our 2018 Annual Meeting of Stockholders</u>	74
<u>Proposals for Inclusion in Our 2018 Proxy Statement</u>	74
<u>Advanced Notice of Nominations or Proposed Business for Our 2018 Annual Meeting of Stockholders</u>	74
<u>Other Matters</u>	75
<u>Appendix A – Amended and Restated 2004 Omnibus Stock and Incentive Plan</u>	A-1

DENBURY RESOURCES INC.
5320 Legacy Drive
Plano, Texas 75024

PROXY STATEMENT

Annual Meeting of Stockholders
to be held on Wednesday, May 24, 2017

This proxy statement is furnished in connection with the solicitation of proxies by the Board of Directors (sometimes referred to herein as “our Board” or “the Board”) of Denbury Resources Inc., a Delaware corporation (“Denbury” or “the Company”) for use at the Company’s annual meeting of stockholders to be held on Wednesday, May 24, 2017 at the Company’s corporate headquarters at 5320 Legacy Drive, Plano, Texas 75024, at 8:00 A.M. Central Daylight Time (CDT), or at any adjournment or postponement thereof. This proxy statement, proxy card and our 2016 Annual Report to Stockholders are being first made available to stockholders on or about April 13, 2017.

INTERNET AVAILABILITY OF PROXY MATERIALS

As permitted under the rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”), the Company is making its proxy materials available to its stockholders electronically via the Internet. On or about April 13, 2017, the Company is sending a Notice Regarding the Internet Availability of Proxy Materials (the “Notice”) to its stockholders of record as of the close of business on March 27, 2017. The Notice includes (i) instructions on how to access the Company’s proxy materials and vote via the Internet, (ii) the date, time and location of the annual meeting, (iii) a description of the matters intended to be acted upon at the annual meeting, (iv) a list of the materials being made available electronically, (v) instructions on how a stockholder can request paper copies of the Company’s proxy materials, (vi) any control/identification numbers that a stockholder needs to access the proxy materials and (vii) information about attending the annual meeting and voting in person.

RECORD DATE AND COMMON STOCK OUTSTANDING

Our Board has fixed the record date for the annual meeting as of the close of business on March 27, 2017. Only Denbury stockholders of record on the record date are entitled to receive notice of and to vote at the annual meeting. If you are a holder of our common stock, you are entitled to one vote at the annual meeting for each share of common stock you held on the record date. On the record date, there were 398,003,141 shares of Denbury common stock issued and outstanding and entitled to vote at the annual meeting.

VOTING OF COMMON STOCK

Voting by Stockholders of Record

You are a stockholder of record if your shares are directly held by you and registered in your name with our transfer agent, American Stock Transfer & Trust Company, LLC. If you are a stockholder of record, you may vote your shares via the Internet at www.proxydocs.com/DNR in accordance with the instructions in the Notice. If you have requested a paper copy of the proxy materials, you may also vote by touch-tone telephone from the United States by calling 1-866-206-5293, or by completing, signing and dating the proxy card and returning the proxy card in the prepaid envelope. In order to be valid and acted upon at the annual meeting, your proxy must be received before 5:00 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) on May 23, 2017. Shares represented by proxy will be voted at the annual meeting unless the proxy is revoked at any time prior to the time at which the shares covered by proxy are voted by: (i) timely submitting a proxy with new voting instructions via the Internet or telephone; (ii) timely delivering a valid, later-dated executed proxy card; (iii) delivering a written notice of revocation that is received by our Secretary at 5320 Legacy Drive, Plano, Texas 75024, by 5:00 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) on May 23, 2017; or (iv) voting in person at

the annual meeting by completing a ballot (however, attending the annual meeting without completing a ballot will not revoke any previously submitted proxy). If you properly complete and sign your proxy card but do not indicate how your shares should be voted on a matter, the shares represented by your proxy will be voted in accordance with the recommendation of our Board as discussed below.

1

Table of Contents

Voting by Beneficial Owners

You are considered a beneficial owner of shares held in “street name” if your shares are held by a broker, bank or other nominee (collectively referred to as a “broker”) on your behalf. If you are a beneficial owner of shares, you will receive instructions from your broker describing how to vote your shares. As a beneficial owner of your shares, you are entitled to direct your broker how to vote your shares. You may instruct your broker on how to vote by completing the voting instruction form provided to you by your broker. You may also vote by telephone or via the Internet if your broker makes such methods available, in which case applicable instructions will be provided to you by your broker. You may change your vote by submitting new voting instructions to your broker in accordance with your broker’s procedures. If you do not instruct your broker on how to vote your shares, your broker may vote your shares as it decides with respect to the matter for which it has discretionary authority (Proposal Five (the ratification of the selection of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP as our independent registered public accounting firm)) in the absence of timely instructions from you. There are also non-discretionary matters for which your broker does not have discretionary authority to vote unless it receives timely instructions from you: Proposal One (the election of directors), Proposal Two (the non-binding, advisory approval of named executive officer compensation), Proposal Three (the advisory vote on the frequency of the stockholder vote on named executive officer compensation prospectively) or Proposal Four (amendment and restatement of our 2004 Omnibus Stock and Incentive Plan). A “broker non-vote” results when a broker does not have discretion to vote on a particular matter, you have not given timely instructions on how the broker should vote your shares and the broker indicates it does not have authority to vote such shares on its proxy. As the beneficial owner of shares, you are invited to attend the annual meeting; however, you may not vote your shares in person at the annual meeting unless you obtain a written proxy from your broker.

Quorum; Required Vote; Treatment of Abstentions and Broker Non-Votes

We must have present in person or represented by proxy at least one-third of our issued and outstanding shares of common stock entitled to vote at the annual meeting in order to have a quorum. Abstentions and broker non-votes are counted as present at the annual meeting for purposes of determining whether a quorum is present. With respect to Proposal One (the election of directors), you will not be allowed to cumulate your votes. If you do not wish to vote for a particular nominee, you must clearly identify such nominee on your proxy card or voting instruction form. In order for a nominee to be elected as director, such nominee must receive the vote of the majority of the votes cast with respect to such nominee at the annual meeting, where a quorum is present. A majority of votes cast means that the number of shares voted “for” a nominee’s election must exceed the number of shares voted “withhold” for such nominee’s election. Abstentions and broker non-votes will not be counted as votes cast for purposes of the election of directors. With respect to Proposals Two, Three, Four and Five, the affirmative vote of a majority of the shares having voting power present in person or represented by proxy at the annual meeting, where a quorum is present, is required for approval. Abstentions will be included in the vote total on Proposals Two, Three, Four and Five, such abstentions having the same effect on each such proposal as a negative vote; however, if there is a broker non-vote with respect to Proposals Two, Three or Four, it will not be included in the vote total and will not have any effect.

We will vote all properly executed proxies at the annual meeting in accordance with the direction on the proxy. You should be aware that if no vote direction is indicated, the shares will be voted FOR the election of all of the director nominees under Proposal One; FOR Proposal Two (the non-binding, advisory approval of named executive officer compensation); FOR Proposal Three (an advisory vote on the frequency of the stockholder vote on named executive officer compensation every one year); FOR Proposal Four (amendment and restatement of our 2004 Omnibus Stock and Incentive Plan); and FOR Proposal Five (the ratification of the selection of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP as our independent registered public accounting firm). Our Board has designated John P. Dielwart and/or Phil Rykhoek to serve as proxies. We do not know of any matters other than those matters listed in the Notice that will be presented for action at the annual meeting. However, if any other matters are properly presented for action at the annual meeting, we intend for Messrs. Dielwart and Rykhoek, and each of them acting singly as proxies named in the proxy

card, to vote at their discretion on such matters.

2

Table of Contents

PERSONS MAKING THE SOLICITATION

We are soliciting this proxy and will bear all costs incurred in connection with such solicitation for the annual meeting, including those incurred for the preparation, printing and mailing of the proxy materials. Our directors, officers or employees may solicit proxies by personal interviews, telephone or other means of communication. If they do so, these individuals will not receive any additional compensation for these services. We may also retain a proxy solicitor to assist us with the distribution and solicitation of proxies for the annual meeting at our expense.

Table of Contents

Proposal One: Election of Directors

Our Second Amended and Restated Bylaws (“Bylaws”) provide that our Board shall consist of a minimum of three and a maximum of fifteen directors. Each of the directors is elected annually and holds office until the next annual meeting of stockholders and until his or her successor is elected and qualified, or until his or her earlier resignation or removal. We presently have eight directors, all of whom are serving terms that expire at the annual meeting. As previously announced by the Company, Wieland F. Wettstein, a founding director of the Company since 1990, and Chairman of the Board for eight years between 2008 and 2016, is retiring from the Board upon completion of his current term. The Board is nominating Lynn A. Peterson as a director for the first time, and as a result, eight director nominees will still be seeking election at the annual meeting.

As recently announced by the Company, Phil Rykhoek, our Chief Executive Officer for the past eight years, will be retiring from that position on June 30, 2017, and retiring from the Board at that time. The Board intends to elect Christian S. Kendall as Chief Executive Officer as of that date and to appoint Mr. Kendall to replace Mr. Rykhoek as a director of the Company.

Unless you mark a proxy to the contrary, we plan to vote the proxies for the election of the eight nominees listed below as directors. With the exception of Mr. Peterson, these individuals are current members of the Board. We do not foresee any reason why any of these nominees would become unavailable, but if any of them should, your proxy may be voted for a substitute that is nominated by the Board, or we may reduce the size of our Board accordingly.

The name, age, Board committee membership, period of time served as a director of Denbury and the principal occupation of each person nominated for election as a director are as follows:

Name	Age	Current Board Committees	Director Since	Principal Occupation
		Compensation Committee		
John P. Dielwart, Chairman	64	Reserves and HSE Committee	2013	Vice-Chairman of ARC Financial Corp.
		Risk Committee Compensation Committee		
Michael B. Decker	67	Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee Audit Committee	2007	Partner with Wingate Partners
		Compensation Committee		
Gregory L. McMichael	68	Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee	2004	Independent Consultant
		Risk Committee Audit Committee		
Kevin O. Meyers	63	Reserves and HSE Committee	2011	Independent Consultant
Phil Rykhoek	60	N/A	2010	Chief Executive Officer of Denbury Resources Inc.
Randy Stein	63	Audit Committee	2005	Independent Consultant

Nominating/Corporate
Governance Committee

Risk Committee
Compensation Committee

Laura A. Sugg	56		2012	Independent Consultant
Lynn A. Peterson	64	N/A		Chairman of the Board, President and Chief Executive Officer of SRC Energy Inc.

Table of Contents

Our directors and director nominee bring various skills, experience and insight to our Board. They consist of two current chief executive officers of public oil and gas companies (Messrs. Rykhoek and Peterson), a former chief executive officer of a public oil and gas company (Mr. Dielwart), a qualified financial expert (Mr. Stein), a private equity investor and former chief operating officer (Mr. Decker), two engineers with executive industry experience (Mr. Meyers and Ms. Sugg) and a former oil and gas analyst (Mr. McMichael). These individuals were selected in order to give the Board insight from various points of view, all of which relate to various aspects of our business.

With the exception of Mr. Rykhoek, our Chief Executive Officer, all of our director nominees are independent. Including a large majority of independent directors on our Board helps ensure our Board provides independent oversight. For more information on director independence, see Governance of the Company – Director Independence below. Our director nominees provide an effective mix of experience and fresh perspective. Including directors with a mix of tenure on the Board helps transition the knowledge of the more experienced directors while providing a broad set of perspectives and experiences. For more information on how director candidates are identified, see Governance of the Company – Identification of Director Candidates below.

Table of Contents

The narratives below provide more specific biographical information and outline the skills and qualifications for each of the Board nominees.

John P. Dielwart

Joined the Board: 2013

Age: 64

Board Committees: Compensation Committee, Reserves and HSE Committee, Risk Committee

Principal Occupation: Vice-Chairman of ARC Financial Corp.

John P. Dielwart has been a director of Denbury since November 2013 and was selected Chairman of the Board in March 2016. Mr. Dielwart is a founder and former Chief Executive Officer, as well as a member of the board of directors, of ARC Resources Ltd. (TSX: ARX.TO) (“ARC”), a publicly traded Canadian oil and gas company and a member of the board of directors of Tesco Corporation (NASDAQ: TESO), a publicly traded oilfield services company, and TransAlta Corporation (TSX: TA.TO), a publicly traded electricity power generator and wholesale marketing company. Mr. Dielwart oversaw the growth of ARC, first as its President and then as Chief Executive Officer from its startup in 1996 until his retirement in January 2013. Mr. Dielwart is currently the Vice-Chairman of ARC Financial Corp., Canada’s leading energy-focused private equity manager, a position he assumed after his retirement from ARC. Prior to joining ARC, Mr. Dielwart spent 12 years with a major Calgary-based oil and natural gas engineering consulting firm as Senior Vice President and Director. Mr. Dielwart began his career at a major Calgary-based oil and natural gas company, where he spent five years. Mr. Dielwart served two separate three-year terms as a Governor of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP), including 18 months (2002 to 2004) as Chairman.

Skills and Qualifications:

Mr. Dielwart is a member of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) and received a Bachelor of Science degree (with Distinction) in Civil Engineering from the University of Calgary. In 2015, Mr. Dielwart was inducted into the Calgary Business Hall of Fame. Mr. Dielwart’s background in the oil and gas industry, particularly as a founder and former Chief Executive Officer of ARC, provides the Board with extensive and relevant industry knowledge, as well as a managerial and leadership perspective. Mr. Dielwart’s experience in overseeing the development of ARC into a successful oil and gas company is an asset to both the Board and management.

Michael B. Decker

Joined the Board: 2007

Age: 67

Board Committees: Compensation Committee, Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee

Principal Occupation: Partner with Wingate Partners

Michael B. Decker has been a director of Denbury since December 2007. Mr. Decker has been a partner of Wingate Partners, a Dallas-based private equity investment company, since 1996. Prior to joining Wingate Partners, Mr. Decker held the position of Chief Operating Officer of the Trammell Crow Company. He previously was President of Huffco Group, Inc., an energy exploration company. Mr. Decker currently serves as a board member for Sunrise Oilfield Supply and USA Environment LP. Mr. Decker has served as a consultant for the Boston Consulting Group and has worked as an investment officer for the World Bank.

Skills and Qualifications:

Mr. Decker holds an MBA from the Harvard Business School, a Master of Arts from Oxford University and an Artium Baccalaureatus from Princeton University. Mr. Decker's educational background and current and past roles provide him with significant financial, managerial and leadership experience. Mr. Decker has significant experience in the oil and gas industry, as well as several other industries, which broadens the perspectives he brings to the Board.

Table of Contents

Gregory L. McMichael

Joined the Board: 2004

Age: 68

Board Committees: Audit Committee, Compensation Committee, Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee, Risk Committee

Principal Occupation: Independent Consultant

Gregory L. McMichael has been a director of Denbury since December 2004. Mr. McMichael is currently a self-employed business consultant, having retired in 2004 from his position of Vice President and Group Leader – Energy Research of A.G. Edwards, where he was responsible for all of the firm’s equity research in the energy sector. Prior to his employment by A.G. Edwards, which commenced in 1998, Mr. McMichael was Director of Equity Research of Hanifen, Imhoff, Inc. (“Hanifen”), a regional investment banking firm based in Denver, Colorado, for eight years. Prior to his employment by Hanifen, he worked directly in the oil and gas industry for 15 years, most recently as Chief Executive Officer of Point Resources Inc., a privately held oil and natural gas exploration and production company. Mr. McMichael currently serves as a Special Advisor to the board of directors of Matador Resources Company (NYSE: MTDR), a publicly traded oil and gas company. Mr. McMichael has previously served as a director of Matador Petroleum Company, Quest Resource Corporation and Admiral Bay Resources Inc.

Skills and Qualifications:

Mr. McMichael is a National Association of Corporate Directors Board Leadership Fellow and serves on the board of directors of the Colorado chapter. Mr. McMichael’s experience in the oil and gas industry, coupled with his service on other boards and experience as an analyst covering the energy sector, provides the Board with broad and extensive analytical perspectives. Mr. McMichael monitors the oil and gas industry and provides the Board with various analyses of relative industry performance.

Kevin O. Meyers

Joined the Board: 2011

Age: 63

Board Committees: Audit Committee, Reserves and HSE Committee

Principal Occupation: Independent Consultant

Kevin O. Meyers has been a director of Denbury since July 2011. Mr. Meyers has more than 35 years of experience in the oil and gas industry, having retired from ConocoPhillips at the end of 2010. Mr. Meyers currently serves on the board of directors of the following publicly traded companies: Hornbeck Offshore Services, Inc. (NYSE: HOS), a provider of offshore service vessels, Precision Drilling Corporation (NYSE: PDS), a provider of drilling equipment and services, and Hess Corporation (NYSE: HES), an oil and natural gas exploration and production company. Mr. Meyers previously served on

the board of directors of Bill Barrett Corporation (NYSE: BBG), LUKOIL, the World Energy Council, the United States Energy Association, the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska and the Nature Conservancy of Alaska. For the ten years prior to retirement, Mr. Meyers was a senior executive with ConocoPhillips, most recently serving as Senior Vice President Exploration and Production, Americas. Prior to that, he was President of ConocoPhillips Canada, President of ConocoPhillips Russia and Caspian Region, and President of ConocoPhillips Alaska. For the twenty years prior to that, he served in engineering, technical and executive positions with ARCO, last serving as President of ARCO Alaska.

Skills and Qualifications:

Mr. Meyers holds a Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Bachelor's degrees in Chemistry and Mathematics from Capital University in Ohio. Mr. Meyers' educational background and extensive industry and technical experience provide the Board with significant insight into the Company's operations and technical matters. His leadership experience with large oil and gas companies further broadens the perspectives he brings to the Board.

Table of Contents

Lynn A. Peterson

Age: 64

Principal Occupation: Chairman of the Board, President and Chief Executive Officer of SRC Energy Inc.

Lynn A. Peterson is a first-time director nominee to the Board of Denbury. Mr. Peterson has served as President of SRC Energy Inc. (formerly Synergy Resources Corporation) (“SRC”) since May 2015 and as the Chairman of the Board, President and Chief Executive Officer of SRC since January 2016. Before joining SRC, he was a co-founder of Kodiak Oil & Gas Corporation (“Kodiak”), and served Kodiak as a director (2001-2014) and as its President and Chief Executive Officer (2002-2014) and Chairman of the Board (2011-2014), until its acquisition by Whiting Petroleum Corporation in December 2014. Mr. Peterson served as a director of Whiting Petroleum Corporation from December 2014 to June 2015.

Skills and Qualifications:

Mr. Peterson graduated from the University of Northern Colorado with a Bachelor of Science in Accounting and has more than 30 years of experience in the oil and gas industry. As the current Chief Executive Officer of an oil and gas company, Mr. Peterson provides the Board with valuable industry insight, as well as managerial, business and strategic expertise. Mr. Peterson’s experience in leading oil and gas companies is an asset to both the Board and management.

Phil Rykhoek

Joined the Board: 2010

Age: 60

Board Committees: N/A

Principal Occupation: Chief Executive Officer of Denbury Resources Inc.

Phil Rykhoek has been a director of Denbury since December 2010 and the Chief Executive Officer of Denbury since June 2009. Since joining the Company in June 1995 and until June 2009 when he became Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Rykhoek served as Chief Financial Officer, last serving as Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, Secretary and Treasurer. Mr. Rykhoek led the effort to take Denbury public in the United States in 1995 and has been an integral part of senior management for more than 20 years. Before joining Denbury in June 1995, Mr. Rykhoek was co-founder and an executive officer of Petroleum Financial, Inc. (“PFI”), a private company formed in May 1991 to provide accounting, financial and management services on a contract basis to other entities. While at PFI, Mr. Rykhoek was also an officer of Amerac Energy Corporation, where he had been employed in various positions for eight years, last as Vice President

and Chief Accounting Officer. Mr. Rykhoek also served as a director of the general partner of Encore Energy Partners L.P. between August 2010 and December 2010 and of the general partner of Genesis Energy, L.P. between May 2002 and February 2010.

Skills and Qualifications:

As Chief Executive Officer of the Company, Mr. Rykhoek is intimately knowledgeable of the day-to-day and strategic operations of the Company, providing the Board with a management perspective.

Table of Contents

Randy Stein

Joined the Board: 2005

Age: 63

Board Committees: Audit Committee, Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee, Risk Committee

Principal Occupation: Independent Consultant

Randy Stein has been a director of Denbury since January 2005. Mr. Stein is currently a self-employed business consultant, having retired from PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, formerly Coopers & Lybrand LLP, in 2000. Mr. Stein was employed for 20 years with PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, most recently as principal in charge of the Denver, Colorado tax practice. Mr. Stein served as Audit Committee Chairman, Co-Chairman of the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee and a member of the Compensation Committee of Westport Resources Corp., a Denver-based public oil and gas company, from 2000 until it was acquired in 2004. Mr. Stein is currently a board member and Audit Committee Chairman of Bill Barrett Corporation (NYSE: BBG), an oil and natural gas developer, and also served on the board and audit committee of Koala Corporation, a company engaged in the design, production and marketing of family convenience products, from 2001 through 2005.

Skills and Qualifications:

Mr. Stein's experience in public accounting with a major accounting firm provides our Board with insights into many aspects of the financial reporting and tax issues facing oil and gas companies. Mr. Stein's background also brings additional financial, accounting and tax expertise to the Board through prior experience as a vice president of taxation for a publicly traded oil and gas company, and an expansive understanding of corporate governance and audit committee matters through his service on other boards.

Laura A. Sugg

Joined the Board: 2012

Age: 56

Board Committees: Compensation Committee, Reserves and HSE Committee

Principal Occupation: Independent Consultant

Laura A. Sugg has been a director of Denbury since January 2012. Ms. Sugg currently serves on the board of directors of Murphy Oil Corporation (NYSE: MUR), a publicly traded international oil and gas company. She previously served on the board of directors of Mariner Energy Inc., Huber Energy, the Williams Companies, Inc. and Williams Partners L.P. Ms. Sugg is a retired senior executive of ConocoPhillips, serving over 20 years in diverse roles of increasing responsibility, last serving as President of the Australasia Division. In this role, Ms. Sugg was in charge of profit and loss and growth for ConocoPhillips' operations in Australia and East Timor. Prior to her role as President of the Australasia Division, Ms. Sugg served as ConocoPhillips'

General Manager E&P Human Resources, ConocoPhillips' midstream executive responsible for the profit and loss, health, safety and environment, and operations for its gas gathering, processing, and fractionation business in the U.S., Canada and Trinidad and Vice President Worldwide Gas.

Skills and Qualifications:

Ms. Sugg has a Bachelor's degree in Chemical Engineering from Oklahoma State University and is a member of the National Association of Corporate Directors. Ms. Sugg's background brings extensive industry, operational and technical experience to the Board. Her experience also extends to human resources, compensation and financial matters, which combined with her leadership experience in a large oil and gas company, exemplifies the diverse perspectives she brings to the Board.

Table of Contents

Vote Required

As described above, in order for a nominee to be elected as a director, where a quorum is present, such nominee must receive the affirmative vote of a majority of the votes cast with respect to such nominee at the annual meeting. A majority of votes cast means that the number of shares voted “for” a nominee’s election must exceed the number of shares voted as “withhold” for such nominee’s election, with abstentions and broker non-votes not being counted as votes cast for purposes of the election of directors. Brokers do not have discretion to vote on this proposal without your instruction. If you do not instruct your broker how to vote on this proposal, your broker will deliver a non-vote on this proposal.

Board of Directors’ Recommendation

Our Board of Directors recommends that stockholders vote FOR election of each of the foregoing director nominees.

Table of Contents

GOVERNANCE OF THE COMPANY

The business, properties and affairs of the Company are managed by the Chief Executive Officer under the direction of the Board. The Board has responsibility for establishing broad corporate policies and for the overall performance and direction of the Company. Other than involvement by the Company's Chief Executive Officer, the Board is not involved in the day-to-day operations of the Company. Board members keep informed of the Company's business by participating in Board meetings, attending committee meetings, reviewing regularly provided analyses and reports and engaging in thorough discussions with the Chief Executive Officer and other officers of the Company. Our Board and senior management spend significant time implementing corporate governance guidelines, policies and practices that uphold our core values, align with our corporate governance commitments and support our business sustainability.

Board Leadership Structure

John P. Dielwart serves as Chairman of the Board, and Phil Rykhoek serves as our Chief Executive Officer. The separation of the positions of Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board allows our Chief Executive Officer to focus on the day-to-day leadership and performance of the Company and allows our Chairman of the Board to lead the Board in its fundamental role of providing advice and oversight to management. The Board recognizes that no single leadership structure is right for all companies, and depending on the circumstances, other leadership structures might be appropriate. The Board believes the current leadership structure is effective and appropriate, creates a separation of executive powers by providing a Chairman with whom the Chief Executive Officer can discuss issues facing the Company, and provides a significant voice to non-management directors.

Presiding Director

John P. Dielwart, our Chairman of the Board, is the presiding director at the meetings of non-management directors. To contact him, please address your letters to:

Denbury Resources Inc.
Attn: Chairman of the Board of Directors
5320 Legacy Drive
Plano, Texas 75024

Corporate Governance Guidelines

The Board has adopted Corporate Governance Guidelines that address significant issues of corporate governance and set forth the procedures by which the Board carries out its responsibilities. The primary responsibility of the Board as memorialized in the Corporate Governance Guidelines is the maximization of long-term stockholder value for the Company's stockholders, with due regard for the Company's employees and other stakeholders. Among the areas addressed by the guidelines are assessing of risk, director qualifications, director responsibilities, selection and election of directors, director compensation and tenure, Board committee responsibilities, director orientation and continuing education, director access to management and succession planning, the number of Board meetings, and Board and committee performance evaluations. The Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for assessing and periodically reviewing the adequacy of these guidelines. The guidelines are available on the Company's website at www.denbury.com, under the "About Denbury – Corporate Governance" link.

Table of Contents

Risk Oversight

The Board is responsible for oversight of our risk assessment and risk management. The Board strives to effectively oversee our enterprise-wide risk management while maximizing the long-term value for our stockholders, with due regard for our employees and other stakeholders. The Board receives regular updates from, and maintains an active dialogue with, members of our management team and Internal Audit Department about existing risk management processes and how management identifies, assesses and responds to our most significant risk exposures. These interactions enable the Board to evaluate whether management is appropriately managing our most significant risks. The Board also relies on, and has delegated certain aspects of its oversight responsibility to, its committees to assist the Board with its overall risk assessment and risk management responsibilities. Each committee reviews and assesses with management risk-related matters within the scope of its responsibilities and reports regularly to the Board on such risk-related matters. For example: the Audit Committee oversees our guidelines and policies with respect to risk assessment and risk management, as well as our major financial risk exposures and the steps management has taken to monitor and control such exposures; the Risk Committee oversees our principal business, financial and operational risks, and our other material risks and exposures, and the actions, activities and initiatives we undertake to mitigate such risks and exposures; the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee oversees risks relating to our corporate governance matters and legislative affairs and activities and matters related thereto; the Compensation Committee oversees the extent to which risks arising from our compensation policies and practices are reasonably likely to have a material adverse effect on us; and the Reserves and Health, Safety and Environmental Committee oversees the independent reserves engineers' identification of issues and business risks and exposures, and our health, safety and environmental policies, practices and procedures and management's assessments of high risk areas with respect thereto.

Identification of Director Candidates

The Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for identifying and reviewing director candidates to determine whether they qualify and should be considered for membership on the Board. The Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee has not established a specific minimum or maximum age, level of education, years of experience or specified types of skills for potential director candidates, but in general, consideration is given to the candidates' business and professional backgrounds, and the committee seeks candidates with outstanding integrity, achievements, judgment and other skills and experience that will enhance the Board's ability to serve the long-term interests of the Company and its stockholders.

The Board and the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee aim to assemble a diverse group of Board members and believe that no single criterion, such as gender or minority status, is determinative in obtaining diversity on the Board. The Board defines diversity as differences of viewpoint, professional experience, education and skills, such as serving on other public company boards, the balance of business interest and experience of the candidate as compared to the incumbent or other nominated directors, and the need for any particular expertise on the Board or one of its committees.

Members of the Board will be asked to submit recommendations when there is an opening or anticipated opening for a director position. The Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee may also use outside sources or third parties to find potential director candidates, and similarly may use the services of outside sources or third parties to evaluate or assist in evaluating nominees brought to their attention. For example, the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee retained a third-party recruiting company to help identify Lynn A. Peterson in its recent 2016 and 2017 director search. Numerous candidates were identified as part of this process, including Mr. Peterson.

The Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee will also consider director candidates recommended by the stockholders in accordance with the Company's Bylaws. For information on how to recommend a director candidate,

see Stockholder Proposals for Our 2018 Annual Meeting of Stockholders – Advanced Notice of Nominations or Proposed Business for Our 2018 Annual Meeting of Stockholders below.

Table of Contents

Director Independence

The Company's Bylaws provide that at least two-thirds of the members of the Board will be independent as determined under the rules of the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE") and its corporate governance listing standards. Additionally, each of the Board committee charters requires that members of that committee be independent. The Board has affirmatively determined that all nominees for director, with the exception of Mr. Rykhoek, the Company's Chief Executive Officer, qualify as independent directors under these standards based on its review of all relevant facts and circumstances.

Code of Conduct and Ethics

The Company has a Code of Conduct and Ethics that applies to its officers, employees and directors. This code assists employees in resolving ethical issues that may arise in complying with Denbury's policies. Our Code of Conduct and Ethics is a values-based document organized around Denbury's five core values: Integrity, Teamwork, Innovation, Excellence and Respect. It exemplifies Denbury's commitment to "Doing Right" in the conduct of its business.

The Company's Chief Executive Officer and Senior Financial Officers are also subject to the Code of Ethics for Senior Financial Officers. The purpose of both codes is to promote, among other things:

- ethical handling of actual or apparent conflicts of interest;
- full, fair, accurate and timely disclosure in filings with the SEC and in other public disclosures;
- compliance with the law and other regulations;
- protection of the Company's assets;
- compliance with insider trading policies; and
- prompt internal reporting of violations of the codes.

Both of these codes are available on the Company's website at www.denbury.com, under the "About Denbury – Corporate Governance" link. Any waiver of these codes with respect to executive officers and directors of the Company may be made only by the Board and will be disclosed to stockholders on the Company's website, along with any amendments to these codes, to the extent required by applicable law or NYSE rules.

Related Party Transactions

Related Party Transactions Policy and Process

Under the Company's Related Party Transactions Policy, the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee is charged with reviewing and approving or ratifying all transactions, other than those non-material transactions specifically excluded in the policy, between the Company and a "Related Party." Under the Company's Related Party Transactions Policy, "Related Parties" are the Company's directors and executive officers, beneficial owners that hold more than 5% of any class of the Company's voting securities, as well as immediate family members of any such directors, executive officers and beneficial owners. The Company's Related Party Transactions Policy is available on the Company's website at www.denbury.com, under the "About Denbury – Corporate Governance" link.

Table of Contents

Communication with the Board

The Board has approved a process by which stockholders or other interested parties may contact the members of the Board. All parties wanting to communicate with the Board should address letters to:

Denbury Resources Inc.
Attn: Corporate Secretary
5320 Legacy Drive
Plano, Texas 75024

In addition, interested parties may e-mail the Corporate Secretary and Board members at: secretary@denbury.com. All such communications will be forwarded by the Corporate Secretary directly to the Board.

Table of Contents

BOARD MEETINGS, ATTENDANCE AND COMMITTEES

The Board met 17 times during the year ended December 31, 2016, including telephonic meetings. All directors attended at least 75% of the Board meetings held in 2016. Mr. Wettstein acted as Chairman of the Board through March 2016. In March 2016, the Board selected Mr. Dielwart to serve as Chairman of the Board, replacing Mr. Wettstein, who had served as Chairman of the Board since May 2008. At each in-person meeting, the Board holds an executive session with the non-management Board members, which is chaired by the Chairman of the Board. The Board took all other actions by unanimous written consent during 2016 in accordance with the terms of the Company's Bylaws.

All directors attended at least 75% of all meetings of each of the committees on which they served. Additionally, although the Company encourages the directors to attend the annual meeting of stockholders, but does not have a policy that all of the directors must be present, all of the directors attended last year's annual meeting of stockholders.

During 2016, the Board had an Audit, Compensation, Reserves and HSE, Nominating/Corporate Governance and Risk Committee. At each Board meeting in 2016, the Chairperson of each committee provided a report on their committee's activities and findings from their most recent meetings. The Board committees had the following number of meetings during 2016, including telephonic meetings:

Committee	Number of Meetings in 2016
Audit	8
Compensation	5
Reserves and HSE	6
Nominating/Corporate Governance	4
Risk Committee	4

The table below shows the Committee memberships at March 31, 2017. As previously disclosed, Mr. Wettstein will not be standing for re-election at the annual meeting. The Board has nominated Lynn A. Peterson to serve on the Board and, if he is elected to the Board at the annual meeting, thereafter the Board will decide what committee appointments are appropriate. At this time, it has not been determined if there will be any other changes to the Committee memberships.

Name	Audit	Compensation	Reserves and HSE	Nominating/Corporate Governance	Risk
John P. Dielwart, Chairman		X	X		X
Michael B. Decker		X		Chairman	
Gregory L. McMichael	X	X		X	Chairman
Kevin O. Meyers	X		Chairman		
Phil Rykhoek					
Randy Stein	Chairman			X	X
Laura A. Sugg		Chairwoman	X		
Wieland F. Wettstein	X				X

Table of Contents

Audit Committee

The Audit Committee is comprised of four independent directors: Messrs. McMichael, Meyers, Stein and Wettstein, with Mr. Stein acting as chairman. As previously disclosed, Mr. Wettstein will not be standing for re-election at the annual meeting. Effective with the annual meeting, the Audit Committee will be reduced from four to three members. The primary purpose of the Audit Committee, which is discussed in detail in its charter, is to (a) select, oversee and evaluate the Company's independent registered public accounting firm, (b) oversee and evaluate the Company's internal audit function and (c) provide assistance to the Board in fulfilling its oversight responsibility with respect to:

- the integrity of the Company's financial statements;
- the Company's compliance with legal and regulatory requirements;
- the independence and qualifications of the Company's independent registered public accounting firm;
- the preparation of required disclosures for the Company's financial statement filings with the SEC; and
- the evaluation as to whether the Company has effective processes for risk assessment and risk management.

The Audit Committee meets regularly with financial management, the Company's Director of Internal Audit and the independent registered public accounting firm to review financial accounting and reporting and financial controls of the Company. The Audit Committee reviews and gives prior approval for audit and permitted non-audit services and related fees of the independent registered public accounting firm. The Director of Internal Audit and the independent registered public accounting firm have unrestricted access to the Audit Committee and periodically meet with the Audit Committee without management representatives present to discuss the results of their examinations and their opinions. The Audit Committee has the power to conduct internal audits and investigations, reviews recommendations or suggestions for changes in accounting procedures, and has the power to initiate or supervise any special investigations it may choose to undertake. Each year, the Audit Committee recommends to the Board (for ratification by the stockholders) an independent registered public accounting firm (see Audit Matters – Proposal Five).

The NYSE and SEC have adopted standards with respect to independence and financial literacy of the members of audit committees of public companies (including our Audit Committee). The standards require that all of the members of such audit committees be independent and that they all be able to read and understand fundamental financial statements, including balance sheets, income statements and cash flow statements. Additionally, at least one member of the audit committee must qualify and be designated as an "audit committee financial expert." The financial expert must be knowledgeable in the application of generally accepted accounting principles, the understanding and preparation of financial statements, accounting for estimates, accruals and reserves, internal accounting controls and audit committee functions. Such knowledge is to have been obtained through past education and experience in positions of financial oversight. Both Messrs. Stein and Wettstein have such experience and have been designated as "audit committee financial experts." All members of the Audit Committee satisfy the criteria for both independence and financial literacy.

The Audit Committee charter is available on our website at www.denbury.com, under the "About Denbury – Corporate Governance" link.

Compensation Committee

The Compensation Committee is comprised of four independent directors: Messrs. Decker, Dielwart and McMichael and Ms. Sugg, with Ms. Sugg acting as chairwoman. The primary purpose of the Compensation Committee is to provide assistance to the Board in discharging its oversight responsibilities relating to the compensation and development of the Chief Executive Officer and other officers, and to oversee and administer the Company's equity and other compensation and benefit plans. The Compensation Committee's duties and responsibilities, which are discussed in detail in its charter, include:

recommending for adoption by the Board, a general compensation program and salary structure for the Company and reviewing the program annually, recommending to the Board overall salary increases, bonuses and other annual compensation, and proposing modifications to the compensation program as deemed necessary;

Table of Contents

reviewing and approving on at least an annual basis the corporate goals and objectives relevant to the compensation of the Chief Executive Officer, evaluating the Chief Executive Officer's performance in light of these goals and objectives, and, together with the other independent, non-employee, outside directors of the Board, determining and approving the Chief Executive Officer's compensation based on this evaluation, as well as, in consultation with the Chief Executive Officer, evaluating the performance of, and reviewing and recommending for adoption by the Board the compensation of, all other senior executives on an annual basis;

recommending to the Board the adoption of, or material modifications to, the Company's incentive compensation plans, deferred compensation plans and equity-based plans, granting awards under these plans, and administering these plans; and

reviewing and discussing with management the compensation discussion and analysis and preparing and approving the Compensation Committee Report, both of which are included in this proxy statement.

The Compensation Committee charter is available on the Company's website at www.denbury.com, under the "About Denbury – Corporate Governance" link.

Reserves and Health, Safety and Environmental ("Reserves and HSE") Committee

The Reserves and HSE Committee is comprised of three independent directors: Ms. Sugg and Messrs. Dielwart and Meyers, with Mr. Meyers acting as chairman. The primary purpose of the Reserves and HSE Committee is to provide assistance to the Board in discharging its oversight responsibilities relating to (a) the Company's independent reserves engineer, (b) information regarding the Company's reserves and (c) the Company's health, safety and environmental policies, practices and procedures. The Reserves and HSE Committee's duties and responsibilities, which are discussed in detail in its charter, include:

- evaluating and recommending for selection by the Board, the Company's independent reserves engineer;
- reviewing and monitoring the independence of the Company's independent reserves engineer;
- reviewing with management and the independent reserves engineer the calculation and reporting of the Company's oil, natural gas, CO₂ and helium reserves;
- reviewing with management the Company's health, safety and environmental policies, practices and procedures and assessments of relevant high risk areas of each;
- reviewing the Company's strategy and initiatives in the area of corporate social responsibility; and
- reviewing the Company's reports regarding corporate responsibility activities prior to publication.

The Reserves and HSE Committee charter is available on the Company's website at www.denbury.com, under the "About Denbury – Corporate Governance" link.

Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee

The Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee is comprised of three independent directors: Messrs. Decker, McMichael and Stein, with Mr. Decker acting as chairman. The primary purpose of the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee is to provide assistance to the Board in discharging its oversight responsibilities relating to effective corporate governance. The Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee's duties and responsibilities, which are discussed in detail in its charter, include:

- identifying, recruiting, screening, interviewing and recommending for selection by the Board, individuals qualified to become members of the Board (see Governance of the Company – Identification of Director Candidates);
- recommending to the Board and overseeing the evaluation by the Board of, the director nominees to be presented for stockholder approval at the annual meeting of stockholders or for appointment by the Board if a vacancy occurs between annual meetings;

- developing and recommending to the Board for its approval an annual self-evaluation process of the Board and its committees;
- monitoring the education, orientation and training needs of directors of the Board;

Table of Contents

• developing and recommending to the Board for its approval various codes of conduct and ethics and a set of corporate governance guidelines;

• recommending to the Compensation Committee director compensation and benefits on an annual basis; and

• reviewing, approving, or ratifying if appropriate, any related party transactions and any material amendments or modifications to such related party transactions pursuant to the Company's Related Party Transactions Policy.

The Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee charter is available on the Company's website at www.denbury.com, under the "About Denbury – Corporate Governance" link.

Risk Committee

The Risk Committee is comprised of four independent directors: Messrs. Dielwart, McMichael, Stein and Wettstein, with Mr. McMichael acting as chairman. As previously disclosed, Mr. Wettstein will not be standing for re-election at the annual meeting. Effective with the annual meeting, the Risk Committee will be reduced from four to three members. The primary purpose of the Risk Committee is to provide assistance to the Board in discharging its oversight responsibilities relating to the Company's principal business, financial and operational risks, and other material risk exposures, and the actions, activities and initiatives of the Company to mitigate such risks and exposures, in each case to the extent such oversight is not otherwise the duty or responsibility of other committees of the Board. The Risk Committee's duties and responsibilities, which are discussed in detail in its charter, include:

- reviewing and evaluating management's identification of the major risks to the Company's business;
- reviewing the principal financial risks, exposures and liabilities undertaken or assumed by the Company;
- reviewing the Company's hedging activities;
- reviewing the Company's insurance programs and policies; and
- reviewing other material risk exposures as directed by the Board.

The Risk Committee charter is available on the Company's website at www.denbury.com, under the "About Denbury – Corporate Governance" link.

Table of Contents

SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT

The following table presents information regarding the number of shares of Denbury common stock beneficially owned as of February 28, 2017 by (i) each stockholder known by the Company to beneficially own more than 5% of our issued and outstanding common stock, (ii) each executive officer of the Company named in the Summary Compensation Table (our named executive officers), (iii) each director of the Board and director nominee and (iv) all directors and executive officers as a group. Unless otherwise indicated, each stockholder identified in the table is believed to have sole voting and investment power with respect to the shares beneficially held. The percent of outstanding shares is calculated on the basis of 398,020,508 shares of Denbury common stock outstanding (which excludes treasury shares) as of February 28, 2017. The table includes shares that were acquirable within 60 days following this date.

Name of Beneficial Owner	Beneficial Ownership of Common Stock as of February 28, 2017		Percent of Shares Outstanding
	Shares		
Directors and Executive Officers:			
John P. Dielwart	120,414	(1) *	
Michael B. Decker	190,023	(1)(2) *	
Gregory L. McMichael	99,379	(1)(2) *	
Kevin O. Meyers	107,030	(1) *	
Lynn A. Peterson	—	(3) *	
Randy Stein	158,941	(1)(2) *	
Laura A. Sugg	93,930	(1) *	
Wieland F. Wettstein	350,375	(1)(2)(4) *	
Phil Rykhoek	1,602,280	(2)(5) *	
Christian S. Kendall	783,404	(5) *	
Mark C. Allen	976,798	(2)(5) *	
Jim Matthews	263,636	(2)(5) *	
All of the executive officers and directors as a group (12 persons)	4,746,210	(6)	1.2 %
5% or more Stockholders			
The Vanguard Group	47,730,359	(7)	12.0 %
BlackRock, Inc.	40,101,003	(8)	10.1 %
Capital Research Global Investors	37,158,795	(9)	9.3 %
SailingStone Capital Partners LLC	31,630,490	(10)	7.9 %
State Street Corporation	22,480,186	(11)	5.6 %

* Indicates less than 1%.

(1) Includes 41,487 shares of unvested restricted common stock which will vest on May 23, 2017. In addition to the foregoing vesting provisions, unvested awards will vest upon the holder's death or disability or a change in control of the Company.

(2) Does not include stock appreciation rights ("SARs") for which the closing price of Denbury common stock on February 28, 2017, was below the various strike prices.

(3) Mr. Peterson is a first-time director nominee to the Board of Denbury.

(4) Includes 90,072 shares of common stock held by Mr. Wettstein's spouse.

(5) Includes the following shares of common stock (as shown in the table below) for each individual which they respectively have the right to acquire pursuant to: (a) shares of unvested restricted common stock which vest on the

dates listed or at the time the executive (i) becomes retirement eligible and (ii) has held the restricted common stock for one year from the date of grant; (b) shares of unvested restricted common stock that vest ratably between January 31, 2016 and the date the officer becomes retirement eligible; and (c) shares related to the (i) TSR (total shareholder return) award granted in 2014 and (ii) EBITDAX award granted in 2016, which vested at 53% and

Table of Contents

77%, respectively, of the targeted level on March 31, 2017 (see Executive Compensation – Compensation Discussion and Analysis – Results of Performance-Based Compensation for Year-Ended 2016). The holders of the performance-based stock do not have voting rights with respect to such shares until such shares vest. In addition to the foregoing vesting provisions, all of these shares will vest upon a holder's death or disability or a change in control of the Company. This does not include performance shares for which the performance period has not ended.

	Phil Rykhoeck	Christian S. Kendall	Mark C. Allen	Jim Matthews
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vested on March 31, 2017	(a) —	—	35,951	18,489
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vesting on July 8, 2017	(a) 496,894	95,031	73,912	38,012
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vesting on September 8, 2017	(a) —	99,000	—	—
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vesting on October 1, 2017	(a) —	52,631	—	—
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vesting on January 9, 2018	(a) —	—	26,861	13,814
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vesting on July 8, 2018	(a) —	92,236	71,739	36,894
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vesting on September 8, 2018	(a) —	99,000	—	—
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vesting on October 1, 2018	(a) —	51,083	—	—
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vesting on July 8, 2019	(a) —	92,236	71,740	36,895
Unvested Restricted Stock - Vesting on October 1, 2019	(a) —	51,084	—	—
Unvested Restricted Stock - Ratably & Retirement Vesting	(b) —	—	67,997	—
TSR Performance-Based Awards - Vested on March 31, 2017	(c) 42,271	—	18,493	9,510
EBITDAX Performance-Based Awards - Vested on March 31, 2017	(c) 136,889	77,000	59,889	30,800
Total	676,054	709,301	426,582	184,414

Shares beneficially owned by these executive officers and directors as a group include 1,911,908 shares of restricted stock which vest over time and 374,855 performance-based shares, which vested on March 31, 2017.

(6) This amount does not include SARs held by certain executive officers for which the closing price of Denbury common stock on February 28, 2017, was below the various strike prices.

Information based on Schedule 13G/A filed with the SEC on February 9, 2017. The Vanguard Group claims sole voting power of 433,946 shares, shared voting power of 41,048 shares, sole dispositive power of 47,273,017 shares and shared dispositive power of 457,342 shares. The address of The Vanguard Group is 100 Vanguard Blvd., Malvern, Pennsylvania 19355.

Information based on Schedule 13G/A filed with the SEC on March 9, 2017. BlackRock, Inc. claims sole voting (8) power of 38,326,047 shares and dispositive power of 40,101,003 shares. The address of BlackRock, Inc. is 55 East 52nd Street, New York, New York 10055.

Information based on Schedule 13G/A filed with the SEC on February 13, 2017. Capital Research Global (9) Investors claims sole voting and dispositive power of 37,158,795 shares. The address of Capital Research Global Investors is 333 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, California 90071.

Information based on Schedule 13G/A filed with the SEC on February 10, 2017. SailingStone Capital Partners (10) LLC claims sole voting and dispositive power of 31,630,490 shares. The address of SailingStone Capital Partners LLC is One California Street, 30th Floor, San Francisco, California 94111.

Information based on Schedule 13G filed with the SEC on February 9, 2017. State Street Corporation claims (11) shared voting and dispositive power of 22,480,186 shares. The address of State Street Corporation is State Street Financial Center, One Lincoln Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02111.

Table of Contents

MANAGEMENT

The names, ages and positions held by our officers are set forth below. Each officer holds office until his or her successor is chosen and qualifies or until their earlier resignation or removal in accordance with our Bylaws. Set forth below the table is a description of the business experience of each of our current officers. As recently announced by the Company, Phil Rykhoek, our Chief Executive Officer for the past eight years, will be retiring from that position on June 30, 2017, and retiring from the Board at that time. The Board intends to elect Christian S. Kendall as Chief Executive Officer as of that date and to appoint Mr. Kendall to replace Mr. Rykhoek as a director of the Company.

Name	Age	Position
Phil Rykhoek	60	Director and Chief Executive Officer
Christian S. Kendall	50	President and Chief Operating Officer
Mark C. Allen	49	Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer and Assistant Secretary
Jim Matthews	55	Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary
Dan E. Cole	64	Vice President – Commercial Development and Governmental Relations
Matthew Dahan	53	Vice President – North Production Operations
John Filiatrault	51	Vice President – CQ Supply and Pipelines
Steve McLaurin	50	Vice President and Chief Information Officer
Alan Rhoades	52	Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer
David Sheppard	45	Vice President – Wells, Projects and Gulf Coast Operations

Phil Rykhoek is a Director and Chief Executive Officer of Denbury. Biographical information for Mr. Rykhoek is included under Proposal One – Election of Directors.

Christian S. Kendall, President and Chief Operating Officer, has served as the Company’s Chief Operating Officer since joining Denbury in September 2015 and as President since October 2016. Prior to joining Denbury, Mr. Kendall was employed at Noble Energy, Inc. (“Noble”), where he served as a member of Noble’s executive management and as part of its operations leadership team as Senior Vice President, Global Operations Services. Prior to that, Mr. Kendall served as Vice President, Gulf of Mexico (2011-2014), and as Business Unit Manager and Vice President, Noble Energy Mediterranean Ltd (2007-2011), having been with Noble since 2001. Mr. Kendall began his career with Mobil Oil Corporation in 1989 and, in total, has more than 28 years of oil and gas industry experience in domestic and international operations roles. Mr. Kendall holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering, Civil Specialty, from the Colorado School of Mines.

Mark C. Allen, Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer and Assistant Secretary, is a Certified Public Accountant. Mr. Allen served as Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer from the time he joined Denbury in April 1999 until June 2009 when he became Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer. Before joining Denbury, Mr. Allen was Manager of Financial Reporting for ENSCO International Incorporated from November 1996 to April 1999. Prior to November 1996, Mr. Allen was a manager in the accounting firm of Price Waterhouse LLP. Mr. Allen also served as a director of Genesis Energy, L.P. between June 2006 and February 2010 and Encore Energy Partners GP LLC between August 2010 and December 2010.

Jim Matthews, Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary, has served as the Company’s General Counsel since joining Denbury in January 2012 and as a Senior Vice President since May 2014. Mr. Matthews was a partner with the law firm of Vinson & Elkins LLP from 2001 until joining Denbury in 2012, with a primary focus on representing companies in oil and gas finance transactions. Mr. Matthews served as Managing and Administrative Partner of Vinson & Elkins’ Tokyo office during his last three years with the firm. Mr. Matthews holds a Bachelor of Arts degree from Vanderbilt University, a Master’s degree from Ohio University and a Juris Doctor degree from Emory University School of Law.

Dan E. Cole, Vice President – Commercial Development and Governmental Relations, joined Denbury as an officer in October 2006. Prior to joining Denbury, Mr. Cole was Director of the Mississippi/Alabama Business Unit for Plains Marketing, LP since April 2004, and Manager, Gulf Coast Region for EOTT Operating for the prior eight years before it was acquired by Plains Marketing. Mr. Cole has more than 37 years of marketing, transportation and supply

Table of Contents

experience in the natural gas and crude oil industry. Mr. Cole received his Bachelor of Business Administration degree from Texas A&M University.

Matthew Dahan, Vice President – North Production Operations, joined Denbury in October 2010 and has more than 32 years of oil and gas experience. Prior to being named Vice President in June 2014, Mr. Dahan served as Denbury's Asset Manager for the Cedar Creek Anticline and as Reservoir Engineering Manager for the North Region. Before joining Denbury, Mr. Dahan served as Technical Director for Delta Hydrocarbons, BV in the Netherlands and Director of its affiliates Trefoil E&P S.L., Argentina and Delta Hydrocarbons Hungary Kft. Earlier in his career, Mr. Dahan also worked for Mobil Oil Corporation and Saudi Aramco in various engineering and supervisory roles, both domestically and internationally. Mr. Dahan earned his Bachelor of Science degree in Petroleum Engineering from the Colorado School of Mines.

John Filiatrault, Vice President – CQ Supply & Pipelines, joined Denbury as an officer in June 2010. Mr. Filiatrault's career has spanned 29 years in the energy industry with Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America, El Paso Corporation and Kinder Morgan in a variety of assignments relating to engineering and operations. Mr. Filiatrault received his Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering from Valparaiso University and his Master of Business Administration degree from Samford University.

Steve McLaurin, Vice President and Chief Information Officer, joined Denbury as an officer in January 2011. Prior to joining Denbury, Mr. McLaurin was a partner with PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, IBM and SolomonEdwardsGroup. Mr. McLaurin has more than 27 years of experience working with leading organizations and helping them manage their information technology solutions. He started his career as a systems analyst at General Dynamics. Mr. McLaurin holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Science from Evangel University and is a Certified Information Systems Auditor (CISA).

Alan Rhoades, Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer, is a Certified Public Accountant. Mr. Rhoades has served as the Company's Chief Accounting Officer since July 2009. Before joining Denbury in July 2003, Mr. Rhoades was Assistant Controller for Amerada Hess Corporation from 2001 to 2003, and held that same position for Triton Energy Limited from 1996 until it was acquired by Amerada Hess Corporation in 2001. Prior to joining Triton Energy Limited, Mr. Rhoades was a manager in the accounting firm of KPMG LLP. Mr. Rhoades received his Bachelor of Business Administration degree from the University of Texas at Arlington and is a licensed CPA in the state of Texas.

David Sheppard, Vice President – Wells, Projects and Gulf Coast Operations, joined Denbury as an officer in November 2015 and has more than 22 years of experience in the oil and natural gas industry. Prior to joining Denbury, Mr. Sheppard was employed at Noble where he held a variety of leadership roles, most recently as the Director of Global Drilling. Mr. Sheppard's experience and responsibilities at Noble have included onshore and offshore drilling, development projects, and production engineering. Mr. Sheppard earned his Bachelor of Science degree in Petroleum Engineering from Texas A&M University.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION – COMPENSATION DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

This Compensation Discussion and Analysis (this “CD&A”) provides you with a detailed description of our executive compensation objectives, philosophy and programs, the compensation decisions we have made under those programs, and the rationale and details supporting specific compensation decisions. While this CD&A focuses on the compensation of our (i) Chief Executive Officer, (ii) Chief Financial Officer and (iii) two other most highly compensated executive officers for 2016 (our “named executive officers” or “NEOs”), it also provides a description of our overall executive compensation program. In 2016, we only had four officers who met the definition of “named executive officer” under SEC rules. Our named executive officers for 2016 were as follows:

Name	Title
Phil Rykhoek	Chief Executive Officer
Christian S. Kendall	President and Chief Operating Officer
Mark C. Allen	Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer and Assistant Secretary
Jim Matthews	Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary

At Denbury we refer to our Chief Executive Officer and our other three named executive officers as our “senior management team” or “senior management,” and we use those terms throughout this CD&A. This CD&A should be read in conjunction with the Summary Compensation Table on page 47 which details the compensation earned in 2016, 2015 and 2014 by our named executive officers, reported in accordance with SEC rules.

Executive Summary

Pay for Performance Summary

As our Compensation Committee has made short-term and long-term performance-based compensation an increasingly important element of our executive compensation in recent years, it is important to review and understand our short-term performance for 2016 and our long-term performance over the last three years.

In response to the rapid decline in oil prices beginning in the fourth quarter of 2014, we made adjustments during 2015 and 2016 to preserve our financial strength and flexibility. While our operating results during these periods were primarily and negatively affected by low commodity prices, a number of important business developments and accomplishments took place during these periods, including the following:

Reduced cash operating costs, including corporate overhead and interest, to approximately \$34 per barrel of oil equivalent during 2016, a 21% decrease from similar levels during 2014, and improved CO₂ utilization efficiency, resulting in a 41% decrease in CO₂ usage between 2014 and 2016;

Generated average total production of 64,003 barrels of oil equivalent per day in 2016, an 11% decrease from 2015 production levels and a 13% decrease from 2014 production levels when adjusted for asset sales, despite reducing 2016 development capital spending to approximately half of 2015 levels and approximately 20% of 2014 levels;

Completed a process of evaluating our assets with a goal of increasing the value of both existing assets and future projects by optimizing field operational and development plans, identifying exploitation opportunities, reducing CO₂ injection volumes through increased efficiency, and reducing costs;

Completed construction of a natural gas liquids extraction plant at Delhi Field in late 2016, providing us with the ability to sell natural gas liquids from the produced stream, improve the efficiency of the CO₂ flood, and utilize extracted methane to power the plant and reduce field operating expenses;

Revised the joint venture arrangement at Grieve Field in 2016 to provide for our joint venture partner to fund up to \$55 million of the remaining estimated capital to complete development of the facility and fieldwork in

Table of Contents

exchange for a 14% higher working interest and a disproportionate share of revenues from the first two million barrels of production; and

• Obtained 2016 total shareholder return (TSR) performance of 85%, well above the median TSR performance when compared to Russell 3000 index peers and the Company's compensation peer group.

In addition, we significantly improved our capital structure through the following:

- Reduced our debt principal balance by \$791 million, or 22%, between year-end 2014 and year-end 2016 by completing a series of privately negotiated debt exchanges and open-market debt repurchases, as well as utilizing excess cash flow from operations to pay down borrowings on the bank credit facility;

• Modified certain of our financial performance covenants applicable to the 2016, 2017 and 2018 periods to provide more flexibility in managing our balance sheet, the credit extended by lenders, and continuing compliance with financial performance covenants in this low oil price environment. In addition, maintained the \$1.05 billion borrowing base under our senior secured bank credit facility, providing significant excess liquidity; and

• Decreased cash interest by nearly \$23 million between 2014 and 2016, impacted significantly by open-market debt repurchases and refinancing of our 8¼% Senior Subordinated Notes due 2020 with 5½% Senior Subordinated Notes due 2022.

We have taken significant actions during the last three years to respond to the demands created by the continued commodity price downturn. We were successful in driving significant year-over-year reductions in capital and operating costs, and took steps to improve operational efficiency and ensure we have liquidity and resources to not only continue to operate in a low oil price environment, but to invest in value added projects in 2017.

We believe that our strategy aligns compensation with both individual and Company short-term and long-term performance. Our Compensation Committee grants a mix of both (i) short-term and long-term awards and (ii) equity and cash performance-based awards to encourage senior management to concentrate not only on what is important for the current year but also what is in the best interests of the Company and its stockholders long term. Over the last three years, performance-based awards have contributed to more than 60% of senior management's target compensation. We believe that this approach discourages concentration on any single goal or metric and increases cross-Company long-term strategic planning and short-term execution.

Additionally, a significant portion of our named executive officer compensation is tied to the value of our common stock because of the percentage of equity-based awards that comprise target compensation (approximately 55% over the last three years). Our equity-based awards have short-term and long-term vesting provisions (ranging from one to three years) and our stock ownership guidelines often require that named executive officers hold Company stock for a longer period of time. Therefore, realized pay from equity compensation grants can be substantially different from grant date values. Total shareholder return (TSR) performance is an important number to track when analyzing executive compensation and Company stock performance. The Company's three-year TSR is below the median when compared to Russell 3000 index peers and our compensation peers, however 2016 TSR performance of 85% is well above the median.

For the performance period ended 2016, our named executive officers were eligible to earn cash and equity under four performance-based awards: the (i) three-year TSR award granted in 2014, (ii) three-year growth and income award granted in 2014, (iii) one-year EBITDAX award granted in 2016 and (iv) 2016 annual incentive bonus. The chart below illustrates the (a) target compensation for the performance periods ended 2016, (b) percentage of target compensation earned at the end of the performance periods and (c) percentage of target compensation realized on the

vesting or payment date by Phil Rykhoek, our Chief Executive Officer, under each award. The percentage amounts of earned and realized target compensation presented in the chart are substantially similar for all named executive officers. See Results of Performance-Based Compensation for Year-Ended 2016 below for a description of each award and the achievement percentage and amount compared to target compensation. The realized compensation column demonstrates that the decline in commodity prices over the last three years, and corresponding reduction in our stock price, has led to significant short falls between targeted performance-based compensation levels and realized performance-based compensation. The effects of the decline are compounded when considering the 20% reduction

Table of Contents

that was applied to the 2016 annual incentive bonus (see Compensation Components – Annual Incentive Bonuses below) and how the decline impacts achievement of the performance objectives in the awards.

Target Performance-Based Compensation
Earned and Realized for our CEO ⁽¹⁾

To help further demonstrate the alignment of performance and compensation, the table below presents the amount of performance-based target compensation realized during the last three years by Phil Rykhoek, our Chief Executive Officer, for awards which had a performance period ending in the last three years. For example, and as illustrated in the chart above, the performance-based TSR award granted in 2014 measured our relative total shareholder return over the three-year performance period ending in 2016. As such, the target amount for that award and the amount realized under that award is reflected in the 2016 row (the year in which the performance period ended).

Realized Performance-Based Compensation for CEO ⁽¹⁾
(Performance periods ending in 2014, 2015 and 2016)

Year Performance Period Ended	Performance Cash ⁽²⁾		Value of Performance-Based Operational Awards which have Vested		Value of Performance-Based TSR Awards which have Vested		Total		Percent of Target Realized
	Target	Realized	Target	Realized	Target	Realized	Target	Realized	
2016	\$ 1,365,000	\$ 1,187,550	\$ 1,279,997	\$ 353,174 ⁽³⁾	\$ 1,319,995	\$ 109,059 ⁽⁵⁾	\$ 3,964,992	\$ 1,649,783	42%
2015	1,365,000	682,500	439,210	— ⁽⁴⁾	949,987	31,440 ⁽⁵⁾	2,754,197	713,940	26%
2014	1,380,000	1,190,100	439,998	309,905 ⁽⁴⁾	379,167	72,244 ⁽⁵⁾	2,199,165	1,572,249	71%

The table excludes awards that have a remaining performance period because no amounts have been realized under (1) those awards. Additionally, for both the performance-based operational awards and TSR awards, the dollar value shown in the table above reflects the realized stock value as of the date of vesting.

For 2014, includes the annual incentive bonus and performance-based cash award. Beginning in 2015, the (2) Compensation Committee combined the performance-based cash award with the annual incentive bonus. The 2015 and 2016 annual incentive bonus includes the payment amount

Table of Contents

for the Company and individual performance components and is discussed in greater detail under Compensation Components – Annual Incentive Bonuses on page 35.

Reflects the amount realized on March 31, 2017, the vesting date for the 2014 growth and income award and the 2016 EBITDAX award, which both had a performance period ending on December 31, 2016. To manage and conserve shares available under the 2004 Omnibus Stock and Incentive Plan (the “2004 Incentive Plan”), the (3) Compensation Committee set a stock price floor of \$2.25 per share in determining the total number of shares that could be granted under the 2016 EBITDAX award. As a result, Mr. Rykhoek was granted 177,778 shares under the 2016 EBITDAX award instead of the 196,078 shares that would have been granted if the actual NYSE closing stock price on January 4, 2016 of \$2.04 per share had been used.

Reflects the amounts realized on March 31, 2016 and 2015, as applicable, the vesting dates for the 2015 and 2014 (4) capital efficiency awards, respectively, which had performance periods ending on December 31, 2015 and 2014, respectively.

Reflects the amounts realized on March 31, 2017, 2016 and 2015, as applicable, the vesting dates for the 2014, 2013 and 2012 TSR awards, respectively, which had performance periods ending on December 31, 2016, 2015 and (5) 2014, respectively. Additionally, the TSR award target value is based on the Company’s stock price on the date of grant (versus the fair value calculated using the Monte-Carlo valuation model used in the Summary Compensation Table).

Impact of Low Oil Prices on 2016 Compensation Decisions

Salary and Annual Incentive Bonus: In making 2016 executive compensation determinations, the Compensation Committee decided to:

freeze salaries for senior management and all other employees;

freeze target incentive compensation amounts for senior management; and

use negative discretion to reduce the annual incentive bonus by 20% for all employees, including senior management, who had otherwise met or exceeded target performance levels.

The most important factor taken into account by the Compensation Committee in making these decisions was the continued low oil price environment and its negative effect on the Company’s revenues and profits.

Equity Compensation: Likewise, the fall in oil prices has led to a general industry decline in stock prices. This means that an equity award that is economically equivalent to an equity award granted in prior years requires a larger number of shares. Shares previously reserved for issuance under equity plans are inadequate to allow grants at the same economic level, which is accentuated by the fact that we grant equity awards to substantially all of our employees. In order to preserve the maximum number of reserved shares for equity grants, the Compensation Committee made the following decisions with respect to 2016 executive compensation equity grants:

set a stock price floor of \$2.25 per share to determine the total number of shares covered by performance-based equity grants to our executive officers in January 2016, which resulted in a lower number of shares being eligible to be earned than if the actual closing stock price on the date of grant of \$2.04 had been used;

- modified performance-based equity awards so that any amounts earned under the awards in excess of the 100% target level are payable in cash, rather than in shares of stock; and
-

added a performance-based cash award to the long-term incentive compensation mix to replace a performance-based equity award.

Table of Contents

Summary of Executive Compensation Practices

Overview of 2016 Executive Compensation

The following illustrates the compensation components of our 2016 target compensation for senior management, over 60% of which is designed to be delivered through both short-term and long-term performance-based incentive awards. The percentage amounts in the graphic below represent average numbers for the named executive officers as a group.

Table of Contents

Key Compensation Decisions for 2016

The table below summarizes the key compensation decisions made to, or affecting, our compensation components and practices for 2016, and the Compensation Committee's rationale behind such decisions. Each decision is discussed in greater detail throughout this CD&A, and our compensation components are described below under Compensation Components.

Compensation Area	Compensation Committee Decision/Change for 2016	Compensation Committee Rationale	CD&A Discussion
	Eliminated the growth and income award.	Suspended paying dividends in the third quarter of 2015 and the growth and income award was not an appropriate measure of performance in the current commodity price environment.	See page 37
	Modified the calculation in the capital efficiency award to remove finding and development costs and changed the award name to the EBITDAX award.	Calculating finding and development costs across a peer group of companies is too imprecise in the current commodity price environment and therefore is not a meaningful measure of Company performance.	See page 39
Performance-based equity compensation	Any amounts earned under the TSR award and EBITDAX award above the 100% target levels will be payable in cash, rather than in shares of Company common stock. Set a stock price floor of \$2.25 per share (which was above the grant date closing price) to determine the total number of shares that would be granted as performance-based awards.	Conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan.	See page 37
		Conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan even though it reduced the target value of the award to senior management.	See page 26
Performance-based cash compensation	Added the Oil Price Change vs. TSR award to the incentive-based compensation mix.	(A) Replace the growth and income award with an award that reduces the emphasis on the oil price impact to the Company's TSR and is a better measure of the creation of shareholder value; (B) conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan; and (C) reduce the mark-to-market volatility of the award by paying it in cash instead of equity.	See page 40
Peer group	Adjusted the compensation peer group to remove four companies and add five companies.	Reflect a more representative compensation peer group by including more companies of similar size.	See page 33
Base salaries	Did not approve market-based salary increases for members of senior management.	In a more stable oil price environment, the Compensation Committee would have awarded salary increases; however, the Compensation Committee did not believe it was appropriate in the current oil price environment.	See page 35

Table of Contents

Below is a summary of certain executive compensation practices that we have implemented to drive performance and long-term stockholder value.

What We Do

⌋ Pay for Performance. A majority of senior management pay is performance-driven and not guaranteed. It must be earned every year based on objective and challenging operational and financial goals and individual contributions.

⌋ No Employment Agreements. The Company does not have employment agreements with executive officers.

⌋ Stock Ownership Guidelines. All officers and directors are subject to stock ownership and retention guidelines that are in line with our peer group.

⌋ No Company Securities Hedging. The Company prohibits hedging and short sales of Denbury stock by executive officers and directors.

⌋ Discourage Pledging. The Company discourages pledging by executive officers and directors. Currently, no executive officers or directors pledge shares of the Company.

⌋ Risk Mitigation. The Company mitigates compensation risk through varied performance measures and targets, long-term equity incentives, an independent compensation consultant and Board and management processes to identify risks.

⌋ Independent Compensation Consultant. The Compensation Committee uses an independent compensation consultant that provides no other services to the Company.

⌋ Relevant Peer Group. The Company uses a representative and relevant peer group when making compensation decisions.

⌋ No New Tax Gross-Ups. The Company has a policy of no new tax gross-up provisions in severance arrangements.

⌋ Severance Plan Double Trigger Change in Control. The Company has double trigger severance payments under its Severance Protection Plan. Severance protection benefits will become payable under the Severance Protection Plan only with the occurrence of both a change in control and a qualifying termination.

⌋ No Dividends on SARs or Performance Awards. The Company does not pay dividends on SARs or on performance-based equity awards. The Company accrues dividends (if any) on time-vested restricted stock before vesting, but pays dividends only after vesting of the underlying shares.

Table of Contents

Say on Pay Results and Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation

Say on Pay Results

In considering and making compensation decisions relative to senior management, the Compensation Committee noted that in 2014, 2015 and 2016 approximately 96%, 94% and 82%, respectively, of the stockholders who voted on the say-on-pay proposal at our annual meeting of stockholders voted in favor of the compensation of our named executive officers. Because of the support of this proposal, the Compensation Committee determined that no significant changes to our executive compensation policies and decisions were necessary at this time but continued to make minor adjustments consistent with our compensation objectives and philosophy.

At the 2017 annual meeting of stockholders, we will again hold an annual advisory vote to approve named executive compensation (see page 57). The Compensation Committee will continue to monitor and consider the outcomes of this year's and future advisory votes on the Company's executive compensation program, as well as feedback from stockholders throughout the course of the year, when making compensation decisions for the Company's senior management.

Table of Contents

Objectives and Philosophy

Our compensation policies are designed to ensure that salary levels and compensation incentives attract and retain top level individuals in key positions and are commensurate with each individual's level of executive responsibility, the type and scope of our operations, and our Company-wide financial condition and performance. Our overall compensation philosophy is that we:

- pay competitive base salaries at a level to attract and retain outstanding talent, generally targeted at the median level of salaries of our peer companies;
- provide a proper balance and mix of compensation, which places significant emphasis on long-term and performance-based incentives;
- encourage all employees to own Company stock to better align their interests with those of our stockholders; and
- reward employees for the effort and results of the team or Company as a whole, rather than compensating only for individual performance, while differentiating compensation based on individual performance.

Annually, the Compensation Committee sets target compensation for members of senior management by analyzing the following compensation elements for each company in our compensation peer group:

- base salary;
- target and actual total cash;
- long-term incentives; and
- target and actual total direct compensation.

The Compensation Committee, with assistance from Meridian Compensation Partners, LLC ("Meridian"), also closely monitors industry trends and peer group data relative to executive compensation as a means to determine whether the mix of cash and equity is appropriate. Generally, base salaries are less than 20% of senior management's total targeted compensation, so that a significant portion of the compensation is paid either through annual cash bonuses or incentive awards. This means that all compensation components other than base salaries will be based, to a significant degree, on Company performance.

When evaluating compensation, we compare the compensation of our senior management to that of our compensation peer group and have always placed a significant emphasis on the aggregate compensation of our senior management as compared to the aggregate compensation of the senior management of our peers. We believe this is an important consideration due to the unique nature of our business and our focus on enhanced oil recovery, where it can be difficult to find an appropriate comparison for certain members of our senior management.

We believe that our overall compensation program has proven to be an effective retention and motivational tool for our senior management. Our mix of compensation components and the general terms of each component are discussed in greater detail below under Compensation Components.

Roles in Setting Executive Officer Compensation

Role of the Compensation Committee

The Compensation Committee provides assistance to the Board in discharging its oversight responsibilities relating to the compensation of our Chief Executive Officer and other executive officers. The Compensation Committee, which consists of four independent directors, is responsible for the review and approval of all aspects of our executive compensation program. Among its primary duties, the Compensation Committee reviews and approves, on at least an annual basis, the corporate goals and objectives relevant to the compensation of our Chief Executive Officer, evaluates

the Chief Executive Officer's performance in light of these goals and objectives, and, together with the other independent directors of the Board, determines and approves our Chief Executive Officer's compensation based on this evaluation. Additionally, in consultation with the Chief Executive Officer, the Compensation Committee evaluates

Table of Contents

the performance of, and reviews and recommends for adoption by the Board the compensation of, all other executive officers on an annual basis.

Other duties of the Compensation Committee with respect to setting executive officer compensation include:

- setting, reviewing and certifying performance metrics and targets under performance-based compensation awards;
- evaluating Company and individual performance results with respect to annual incentive bonuses;
- evaluating and setting the Company's compensation peer company group;
- evaluating the competitiveness of each executive officer's total compensation package; and
- approving any changes to each executive officer's total compensation package, including but not limited to, base salary, annual cash bonus target amounts and long-term incentive amounts.

For 2016, the Compensation Committee determined the compensation packages for executive officers in December 2015. Performance-based equity and cash awards are granted in January of each year, while time-based restricted stock is granted mid-year. The Company performance component of the annual incentive cash bonus is approved by the Compensation Committee in December for performance during the year and paid in early January, but the individual performance component is not approved until the first quarter of the following year and paid in the second quarter.

The Compensation Committee charter, which fully describes the Compensation Committee's duties and responsibilities, is available on the Company's website at www.denbury.com, under the "About Denbury – Corporate Governance" link.

Role of the Chief Executive Officer

Within the framework of the compensation programs approved by the Compensation Committee, each year our Chief Executive Officer recommends the level of base salary increase (if any), target annual cash bonus amounts, and target long-term incentive award amounts for our other executive officers. These recommendations are based, in part, upon his assessment of each executive officer's performance, the performance of the individual's respective department or function, the performance of the Company as a whole, and officer retention considerations. The Compensation Committee reviews our Chief Executive Officer's recommendations and approves and recommends for adoption by the Board any compensation changes affecting our executive officers as it determines in its sole discretion. Our Chief Executive Officer is not involved in setting or approving his own compensation.

Role of the Independent Compensation Consultant

As described in Objectives and Philosophy above, the Compensation Committee has engaged Meridian to serve as its independent compensation consultant and to advise the Compensation Committee on compensation-related matters. Meridian reports directly to the Compensation Committee. The Compensation Committee retains sole authority to approve Meridian's compensation, determine the nature and scope of its services, evaluate its performance, and terminate its engagement. A representative of Meridian attends meetings of the Compensation Committee, as requested, and communicates with the Compensation Committee periodically between meetings.

Meridian provides various executive compensation services to the Compensation Committee pursuant to a written consulting agreement with the Compensation Committee. Generally, these services include (i) advising the Compensation Committee on the principal aspects of our executive compensation program and evolving industry practices and (ii) providing market information and analysis regarding the competitiveness of our compensation program design and our award values in relation to Company and executive officer performance.

At the direction of the Compensation Committee, Meridian performed the following services, among others, related to our 2016 compensation program:

- provided presentations and reports on executive compensation trends (including those related to incentive awards);
- provided evaluations of total compensation for each executive officer, as well as the Company's overall compensation program;
- provided input to the Compensation Committee with respect to executive officer compensation;

Table of Contents

• reviewed drafts of this proxy statement, including the CD&A and related compensation tables;
 • reviewed the Company's compensation peer groups and recommended changes; and
 • provided other consulting and advice at the request of the Compensation Committee.

Other than Meridian's services mentioned herein and other services performed at the request of the Compensation Committee, including an analysis of the compensation paid to the Company's directors and general educational presentations related to compensation-related matters, Meridian provided no other material services to the Company during 2016. The Compensation Committee has assessed the independence of Meridian pursuant to applicable SEC and NYSE rules and concluded that no conflict of interest exists that would prevent Meridian from serving as an independent compensation consultant to the Compensation Committee.

Use of Peer Survey Comparisons

In making 2016 executive officer compensation decisions in December of 2015, the Compensation Committee considered compensation data from a select group of peer companies. Based on consultation with Meridian, for 2016, the Compensation Committee adjusted the compensation peer group from the group used for 2015 compensation by removing four companies (Pioneer Natural Resources Company, Noble Energy, Inc., Continental Resources, Inc. and Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation) and adding five companies (California Resources Corporation, EP Energy Corporation, Oasis Petroleum Inc., Ultra Petroleum Corp. and WPX Energy, Inc.). The 2016 compensation review peer group is set forth below.

2016 Compensation Review Peer Group

California Resources Corporation	Murphy Oil Corporation	SM Energy Company
Cimarex Energy Co.	Newfield Exploration Company	Southwestern Energy Company
Concho Resources Inc.	Oasis Petroleum Inc.	Ultra Petroleum Corp.
EP Energy Corporation	QEP Resources, Inc.	Whiting Petroleum Corporation
Linn Energy, Inc.	Range Resources Corporation	WPX Energy, Inc.

The peer companies were selected from a group of independent publicly traded oil and gas companies with similar operations using several criteria, such as market capitalization, revenues, assets, enterprise value and production volumes. We believe that the selected companies were the most appropriate for executive officer compensation comparisons for 2016 compensation decisions. The differences and similarities between us and the companies in our compensation peer group are taken into consideration when considering peer group data for executive officer compensation. The Compensation Committee reviews the peer group composition annually.

Table of Contents

Compensation Components

The Company's 2016 senior management compensation program comprises the following primary components:
2016 Compensation Components

Base Salary Annual Incentive Bonus Incentive Cash and Equity Awards

The two graphs below detail the percentage each compensation component contributed to total 2016 targeted compensation for (1) our Chief Executive Officer (Mr. Rykhoek) and (2) an average for our three other named executive officers (Messrs. Kendall, Allen and Matthews). Each component is discussed in more detail below.

The Compensation Committee froze 2016 total target compensation for our named executive officers, except with respect to Christian Kendall's base salary increase when he was promoted to President. The comparative target compensation amounts for each compensation component for 2015 and 2016 for our named executive officers were as follows:

	Base Salary			Target Annual Incentive Bonus			Target Incentive Cash and Equity Awards		
	2015	2016	% Change	2015	2016	% Change	2015	2016	% Change
Phil Rykhoek	\$780,000	\$780,000	0%	\$1,365,000	\$1,365,000	0%	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	0%
Christian S. Kendall ⁽¹⁾	525,000	577,500	10%	918,750	941,719	2.5%	—	2,250,000	— %
Mark C. Allen	469,287	469,287	0%	821,252	821,252	0%	1,750,000	1,750,000	0%
Jim Matthews	388,043	388,043	0%	582,065	582,065	0%	900,000	900,000	0%

Mr. Kendall joined the Company as Chief Operating Officer in September 2015 and was paid \$165,057 in salary in (1)2015. In October 2016, Mr. Kendall was promoted to President and received a base salary increase. Mr. Kendall's target annual incentive bonus amount was prorated to account for his base salary increase.

Table of Contents

Base Salaries

We strive to provide our senior management with a level of assured cash compensation in the form of base salaries, at appropriate levels given their positions, professional status and accomplishments. We believe that base salaries should be in the 50th percentile of the salaries of similar management positions at our compensation peer companies, and we have generally targeted that amount for many years. In 2016, the Compensation Committee froze base salaries for all employees, including senior management. We believe that the base salary of our Chief Executive Officer, who has not received a base salary increase since January 2014, is below the targeted 50th percentile and the base salaries of the other named executive officers are at or above the targeted 50th percentile of the base salaries of our peers.

Annual Incentive Bonuses

Annual incentive bonuses are paid in cash and are an integral part of the overall compensation program for all of our employees. They resonate with our employees and encourage and produce a team-oriented approach to meeting the Company's annual goals. The decision to pay annual incentive bonuses, and in what amounts, is determined by the Compensation Committee on a Company-wide basis, and executive officers receive annual incentive bonuses only if all employees receive them. The target annual incentive bonus amounts are based on a percentage of base salary. For 2016, these percentages did not change from 2015 and were as follows: 175% for Messrs. Rykhoek, Kendall and Allen and 150% for Mr. Matthews.

For 2016, annual incentive bonuses were determined based on two factors: Company performance and individual performance. The Company performance factor, which comprised 65% of the target annual incentive bonus, was evaluated by the Compensation Committee with a potential range from 0% to 125% of target. The individual performance factor, which comprised 35% of the target annual incentive bonus, was evaluated by the Compensation Committee, considering recommendations by the Chief Executive Officer, other than for himself, with a potential range from 0% to 200% of target.

Annual Incentive Bonus Calculation

Company Performance (65% Weighting). For the 2016 annual incentive bonuses, the entire Company performance component was based on objective performance criteria. In particular, the Compensation Committee measured the Company's performance with regard to the following financial and operating performance criteria: (i) total production, (ii) lease operating expenses, (iii) capital expenditures and (iv) health, safety and environmental performance, at the targets and weightings in the table below. The Compensation Committee sets the performance criteria based on the Company's 2016 performance goals. Two principal 2016 Company goals were to reduce lease operating expenses and capital expenditures in order to preserve liquidity and not increase debt. Consequently, compared to 2015, the Company set more ambitious lease operating expenses and capital expenditures targets. However, because of the

Table of Contents

uncertainties in the oil price environment and the 50% reduction in our capital expenditure budget, the Company reduced its total production target compared to 2015 levels.

At its December 2016 meeting, the Compensation Committee approved the Company performance component of the 2016 annual cash bonus for all employees, including the named executive officers, at 100% of target based on the performance criteria, but, due to the current oil market conditions, the Compensation Committee determined that it was appropriate to reduce the bonus payment amount by 20%. This portion of the annual bonus was paid in early January 2017.

Criteria	Target	Target Points	Actual Results	Points Earned
Total Production	64,000 – 68,000 BOE/d	40	Production was within the originally targeted range despite asset dispositions and downtime due to extraordinary weather events	40
Lease Operating Expenses	Total LOE of \$467 million	20	Total LOE of \$415 million	25
Capital Expenditures	Total LOE of \$19.31/BOE Total capital of less than \$250 million (excluding capitalized interest and acquisitions)	20	Total LOE of \$17.71/BOE Total capital of \$209 million	20
Health, Safety and Environmental	Numerous targets with respect to total recordable incident rates, days away/restricted or transfer rates, significant releases, vehicle and contractor incidents and training	20	Met or beat many of its targets, but was below target on employee and contractor total recordable incident rate and days away/restricted or transfer rates	15
Total		100		100
	Bonus Reduction — as a %			(20)
	Bonus Payment — as a % of target			80

As is the case with all of our performance measures, we believe that it should be difficult to exceed the targeted amounts, as to do so would require us to perform at or above 100% of our budgets or targets in every area, and our forecasts assume a high level of efficiency. Because the performance criteria cover the primary focal points of our business, significantly exceeding our targets in every area is difficult. These targets are achievable, but require that work be completed on schedule and within targeted amounts, and significantly exceeding these targets is unlikely, particularly in our current industry operating environment.

Individual Performance (35% Weighting). The Compensation Committee makes subjective determinations with respect to the individual performance component of the annual incentive bonus for our senior management, based on an overall retrospective evaluation of the individual's personal performance during the year. The Compensation Committee considers, among other things, attainment of personal goals, leadership, teamwork and the role the individual played in meeting the Company performance criteria outlined above, and in significant projects, matters or transactions. Because these decisions are subjectively made on an overall basis, it is not possible to determine precisely how these measures are weighted or evaluated by the Compensation Committee.

The individual performance component of the 2016 annual incentive bonus is expected to be paid in the second quarter of 2017. The Compensation Committee concluded that awards above 100% of the target amount were appropriate for all named executive officers, primarily due to the fact that the Company's senior management successfully led the Company in meeting many of its operational goals in a challenging and unpredictable operating environment. The Compensation Committee believed that senior management responded both individually and as a

team to navigate the Company through another trying year. Specifically, the Compensation Committee noted individual and team contributions with respect to (i) achieving high 2016 TSR performance compared to that of our peers, (ii) strategic planning and execution of transactions and initiatives that significantly reduced our debt, (iii) our innovation and improvement teams which led to lower lease operating expenses and improved efficiencies within the Company, (iv) numerous important litigation and transactional matters and (v) maintaining challenging health, safety and environmental standards.

Table of Contents

The Compensation Committee concluded that awards of 150% were warranted for Messrs. Allen and Matthews and 125% were warranted for Messrs. Rykhoek and Kendall. However, despite the high individual performance by all members of senior management, the Compensation Committee determined that it was appropriate to reduce the payment of the individual performance component by 20% for all employees, including senior management.

2016 Incentive Cash and Equity Awards – Overall Program

Incentive awards are a significant focus of our total compensation program for all employees, and an even higher level of focus for compensation of our senior management. All incentive awards granted under our 2004 Incentive Plan are designed to motivate our employees to increase the value of the Company, which benefits not only the employees but the Company's stockholders. The total incentive award target amount for each executive officer in 2016 remained the same as each executive officer's total target amount in 2015.

In 2016, adjustments were made by the Compensation Committee to the incentive program to include a performance-based cash award in addition to the previously granted performance-based equity awards and time-vested restricted stock. This was primarily done to accommodate (i) the limited number of shares available for issuance under the 2004 Incentive Plan and (ii) the need to replace the growth and income award used in 2014 and 2015 in light of the Company's suspension of dividend payments in the third quarter of 2015.

For 2016, the Compensation Committee determined that the incentive awards granted to our named executive officers would be allocated as follows, with 90% of these awards measuring performance over a three-year period:

Percent	Award Name	Award Type	Terms
40%	Time-Vested Restricted Stock	Equity	Three-year graded vesting (34%, 33%, 33%)
25%	TSR Performance Award	Equity ⁽¹⁾	Based on a three-year TSR performance period and cliff vesting after 3.25 years
10%	EBITDAX Performance Award	Equity ⁽¹⁾	Based on a one-year performance period and vesting after 1.25 years
25%	Oil Price Change vs. TSR Performance Award	Cash	Based on a three-year performance period and cliff vesting after 3.25 years

Any amounts earned under the TSR and EBITDAX performance awards above the 100% target levels will be (1) payable in cash, rather than in shares of Company common stock, in order to conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan.

We continued to place a great emphasis on performance-based awards to further align the interests of our executive officers with those of our stockholders. For 2016, performance-based incentive awards (the TSR, EBITDAX and Oil Price Change vs. TSR awards) comprised 60% of our award mix. The remaining 40% of the award mix was time-vested restricted stock with a three-year graded vesting. Each of the three performance-based incentive awards are discussed in greater detail below.

Generally, the target number of shares or cash value eligible to be earned under the three performance-based incentive awards will be earned if the Company ranks at the 50th percentile of its peer group or performs at the mid-point of the designated vesting levels, and the maximum number of shares or cash value (200%) will be earned if the Company ranks the highest in its peer group or performs at the highest designated vesting level. If performance is below designated minimum levels, no shares or cash will be earned. Any amounts earned under the TSR and EBITDAX performance awards above the 100% target levels will be payable in cash, rather than in shares of Company common stock, in order to conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan.

We believe that it should be difficult to substantially exceed the targeted amounts (or the mid-points in the tables below) of the performance measures or rankings in our performance-based incentive awards, as to do so would require us to perform at or above 100% of our budgets or goals. Since the performance measures cover focal points of our business at the time of setting 2016 compensation, exceeding our targets in every area is quite difficult.

Table of Contents

Each of the target levels and the formulas employed to determine achievement was determined and defined by the Compensation Committee at the time of grant of the performance awards, based upon year-end targets and goals. Achievement of discretionary factors and confirmation of performance levels are determined by the Compensation Committee. Any portion of the performance shares which are not earned by the end of the performance period are forfeited.

TSR Performance Award

The TSR performance award is based on comparing the average of the Company's total shareholder return performance during each year within the three-year performance period, to that of the Company's peers. The stock prices used to compare TSR are based on the increase or decrease in the average common stock price between the last ten trading days of each year. The peer group of 17 companies, as selected by the Compensation Committee, is primarily weighted toward oil production and oil reserves, and includes six companies from the Company's peer group used for the Compensation Committee's review for 2016 compensation. For this particular award, it was determined that having a peer group whose members were more aligned with the Company's heavily-weighted oil production and reserve mix, as opposed to natural gas, was more appropriate than a peer group based on the relative size of each member. The peer group of companies used for the 2016 performance-based TSR award was as follows:

2016 TSR Performance Award Peer Group

California Resources Corporation*	Murphy Oil Corporation*
Canadian Oil Sands Ltd	Oasis Petroleum Inc.*
Concho Resources Inc.*	Occidental Petroleum Corporation
ConocoPhillips	Pioneer Natural Resources Company
Continental Resources, Inc.	Sandridge Energy, Inc.
Crescent Point Energy Corp.	SM Energy Company*
Devon Energy Corporation	Vermilion Energy
Marathon Oil Corporation	Whiting Petroleum Corporation*
MEG Energy	

*Included in the Company's peer group used for the Compensation Committee's review for 2016 compensation.

The TSR achievement percentage is determined based on where the Company ranks relative to its peers at the end of the three-year performance period based on the following chart. For example, if the Company ranks ninth out of the 18 total companies, it would achieve 106% of the target amount of the award.

Three-Year Average TSR Rank Performance Percentage Scale (subject to interpolation) ⁽¹⁾

1	200%
2	188%
3	176%
4	165%
5	153%
6	141%
7	129%
8	118%
9	106%
10	94%
11	82%
12	71%
13	59%
14	47%
15	35%
16	24%

17	12%
18	0%

(1) Any amounts earned under the TSR award above the 100% target levels will be payable in cash, rather than in shares of Company common stock, in order to conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan.

38

Table of Contents

EBITDAX Performance Award

The EBITDAX performance award is based on quantitative formulaic operational performance criteria. The goal of the Compensation Committee was to select an objective performance measure that would not be significantly affected by commodity prices, or if so affected or influenced, our peer group would theoretically be similarly subjected to the same market influences on their performance.

Each year, the Compensation Committee considers the Company's goals and attempts to match specific operational performance measures with such corporate goals. The EBITDAX performance award compares the Company's operating cash flow per barrel of production as compared to that of our peers, by essentially measuring EBITDAX, or our pre-tax income on a per barrel of production basis adjusted to exclude interest, depreciation, depletion, amortization and accretion expense, exploration expenses, impairment charges, debt extinguishment gains or losses, commodity derivative gains or losses, or gains or losses from asset purchases and sales. The Compensation Committee felt this was an appropriate operational performance measure because of the importance of maximizing profitability to fund ongoing operations and capital expenditures and service long-term debt obligations in the current oil price environment.

The peer group of 13 companies, as selected by the Compensation Committee, is primarily weighted toward oil production and oil reserves, and includes six companies from the Company's peer group used for the Compensation Committee's overall review in setting 2016 compensation. Similar to the TSR performance award, it was determined that having a peer group whose members were more aligned with the Company's heavily oil-weighted production and reserve mix, as opposed to natural gas, was more appropriate than a group based on the relative size of each member. Additionally, we had to exclude four Canadian companies (Canadian Oil Sands Ltd, Crescent Point Energy Corp., MEG Energy and Vermilion Energy), as their publicly filed financial information does not contain the information necessary to calculate the metric properly. The peer group of companies used for the EBITDAX performance award was as follows:

EBITDAX Performance Award Peer Group

California Resources Corporation*	Oasis Petroleum Inc.*
Concho Resources Inc.*	Occidental Petroleum Corporation
ConocoPhillips	Pioneer Natural Resources Company
Continental Resources, Inc.	Sandridge Energy, Inc.
Devon Energy Corporation	SM Energy Company*
Marathon Oil Corporation	Whiting Petroleum Corporation*
Murphy Oil Corporation*	

* Included in the Company's peer group used for the Compensation Committee's review for 2016 compensation.

Table of Contents

The EBITDAX achievement percentage is determined based on where the Company ranks on a per barrel-of-oil-equivalent basis relative to its peers at the end of a one-year performance period based on the following chart. For example, if the Company ranks seventh out of the 14 total companies, it would achieve 108% of the target amount of the award.

EBITDAX Rank Performance Percentage Scale (subject to interpolation) ⁽¹⁾

1	200%
2	185%
3	169%
4	154%
5	138%
6	123%
7	108%
8	92%
9	77%
10	62%
11	46%
12	31%
13	15%
14	0%

(1) Any amounts earned under the EBITDAX award above the 100% target levels will be payable in cash, rather than in shares of Company common stock, in order to conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan.

Oil Price Change vs. TSR Performance Award

The Oil Price Change vs. TSR performance award compares the change in WTI crude oil prices to our total shareholder return, both over a three-year period. This award is payable in cash in order to conserve shares available for grant under our 2004 Incentive Plan and to reduce the impact of mark-to-market volatility of the award by paying it in cash instead of equity. As our stock price is influenced heavily by fluctuations in oil prices (approximately 96% of our production is oil), the Compensation Committee believes that comparing our stock price performance to the change in oil prices is a reasonable metric to judge the Company's performance.

The stock prices used to compare TSR are based on the increase or decrease in the average common stock price between the last ten trading days of each year. The WTI crude oil prices used to compare oil prices are based on the increase or decrease in the forward looking closing trading price of the next 12 months of WTI crude oil (NYMEX) strip prices between the end of the preceding calendar year to start the performance period and the end of each calendar year to end the performance period.

The Oil Price Change vs. TSR achievement percentage is determined based on where the Company's TSR ranks relative to the change in oil price at the end of the three-year performance period based on the following chart. For example, if the Company's average TSR over the previous three years was 12% and the change in WTI crude oil prices over that same period increased by an average of 8%, the Company's TSR relative to Oil Price Change would be 4% (the difference between Company TSR and Oil Price Change), and the award recipients would achieve 100% of the target amount of the award.

Table of Contents

TSR Relative to Oil Price Change	Performance Percentage Scale
> 50%	200%
≤ 50% and > 45%	190%
≤ 45% and > 40%	180%
≤ 40% and > 35%	170%
≤ 35% and > 30%	160%
≤ 30% and > 25%	150%
≤ 25% and > 20%	140%
≤ 20% and > 15%	130%
≤ 15% and > 10%	120%
≤ 10% and > 5%	110%
≤ 5% and > -5%	100%
≤ -5% and > -10%	90%
≤ -10% and > -15%	80%
≤ -15% and > -20%	70%
≤ -20% and > -25%	60%
≤ -25% and > -30%	50%
≤ -30% and > -35%	40%
≤ -35% and > -40%	30%
≤ -40% and > -45%	20%
≤ -45% and > -50%	10%
≤ -50%	0%

Table of Contents

Results of Performance-Based Compensation for Year-Ended 2016

For the performance period ended 2016, our named executive officers were eligible to earn equity and cash under four performance-based awards: the (i) three-year TSR award granted in 2014, (ii) three-year growth and income award granted in 2014, (iii) one-year EBITDAX award granted in 2016 and (iv) 2016 annual incentive bonus. The Compensation Committee certified the TSR award, growth and income award and EBITDAX award at 53%, 0% and 77%, respectively, of the targeted levels (target equal to 100%). The Company performance component (65% of the total bonus) of the 2016 annual incentive bonus was certified at 100% of target based on the performance criteria, and the Compensation Committee concluded that awards above 100% of the target amount were appropriate for all named executive officers for the individual performance component (35% of the total bonus), but, due to the current oil market conditions, the Compensation Committee reduced the bonus payment amount by 20% for both the Company and individual components.

Below are summaries of the performance points or percentile rank earned, as applicable, for each of the awards based on the Company's performance relative to the performance metrics.

2014 TSR Award (three-year performance period)

Performance Metric	TSR Percentile Rank Compared to Peers	Award Achievement (Percent of Target)
Compared the average of the Company's total shareholder return performance during each year within the three-year performance period to that of the Company's peers.	26.7% (ranked 12th out of 16 companies)	53%

2014 Growth and Income Award (three-year performance period)

Performance Metric	Growth and Income Rate	Award Achievement (Percent of Target)
A measure of the Company's average annual growth and income rate for a three-year performance period against its long-term objectives. The growth and income rate is equivalent to the sum of the production-per share growth rate and an annual adjusted free cash flow per-share yield. The annual production-per-share growth rate is based on the Company's annual production volume growth on a barrels-of-oil-equivalent basis, and the annual adjusted free cash flow per-share yield is based on cash flows from operations adjusted for commodity prices, commodity derivative settlements, working capital changes and development capital expenditures.	5.7%	0%

2016 EBITDAX Award (one-year performance period)

Performance Metric	EBITDAX Rate Compared to Peers	Award Achievement (Percent of Target)
Compares the Company's operating cash flow per barrel of production as compared to that of our peers, by essentially measuring EBITDAX, or our pre-tax income on a per barrel of production basis adjusted to exclude interest, depreciation, depletion, amortization and accretion expense, exploration expenses, impairment charges, debt extinguishment gains or losses, commodity derivative gains or losses, or gains or losses from asset purchases and sales.	38.5% (ranked 9th out of 14 companies)	77%

Table of Contents

2016 Annual Incentive Bonus – Company Portion (65%)

Criteria	Target	Target Points	Actual Results	Points Earned
Total Production	64,000 – 68,000 BOE/d	40	Production was within the originally targeted range despite asset dispositions and downtime due to extraordinary weather events	40
Lease Operating Expenses	Total LOE of \$467 million	20	Total LOE of \$415 million	25
Capital Expenditures	Total LOE of \$19.31/BOE	20	Total LOE of \$17.71/BOE	20
Health, Safety and Environmental	Total capital of less than \$250 million (excluding capitalized interest and acquisitions)	20	Total capital of \$209 million	20
	Numerous targets with respect to total recordable incident rates, days away/restricted or transfer rates, significant releases, vehicle and contractor incidents and training	20	Met or beat many of its targets, but was below target on employee and contractor total recordable incident rate and days away/restricted or transfer rates	15
Total		100		100
	Bonus Reduction — as a %			(20)
	Bonus Payment — as a % of target			80

2016
Annual
Incentive
Bonus –
Individual
Portion
(35%)

The Compensation Committee concluded that awards above 100% of the target amount were appropriate for all named executive officers, primarily due to the fact that the Company's senior management successfully led the Company in meeting many of its operational goals in a challenging and unpredictable operating environment. The Compensation Committee believed that senior management responded both individually and as a team to navigate the Company through another trying year. Specifically, the Compensation Committee noted individual and team contributions with respect to (i) achieving high 2016 TSR performance compared to that of our peers, (ii) strategic planning and execution of transactions and initiatives that significantly reduced our debt, (iii) our innovation and improvement teams which led to lower lease operating expenses and improved efficiencies within the Company, (iv) numerous important litigation and transactional matters and (v) maintaining challenging health, safety and environmental standards.

The Compensation Committee concluded that awards of 150% were warranted for Messrs. Allen and Matthews and 125% were warranted for Messrs. Rykhoek and Kendall. However, despite the high individual performance by all members of senior management, the Compensation Committee determined that it was appropriate to reduce the payment of the individual performance component by 20% for all employees, including senior management.

The chart below shows the share and cash amounts earned under each award by each named executive officer.

Edgar Filing: DENBURY RESOURCES INC - Form DEF 14A

Name	2014 TSR Award Shares (#)		2014 Growth and Income Award Shares (#)		2016 EBITDAX Award Shares (#)		2016 Annual Incentive Bonus Cash (\$) ⁽²⁾	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Phil Rykhoek	79,758	42,271	53,172	—	177,778	136,889	1,365,000	1,187,550
Christian S. Kendall ⁽¹⁾	—	—	—	—	100,000	77,000	941,719	819,295
Mark C. Allen	34,894	18,493	23,263	—	77,778	59,889	821,252	771,977
Jim Matthews	17,945	9,510	11,963	—	40,000	30,800	582,065	547,141

Mr. Kendall joined the Company in September 2015 and was not granted performance-based awards as part of his (1) compensation until 2016. Mr. Kendall's target annual cash bonus amount was prorated based on a salary increase that he received in October 2016.

(2) Includes the Company and individual components of the 2016 annual incentive bonus.

Table of Contents

2017 Compensation Changes

This section describes compensation actions taken with respect to 2017 compensation. We include this disclosure because we believe it enhances the understanding of our executive compensation practices and our objectives, philosophy and programs going forward.

For 2017, salary levels and total target compensation levels for our executive officers are expected to remain unchanged from 2016 levels. Additionally, there are no changes to the Company's cash and equity incentive award program. The Compensation Committee still believes it is important to conserve shares under our 2004 Incentive Plan and decided to maintain the cash portions of the program.

In December 2016, the Compensation Committee approved the allocation of incentive-based awards granted to our named executive officers for 2017 compensation, which were the same as 2016 and are as follows:

2017 Percent	Award Name	Award Type	Terms
40%	Time-Vested Restricted Stock	Equity	Three-year graded vesting (34%, 33%, 33%)
25%	TSR Performance Award	Equity ⁽¹⁾	Based on a three-year TSR performance period and cliff vesting after 3.25 years
10%	EBITDAX Performance Award	Equity ⁽¹⁾	Based on a one-year performance period and vesting after 1.25 years
25%	Oil Price Change vs. TSR Performance Award	Cash	Based on a three-year performance period and cliff vesting after 3.25 years

Any amounts earned under the TSR and EBITDAX performance awards above the 100% target levels will be (1) payable in cash, rather than in shares of Company common stock, in order to conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan.

Other than the time-vested restricted stock, on January 3, 2017, the following long-term performance-based incentive awards were granted to the executive officers, all as determined or recommended by the Compensation Committee, and, as appropriate, ratified by the independent members of the Board. The table below shows the cash amount or number of shares of common stock to be issued under performance-based incentive awards at the target level for the (i) Oil Price Change vs. TSR award (payable in cash), (ii) EBITDAX performance award (payable in common stock) and (iii) TSR performance award (payable in common stock). All of the performance-based incentive awards are subject to earlier vesting in the event of a change in control, death, disability, and in some cases retirement eligibility, as provided in the 2004 Incentive Plan and/or specific award agreements. It is currently anticipated that time-vested restricted stock awards for 2017 shown in the table below will be approved and granted mid-year to the executive officers and all employees, ratably vesting over a three-year period; however, these awards have yet to be approved by the Compensation Committee.

Name	Anticipated Time-Vested Restricted Stock (100% of target) (Dollar Value)	Oil Price Change vs. TSR Award (100% of target) (Dollar Value)	EBITDAX Award (100% of target) (Number of Shares)	TSR Award (100% of target) (Number of Shares)
Phil Rykhoek	\$	— ⁽¹⁾ \$1,000,000	105,263	263,157
Christian S. Kendall	900,000	562,500	59,210	148,026
Mark C. Allen	700,000	437,500	46,052	115,131

Jim Matthews	360,000	225,000	23,684	59,210
--------------	---------	---------	--------	--------

(1) As recently announced by the Company, Phil Rykhoek, our Chief Executive Officer for the past eight years, will be retiring from that position on June 30, 2017 and will not receive this grant.

Table of Contents

Change in Control and Severance Benefits

Our senior management, together with all of our other employees, have built Denbury into the successful enterprise that it is today, and we believe that it is important to protect them in the event of a change in control. Further, it is our belief that the interests of stockholders will be best served if the interests of our senior management are aligned with theirs, and providing change-in-control benefits should eliminate, or at least reduce, possible reluctance of senior management to pursue potential change-in-control transactions that may be in the best interest of stockholders. For more information on these potential benefits, see Potential Payments Upon Termination or Change in Control below.

Perquisites and Other Benefits

Our senior management participates in our benefit plans on the same terms as our other employees. These plans include medical, dental, vision, disability and life insurance, partial matching contributions to our 401(k) plan and matching contributions of up to \$1,000 under our charitable gift program. Beginning in 2011, the Compensation Committee decided to discontinue paying for monthly membership dues at golf and other clubs, whether or not considered perquisites, on an individual basis, and instead added a cash compensation component for each named executive officer. The amount paid to cover such items in 2016 was \$25,000 for Messrs. Rykhoek, Kendall and Allen, and \$20,000 for Mr. Matthews. Our only retirement benefits are our 401(k) plan and a retirement vesting provision included in most of our incentive cash and equity awards. We do not have any pension or post-retirement medical benefits.

Stock Ownership Guidelines

Our Board has approved stock ownership and retention guidelines for our officers, based on the recommendation of the Compensation Committee and a review of our peer company stock ownership guidelines performed by Meridian. Under our stock ownership and retention guidelines, all officers are expected to hold stock with the following values:

Officer Level	Ownership Guideline
President and/or Chief Executive Officer	5x annual base salary
Chief Operating Officer, Executive Vice Presidents and/or Senior Vice Presidents	3x annual base salary
Vice President	2x annual base salary

Stock that counts toward satisfaction of these guidelines includes shares of common stock owned directly by the officer or immediate family members plus restricted stock (vested and unvested). Until the guideline amount is achieved, officers are required to retain at least one-third of the shares obtained through the 2004 Incentive Plan other than awards of SARs.

Risk Assessment Related to Our Compensation Program

We do not believe that our compensation policies and practices for our employees are reasonably likely to have a material adverse effect on the Company's risk profile. Although portions of our compensation program are performance-based, we believe that we have allocated our compensation among base salary and short-term and long-term compensation opportunities in such a way as to discourage excessive risk taking. Further, one of the main factors we take into consideration in setting compensation is the performance of the Company as a whole, which we believe encourages decision making that is in the best long-term interests of the Company and our stockholders. Finally, the time-based vesting over a multi-year period for certain of our incentive awards, as well as our stock ownership guidelines for our directors and officers, ensures their interests align with those of our stockholders for the long-term performance of our Company.

Table of Contents

Policy on Recovery of Compensation and Clawbacks

We do not currently have a policy providing for specific compensation penalties if we are required to restate our financial statements. The only specific impact of such an event relative to our compensation program would be a potential downward adjustment to our performance-based awards, not to exceed 25%, based on the subjective review by the Compensation Committee, although such an event would also likely affect the more subjective annual incentive bonuses awarded by the Compensation Committee, which consider overall Company performance, and would likely affect the value of the equity awards granted to our employees. Section 954 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires the SEC to implement regulations requiring clawbacks of compensation from designated officers in the event of a financial restatement; however, the Company has deferred taking action on these clawback provisions pending promulgation by the SEC of final regulations under these Dodd-Frank Act provisions. Additionally, the Financial CHOICE Act has been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives, which as drafted would have the effect of modifying the clawback requirement so that it would only apply to “bad actor” executives who had control or authority over the issuer’s financial reporting in the event of a restatement.

Deductibility of Executive Compensation

We believe it is important to have flexibility in designing our compensation programs in a manner that achieves our objectives. Under U.S. federal income tax law, we cannot take a tax deduction for certain compensation in excess of \$1,000,000 per year paid to certain individual named executive officers (our Chief Executive Officer and three other most highly compensated officers, excluding our Chief Financial Officer). However, performance-based compensation, as defined in the Code, is fully deductible as long as the programs are approved by the stockholders and meet certain other requirements. We have designed and monitor certain aspects of our compensation programs to meet performance-based compensation criteria and maximize our tax deductible compensation whenever practicable. For example, beginning in 2014, the Compensation Committee made changes to our annual bonus program intended to qualify a greater portion of our executive compensation for tax deductibility under Section 162(m) of the Code (see Compensation Components – Annual Incentive Bonuses above). While we consider accounting and tax treatment of certain forms of compensation in the design of our compensation program, we choose to weigh all factors, and therefore we have not adopted a policy that limits our compensation options.

The previous CD&A contains statements regarding future individual and Company performance targets and goals. These targets and goals are disclosed in the limited context of Denbury’s compensation programs and should not be understood to be statements of management’s expectations or estimates of results or other guidance. Denbury specifically cautions investors not to apply these statements to other contexts.

Compensation Committee Report

The Compensation Committee has reviewed and discussed the CD&A included in this proxy statement with management. Based on such review and discussion, the Compensation Committee recommended to the Board that the CD&A be included in this proxy statement and incorporated by reference in the Company’s Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2016.

The Compensation Committee

Laura A. Sugg, Chairwoman

Michael B. Decker

John P. Dielwart

Gregory L. McMichael

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION – COMPENSATION TABLES

Summary Compensation Table

The following table sets out a summary of executive compensation for our named executive officers for the years indicated below.

Name and Principal Position	Year	Salary	Bonus ⁽¹⁾	Stock Awards ⁽²⁾	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation ⁽³⁾	All Other Compensation ⁽⁴⁾	Total
Phil Rykhoek Chief Executive Officer	2016	\$780,000	\$15,000	\$2,752,487	\$2,187,550	\$125,070	\$5,860,107
	2015	780,000	15,000	4,008,463	682,500	65,674	5,551,637
	2014	780,000	557,100	4,259,941	648,000	115,377	6,360,418
Christian S. Kendall ⁽⁵⁾ President and Chief Operating Officer	2016	\$538,125	\$261,106	\$1,548,275	\$1,381,795	\$69,813	\$3,799,114
	2015	165,057	260,096	1,002,000	144,734	33,750	1,605,637
Mark C. Allen Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer and Assistant Secretary	2016	\$469,287	\$9,025	\$1,204,212	\$1,209,477	\$55,906	\$2,947,907
	2015	469,287	9,025	1,780,786	410,626	60,038	2,729,762
	2014	455,619	349,337	1,863,711	378,000	88,951	3,135,618
Jim Matthews Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary	2016	\$388,043	\$7,462	\$619,309	\$772,141	\$48,404	\$1,835,359
	2015	388,043	7,462	915,830	291,032	50,698	1,653,065
	2014	376,740	346,616	958,461	216,000	72,970	1,970,787

Includes the amount earned for a Christmas bonus in each year shown that is equivalent to one week's salary and (1) which is paid to all employees. With respect to Mr. Kendall, includes a new hire bonus of \$250,000 in 2015 on the date of hire and in 2016 on the one-year anniversary of his date of hire.

Amounts in this column include the grant-date fair value of (a) restricted common stock awards, (b) performance-based operational awards (at the target level of 100%) and (c) performance-based TSR awards (at the target level of 100%) granted during the year indicated as shown in the following table. The grant-date fair value of (2) restricted common stock and performance-based operational awards is calculated using the closing price of Company common stock on the date of grant. The grant-date fair value of performance-based TSR awards is calculated using a Monte-Carlo simulation model.

Name	Year	Restricted Common Stock	Performance-Based Operational Awards	Performance-Based TSR Awards	Total
Phil Rykhoek	2016	\$1,599,999	\$362,667	\$789,821	\$2,752,487
	2015	1,359,996	1,317,637	1,330,830	4,008,463
	2014	1,359,996	1,319,995	1,579,950	4,259,941
Christian S. Kendall	2016	900,000	204,000	444,275	1,548,275
	2015	1,002,000	—	—	1,002,000
Mark C. Allen	2016	699,999	158,667	345,546	1,204,212
	2015	594,997	577,497	608,292	1,780,786
	2014	594,989	577,496	691,226	1,863,711
Jim Matthews	2016	359,999	81,600	177,710	619,309
	2015	305,997	296,998	312,835	915,830
	2014	305,993	296,990	355,478	958,461

Table of Contents

Performance-based operational awards vest as follows: (i) the EBITDAX awards granted during 2016 were earned at 77% of target and vested on March 31, 2017, (ii) one-third of the awards granted during 2015 were earned at 0% of target and two-thirds will not be earned until the end of the three-year performance period and will vest on March 31, 2018 and (iii) one-third of the awards granted during 2014 were earned at 160% of target and vested on March 31, 2015 and two-thirds of the awards granted during 2014 were earned at 0% of target. Performance-based TSR awards vest based upon a comparison of Company TSR to that of Company peers as follows: (i) awards granted in 2016 vest on March 31, 2019, (ii) awards granted in 2015 vest on March 31, 2018 and (iii) awards granted in 2014 were earned at 53% of target and vested on March 31, 2017. For the EBITDAX performance awards and TSR performance awards granted in 2016, any amounts earned above the 100% target levels are payable in cash, rather than in shares of Company common stock, in order to conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan. Further discussion regarding the underlying awards is included in Note 7 to the Company's audited financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2016, included in the Company's 2016 Annual Report on Form 10-K filed with the SEC on March 1, 2017.

Amounts in this column include (i) amounts earned under the 2015 and 2016 annual incentive bonus plans for the years indicated, regardless of when paid (see Executive Compensation – Compensation Discussion and Analysis – (3) Compensation Components — Annual Incentive Bonuses) and (ii) the dollar value of performance-based cash awards granted during the year indicated. Performance-based cash awards vest as follows: (i) the oil price vs. TSR awards granted in 2016 will not be earned until the end of the three-year performance period and will vest on March 31, 2019 and (ii) awards granted during 2014 vested at 108% of target on March 31, 2015.

Name	Year	Annual Cash Bonus Plan	Performance-Based Cash Awards	Total
Phil Rykhoek	2016	\$1,187,550	\$ 1,000,000	\$2,187,550
	2015	682,500	—	682,500
	2014	—	648,000	648,000
Christian S. Kendall	2016	819,295	562,500	1,381,795
	2015	144,734	—	144,734
	2016	771,977	437,500	1,209,477
Mark C. Allen	2015	410,626	—	410,626
	2014	—	378,000	378,000
	2016	547,141	225,000	772,141
Jim Matthews	2015	291,032	—	291,032
	2014	—	216,000	216,000

Amounts in this column include (a) matching contributions to the 401(k) Plan on each named executive officer's behalf, (b) life and disability insurance premiums paid by the Company on each named executive officer's behalf, (4) (c) allocated discretionary funds for each named executive officer and (d) other compensation-related items as shown in the following table:

Name	Year	401(k) Plan (a)	Insurance Premiums (b)	Cash Perquisites (c)	Other (d)	Total
Phil Rykhoek	2016	\$15,900	\$ 7,918	\$ 25,000	\$76,252	\$125,070
Christian S. Kendall	2016	15,900	6,645	25,000	22,268	69,813
Mark C. Allen	2016	15,900	6,273	25,000	8,733	55,906
Jim Matthews	2016	15,900	4,224	20,000	8,280	48,404

In 2016, all named executive officers had other compensation related to a comprehensive preventative medical examination and an on-site cafeteria that is available to all employees. Messrs. Rykhoek, Allen and Matthews accrued dividends on their ownership of Company common stock in the amount of \$70,835, \$5,189 and \$2,669, respectively.

Additionally, Mr. Kendall was reimbursed approximately \$15,030 in 2016 for relocation expenses in connection with his hiring in September 2015.

(5) Mr. Kendall joined the Company in September 2015. Compensation information for Mr. Kendall is not provided for 2014 because Mr. Kendall was not an employee or a named executive officer of the Company in 2014.

Table of Contents

CEO Realized Compensation

The following CEO Realized Compensation Table discloses the compensation actually realized by our Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Rykhoek, which is different than the compensation that SEC rules require to be reported in the Summary Compensation Table above. We consider this CEO Realized Compensation Table to be relevant to investors because it shows how our compensation program affects the realized compensation of our Chief Executive Officer in a given year. The primary difference between the CEO Realized Compensation Table values and the Summary Compensation Table values is the method and timing used to value performance awards. SEC rules require companies to report the grant-date fair value of all equity awards in the Summary Compensation Table for the year in which such equity awards were granted and to report performance-based equity at the grant-date fair value at 100% of the target level. Additionally, performance-based cash awards are reported in the Summary Compensation Table as of the date of grant at 100% of the target level. As a result, almost 50% of the total compensation amount reported in our Summary Compensation Table relates to awards that have not yet vested or been earned to date, and for which the value, if any, is consequently uncertain. The CEO Realized Compensation Table values contain the following differences from the Summary Compensation Table values:

Time-vested restricted stock is restricted stock that vested during the year presented and is valued at the vesting-date price, representing the value earned by Mr. Rykhoek for such shares. In contrast, the Summary Compensation Table includes the grant-date fair value of all shares in the year granted.

With respect to performance-based equity awards, the CEO Realized Compensation Table reflects the vesting-date fair value of awards earned by Mr. Rykhoek in the year of vesting, at the then-current market price of the shares earned and the percentage actually earned for each award. In contrast, the Summary Compensation Table includes such awards in the year of grant, at the grant-date fair value of the award and assumes that the target (or 100%) is earned.

With respect to the oil price vs. TSR performance-based cash award granted in 2016, the CEO Realized Compensation Table will not include that award until 2019, the year of vesting. In contrast, the Summary Compensation Table includes such award in 2016, the year of grant, at target (or 100%).

CEO Realized Compensation Table

Year	Cash and All Other Compensation (Salary, Bonus, Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation and All Other Compensation)		Stock Awards (Time-Vested Restricted Stock, Performance-Based Operational Awards and Performance-Based TSR Awards)		Option Awards (SARs and Option Awards)		Total	
	Summary	Realized	Summary	Realized	Summary	Realized	Summary	Realized
2016	\$3,107,620	\$ 2,107,620	\$2,752,487	\$ 1,021,783	—	—	\$5,860,107	\$ 3,129,403
2015	1,543,174	1,543,174	4,008,463	1,431,607	—	—	5,551,637	2,974,782
2014	2,100,477	2,100,477	4,259,941	1,102,150	—59,694	—	6,360,418	3,262,321

(1) This column does not include the value of the oil price vs. TSR performance-based cash award, which will vest on March 31, 2019.

(2) Represents the grant-date fair value of restricted stock and performance-based equity awards.

Represents the vesting-date fair value of restricted stock and performance-based equity awards which vested in the (3) year shown. Includes \$668,707 as a result of shares of restricted stock that vested at the time Mr. Rykhoek became retirement eligible and had been held for one year from the date of grant.

(4) Represents the value of option awards exercised during the year reported, calculated by multiplying the number of options exercised by the difference between the exercise price and the closing price on the exercise date.

Table of Contents

2016 Grants of Plan-Based Awards

Name	Grant Date	Action Date	Estimated Future Payouts Under Non-Equity Incentive Plan Awards			Estimated Future Payouts Under Equity Incentive Plan Awards		All Other Stock Awards; Number of Shares of Stock or Units (#)	Grant Date Fair Value of Stock and Option Awards (\$) ⁽¹⁾
			Threshold (\$)	Target (\$)	Maximum (\$)	Threshold (#)	Maximum (#)		
Phil Rykhoek									
Oil Price vs. TSR ⁽²⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	—	1,000,000	2,000,000				
TSR ⁽³⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	60,000	—	1,000,000	—	444,444		789,821
EBITDAX ⁽⁴⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	32,000	—	400,000	—	177,778		362,667
Restricted Stock ⁽⁵⁾	7/8/2016	5/23/2016						496,894	1,599,999
Christian S. Kendall									
Oil Price vs. TSR ⁽²⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	—	562,500	1,125,000				
TSR ⁽³⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	33,750	—	562,500	—	250,000		444,275
EBITDAX ⁽⁴⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	18,000	—	225,000	—	100,000		204,000
Restricted Stock ⁽⁵⁾	7/8/2016	5/23/2016						279,503	900,000
Restricted Stock ⁽⁶⁾	10/1/2016	9/15/2016						154,798	499,998
Mark C. Allen									
Oil Price vs. TSR ⁽²⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	—	437,500	875,000				
TSR ⁽³⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	26,250	—	437,500	—	194,444		345,546
EBITDAX ⁽⁴⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	14,000	—	175,000	—	77,778		158,667
Restricted Stock ⁽⁵⁾	7/8/2016	5/23/2016						217,391	699,999
Jim Matthews									
Oil Price vs. TSR ⁽²⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	—	225,000	450,000				
TSR ⁽³⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	13,500	—	225,000	—	100,000		177,710
EBITDAX ⁽⁴⁾	1/4/2016	12/16/2015	7,200	—	90,000	—	40,000		81,600
Restricted Stock ⁽⁵⁾	7/8/2016	5/23/2016						111,801	359,999

Represents the fair value of equity awards as of the grant date. The fair value of the restricted stock awards and EBITDAX performance awards (at target 100%) is the fair market value of the stock on the date of grant. The fair value of TSR performance awards is based on a Monte-Carlo simulation valuation model on the date of grant. Further discussion regarding the underlying awards, including assumptions, is included in Note 7 of the Company's audited financial statements for the year ended December 31, 2016, included in the Company's Annual Report on Form 10-K filed with the SEC on March 1, 2017.

(2) The oil price vs. TSR performance-based cash award has a three-year performance period and cliff vests on March 31, 2019 upon satisfaction of the performance criteria of the grant (see Executive Compensation –

Compensation Discussion and Analysis – Compensation Components – 2016 Incentive Cash and Equity Awards – Overall Program – Oil Price Change vs. TSR Performance Award above).

(3) The TSR performance award consists of an equity and cash component; both of which are shown in the table. Any amounts earned up to 100% target level of the TSR performance award are payable in equity (the equity component) and any amount earned above the 100% target level are payable in cash (the cash component). The threshold cash amount shown in the table is not payable until the maximum equity amount is payable. The TSR performance award has a three-year performance period and cliff vests on March 31, 2019 based on comparison of Company TSR to that of Company peers (see Executive Compensation – Compensation Discussion and Analysis – Compensation Components – 2016 Incentive Cash and Equity Awards – Overall Program – TSR Performance Award above).

Table of Contents

The EBITDAX performance award consists of an equity and cash component; both of which are shown in the table. Any amounts earned up to 100% target level of the EBITDAX performance award are payable in equity (the equity component) and any amount earned above the 100% target level are payable in cash (the cash component).

- (4) The threshold cash amount shown in the table is not payable until the maximum equity amount is payable. The EBITDAX performance award has a one-year performance period and cliff vested on March 31, 2017 at 77% of target upon satisfaction of the performance criteria of the grant. See Executive Compensation – Compensation Discussion and Analysis – Compensation Components – 2016 Incentive Cash and Equity Awards – Overall Program – EBITDAX Performance Award above.

- (5) These shares of restricted common stock vest ratably on July 8, 2017, 2018 and 2019. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, all of these shares vest upon a holder's death or disability, upon a change in control of the Company or at the time the executive (i) becomes retirement eligible and (ii) has held the restricted common stock for one year from the date of grant.

- (6) These shares of restricted common stock vest ratably on October 1, 2017, 2018 and 2019. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, all of these shares vest upon a holder's death or disability or upon a change in control of the Company.

Table of Contents

2016 Outstanding Equity Awards at Fiscal Year-End

Name	Option Awards			Stock Awards		Equity Incentive Plan Awards: Payout Value of Unearned Shares, Units or Awards That Have Not Vested (\$)
	Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#)	Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#)	Option Exercise Price (\$)	Option Expiration Date	Number of Shares or Units of Stock That Have Not Vested (#)	
	72,992		15.63	1/4/2017		
	76,137		18.71	1/7/2018		
	82,906		17.27	1/6/2019		
	65,383		16.77	1/4/2020		
					496,894 ⁽⁴⁾	1,828,570
Phil Rykhoek						53,172 ⁽⁵⁾ 195,673
						104,652 ⁽⁶⁾ 385,119
						15,731 ⁽⁶⁾ 57,890
						177,778 ⁽⁷⁾ 654,223
						79,758 ⁽⁸⁾ 293,509
						156,977 ⁽⁹⁾ 577,675
						23,597 ⁽⁹⁾ 86,837
						444,444 ⁽¹⁰⁾ 1,635,554
					279,503 ⁽⁴⁾	1,028,571
Christian S. Kendall					198,000 ⁽¹¹⁾	728,640
					154,798 ⁽¹²⁾	569,657
						100,000 ⁽⁷⁾ 368,000
						250,000 ⁽¹⁰⁾ 920,000
	50,689		15.63	1/4/2017		
	45,175		18.71	1/7/2018		
	49,190		17.27	1/6/2019		
	28,390		16.77	1/4/2020		
					73,664 ⁽¹⁾	271,084
					35,951 ⁽²⁾	132,300
Mark C. Allen					53,721 ⁽³⁾	197,693
					217,391 ⁽⁴⁾	799,999
						23,263 ⁽⁵⁾ 85,608
						52,668 ⁽⁶⁾ 193,818
						77,778 ⁽⁷⁾ 286,223
						34,894 ⁽⁸⁾ 128,410

Edgar Filing: DENBURY RESOURCES INC - Form DEF 14A

					79,001 ⁽⁹⁾	290,724
					194,444 ⁽¹⁰⁾	715,554
13,739	16.77	1/4/2020				
			18,489 ⁽²⁾	68,040		
			27,628 ⁽³⁾	101,671		
			111,801 ⁽⁴⁾	411,428		
Jim					11,963 ⁽⁵⁾	44,024
Matthews					27,086 ⁽⁶⁾	99,676
					40,000 ⁽⁷⁾	147,200
					17,945 ⁽⁸⁾	66,038
					40,629 ⁽⁹⁾	149,515
					100,000 ⁽¹⁰⁾	368,000

Table of Contents

- These shares of restricted common stock vest ratably each January 31st until the final vesting upon reaching a retirement age between 60 and 65, depending on length of service, and the officer's separation from the Company. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, all of these shares will vest upon the holder's death or disability or upon a change in control of the Company.
- (1) These shares of restricted common stock cliff vested 100% on March 31, 2017, more than three years after the date of grant.
- (2) These shares of restricted common stock vest ratably on January 9, 2017 and 2018. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, all of these shares vest upon a holder's death or disability, upon a change in control of the Company or at the time the executive (i) becomes retirement eligible and (ii) has held the restricted common stock for one year from the date of grant.
- (3) These shares of restricted common stock vest ratably on July 8, 2017, 2018 and 2019. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, all of these shares vest upon a holder's death or disability, upon a change in control of the Company or at the time the executive (i) becomes retirement eligible and (ii) has held the restricted common stock for one year from the date of grant.
- (4) These 2014 growth and income awards are presented at 100% of the target award. These awards were earned at 0% of the target award and vested on March 31, 2017.
- (5) These 2015 growth and income awards are presented at 100% of the target award and vest on March 31, 2018 upon satisfaction of the performance criteria of the grant. The earned amount can range from 0% to 200% of the targeted shares based upon the Company's level of success in achieving the performance criteria of the grant. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, the target or earned amount of these shares will vest upon a holder's death or disability or upon a change in control of the Company pursuant to the terms of the grant.
- (6) These 2016 EBITDAX awards are presented at 100% of the target award. These awards were earned at 77% of the target award and vested on March 31, 2017.
- (7) These 2014 TSR awards are presented at 100% of the target award. These awards were earned at 53% of target and vested on March 31, 2017.
- (8) These 2015 TSR awards are presented at 100% of the target award and vest on March 31, 2018. The earned amount can range from 0% to 200% of the targeted shares based upon the performance of the Company's stock as compared to the stock performance of the Company's peers. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, the target or earned amount of these shares will vest upon a holder's death or disability or upon a change in control of the Company pursuant to the terms of the grant.
- (9) These 2016 TSR awards are presented at 100% of the target award and vest on March 31, 2019. The earned amount can range from 0% to 200% of the targeted shares based upon the performance of the Company's stock as compared to the stock performance of the Company's peers. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, the target or earned amount of these shares will vest upon a holder's death or disability or upon a change in control of the Company pursuant to the terms of the grant. Any amounts earned under these TSR awards above the 100% target levels will be payable in cash, rather than in shares of Company common stock, in order to conserve available shares under the 2004 Incentive Plan.
- (10) These shares of restricted common stock vest ratably on September 8, 2017 and 2018. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, all of these shares vest upon the holder's death or disability or upon a change in control of the Company.
- (11) These shares of restricted common stock vest ratably on October 1, 2017, 2018 and 2019. In addition to the foregoing vesting provision, all of these shares vest upon the holder's death or disability or upon a change in control of the Company.
- (12)

Table of Contents

Option Exercises and Stock Vested During 2016

Name	Option Awards		Stock Awards	
	Number of Shares Acquired on Exercise (#)	Value Realized on Exercise (\$)	Number of Shares Acquired on Vesting (#)	Value Realized on Vesting (\$)
Phil Rykhoek	—	—	416,137	\$1,021,783
Christian S. Kendall	—	—	102,000	347,820
Mark C. Allen	—	—	73,926	144,048
Jim Matthews	—	—	33,873	66,801

Potential Payments Upon Termination or Change in Control

Our senior management, together with all of our other employees, have built Denbury into the successful enterprise that it is today, and we believe that it is important to protect them in the event of a change of control. Further, it is our belief that the interests of stockholders will be best served if the interests of our senior management are aligned with theirs, and providing change of control benefits should eliminate, or at least reduce, possible reluctance of senior management to pursue potential change of control transactions that may be in the best interests of stockholders.

We do not have any predefined severance benefits for our executive officers, except in the event of a change of control. In the case of a change of control event, we have two benefits for our employees and management, including our named executive officers: (1) eligibility to receive payments under our Severance Protection Plan and (2) immediate vesting of all long-term awards. The Denbury Resources Severance Protection Plan (“Severance Protection Plan”) was originally adopted in December 2000 and was last amended in May 2015. Under the terms of our Severance Protection Plan, an employee is entitled to receive a severance payment if a Change of Control (defined below) occurs and the employee incurs an involuntary termination of employment within the six-month period prior to, or within the two-year period following, that Change of Control (i.e., a “double trigger” payment). An involuntary termination for purposes of the Severance Protection Plan will mean a termination by us without cause or due to the employee’s own decision to terminate employment for good reason. Under the Severance Protection Plan, an involuntary termination will not include any termination of employment due to the participant’s death or disability. If entitled to severance payments under the terms of the Severance Protection Plan, members of our senior management team (including each of our named executive officers) will receive three times the sum of their annual base salary and bonus amounts, which is calculated as an amount equal to fifty percent (50%) of the total amount of all cash bonuses paid to the participant over the two most recent annual periods ending prior to the Change of Control. Our other officers will receive two-and-one-half times their annual salary and bonus amount, and all other employees will receive between one-third and one-and-one-half times their annual salary and bonus amount depending on their salary level and length of service with us. All employees that become entitled to a severance benefit under the Severance Protection Plan will also receive continuing medical and dental benefits, with the members of our senior management team receiving such benefits up to an eighteen-month period (such benefits would cease if the employee became covered under a subsequent employer’s plans).

The Severance Protection Plan provides that if our senior management or vice presidents who were corporate officers prior to January 1, 2011 are subject to the “parachute payment” excise tax, then we will pay such officer under the Severance Protection Plan an additional amount to “gross-up” the severance payment so that the employee will receive the full amount due under the terms of the Severance Protection Plan after payment of the excise tax. For all other officers, no gross-up for excise taxes will be provided. In connection with the December 13, 2012 amendment of the

Severance Protection Plan, a “net-best” provision was added to the Severance Protection Plan, which we believe is a prevalent alternative to providing a gross-up. Pursuant to the “net-best” provision, officers excluded from the Severance Protection Plan’s “gross-up” benefit will receive the greater after-tax benefit of either (i) their full severance payment, for which the individual officer is responsible for the payment of any applicable excise tax, or (ii) a severance payment capped at the safe harbor amount (generally \$1 less than three times the officer’s average annual compensation over the past five years), for which no excise tax is due. This approach provides the officer with a capped

Table of Contents

payment only if the officer would receive a greater after-tax benefit than if the officer paid excise tax on the full severance payment.

For purposes of the Severance Protection Plan, a “Change of Control” means the occurrence of any of the following events: (i) our “continuing directors” no longer constitute a majority of the members of our Board (with a “continuing director” generally being an individual who has served for at least one year or an individual that was approved by a majority of the Board); (ii) any person or group becomes the beneficial owners of our common stock that represents thirty percent (30%) or more of the voting power of our outstanding securities; (iii) a merger or consolidation to which we are a party if (a) our stockholders (prior to the transaction) hold beneficial ownership of less than fifty percent (50%) of the combined voting power of the securities of the surviving corporation, or (b) fifty percent (50%) or more of the individuals that were members of our senior management team prior to the transaction do not hold a senior management position in the surviving corporation six-months following the transaction; or (iv) the sale of all or substantially all of our assets, or our liquidation or dissolution.

In addition to the Severance Protection Plan, our long-term incentives and equity awards have change of control protection. Therefore, upon a Change of Control, defined within our 2004 Incentive Plan by the same definition as given above for the Severance Protection Plan, long-term incentives and equity awards granted pursuant to the 2004 Incentive Plan would immediately vest. Long-term cash incentives would be paid out at the target amount. In the case of our recently issued performance awards, they would vest at the target (or the 100% level) in the event of a Change of Control, and in the case of the TSR awards, they would vest based on the relative return calculated as of the Change of Control date.

The long-term performance-based cash and equity awards granted under the 2004 Incentive Plan would also receive accelerated vesting upon the individual’s death, disability or a post-separation Change of Control, at the target (or the 100% level). A post-separation Change of Control means a Change of Control that occurs not more than ninety (90) days after the individual’s separation from service. For the purposes of the 2004 Incentive Plan, such a separation from service is deemed to have occurred immediately following the post-separation Change of Control. Thus the post-separation Change of Control is also a “double trigger” benefit, although the triggering event will be the Change of Control event.

Table of Contents

The following table shows, as of December 31, 2016, the estimated potential payments and benefits that would be received by our named executive officers based upon a hypothetical termination of employment and/or a change in control in each of the three circumstances indicated in the table (i.e., (1) a change in control with no termination of employment, (2) a change in control with an involuntary termination of employment and (3) death or disability). The fair value of accelerated equity awards includes only those awards that were not currently vested as of December 31, 2016, using the closing stock price of \$3.68 per share. Actual amounts that may become payable to any named executive officer can only be determined with any certainty at the time of an actual termination of employment or upon a change in control.

Name	Severance Protection Plan Payment (\$)	Healthcare and Other Insurance Benefits (\$)	Fair Value of			Tax Gross Up (\$)	Total Value (\$)
			Accelerated Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$) ⁽¹⁾	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$) ⁽²⁾	Other (\$)		
Phil Rykhoek							
Change in Control with no termination of employment	—	—	5,710,004	3,050,000	—	—	8,760,004
Change in Control plus an involuntary termination of employment	5,193,900	101,176	5,710,004	3,050,000	—	4,783,893	18,838,973
Death or Disability	—	—	5,426,630	1,000,000	—	—	6,426,630
Christian S. Kendall							
Change in Control with no termination of employment	—	—	3,614,868	1,715,625	265,030	—	5,595,523
Change in Control plus an involuntary termination of employment	2,196,992	98,725	3,614,868	1,715,625	265,030	—	7,891,240
Death or Disability	—	—	3,530,228	1,068,750	—	—	4,598,978
Mark C. Allen							
Change in Control with no termination of employment	—	—	3,099,204	1,334,375	—	—	4,433,579
Change in Control plus an involuntary termination of employment	3,128,343	97,745	3,099,204	1,334,375	—	—	7,659,667
Death or Disability	—	—	2,975,228	437,500	—	—	3,412,728
Jim Matthews							
Change in Control with no termination of employment	—	—	1,454,456	686,250	—	—	2,140,706
Change in Control plus an involuntary termination of employment	2,305,795	92,339	1,454,456	686,250	—	—	4,538,840
Death or Disability	—	—	1,390,697	450,000	—	—	1,840,697

(1) The amounts in this column represent accelerated vesting of time-based restricted stock and performance-based equity awards, which remain unvested as of December 31, 2016.

(2) The amounts in this column represent accelerated vesting of performance-based cash awards, which remain unvested as of December 31, 2016.

Table of Contents

Proposal Two: Advisory Vote to Approve Named Executive Officer Compensation

The Dodd-Frank Act requires all public companies to solicit from stockholders a non-binding, advisory vote to approve the compensation of their named executive officers. At the 2014, 2015 and 2016 annual meetings of stockholders, approximately 96%, 94% and 82%, respectively, of shares having voting power present in person or represented by proxy were voted in favor of the compensation of the Company's named executive officers. In 2011, based on stockholder approval, the Board determined to hold its advisory vote to approve named executive officer compensation annually until the Board determines, or the next frequency vote (which is included as Proposal Three in this proxy statement) provides, otherwise.

This proposal, commonly known as a "say-on-pay" proposal, grants stockholders the opportunity to express their views on the compensation of our "named executive officers," collectively the group of officers whose compensation is reflected in our Summary Compensation Table contained herein. This vote is not intended to address any specific item of compensation, but rather the overall compensation of the named executive officers as described in this proxy statement.

The Board is asking stockholders to approve, on an advisory basis, the 2016 compensation of our named executive officers, as described in the CD&A of this proxy statement and the compensation tables and narrative which follow, which we urge you to review in voting on this resolution. Although this vote is non-binding, the Compensation Committee values your opinion and will consider the voting results when making future decisions and recommendations about executive compensation. We always welcome feedback from our stockholders, and to ensure we can receive the benefits of meaningful stockholder input, if you abstain or vote against this resolution, we urge you to write us a letter or send us an email and tell us more specifically about the aspects of our compensation practices to which you object. Stockholders can communicate directly with members of the Compensation Committee on these matters by either writing them in care of Denbury Resources Inc., Attention: Compensation Committee, at 5320 Legacy Drive, Plano, Texas 75024, or emailing them at: compensationcommittee@denbury.com. Your correspondence will be received by the Chairwoman of the Compensation Committee with a copy to our Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer.

As described in the CD&A of this proxy statement, our executive compensation policies are designed to ensure that salary levels and compensation incentives attract and retain top-level individuals in key positions and are commensurate with each individual's level of executive responsibility, the type and scope of our operations and our Company-wide financial condition and performance. Additionally, the Compensation Committee believes that performance-based compensation is an increasingly important part of executive compensation (see page 23).

Vote Required

As described above, the affirmative vote of a majority of shares having voting power present in person or represented by proxy at the annual meeting, where a quorum is present, will constitute a non-binding, advisory approval of this Proposal Two. Brokers do not have discretion to vote on this proposal without your instruction. If you do not instruct your broker how to vote on this proposal, your broker will deliver a non-vote on this proposal.

Board of Directors' Recommendation

Our Board of Directors recommends a vote FOR approval of the following non-binding, advisory resolution:

"RESOLVED, that the compensation of the Company's named executive officers, as disclosed in the Compensation Discussion and Analysis, compensation tables and related disclosures contained in the Company's 2017 proxy statement, is hereby approved."

Table of Contents

Proposal Three: Frequency of Advisory Vote on Named Executive Officer Compensation

The Dodd-Frank Act requires us to solicit the non-binding, advisory vote of our stockholders on how frequently we should seek an advisory vote on the compensation of our named executive officers. By voting on this Proposal Three, stockholders may indicate whether they would prefer an advisory “say-on-pay” vote every one, two, or three years, or they may abstain from voting on this matter.

Given the annual frequency of say-on-pay votes since the first advisory vote on say-on-pay in 2011, our Board is recommending that the Company continue its practice of holding an advisory “say-on-pay” vote every one year, for the reasons stated below:

An advisory vote every year gives stockholders a formal mechanism for providing their direct input on our most recent compensation information for our named executive officers, and our philosophy, policies and practices as disclosed in our proxy statement each year.

An advisory vote every year is consistent with our policy of promoting regular communication with our stockholders regarding named executive officer compensation (and other matters) and may encourage additional dialogue.

While this is a non-binding, advisory vote, our Board will carefully consider the results of the vote when deciding when to call for the next advisory vote on named executive officer compensation.

Vote Required

As described above, the affirmative vote of a majority of shares having voting power present in person or represented by proxy at the annual meeting, where a quorum is present, will constitute a non-binding, advisory approval of this Proposal Three. If none of the frequency options receive a majority vote, the option that receives the highest number of votes cast will be considered to be the frequency selected by stockholders. Nonetheless, if two or more frequency alternatives receive a similar level of votes and thus there is no clear mandate from stockholders, the Board may determine that it is in the best interests of the stockholders of the Company to hold a “say-on-pay” vote more or less frequently than the frequency option receiving the highest number of votes. Brokers do not have discretion to vote on this proposal without your instruction. If you do not instruct your broker how to vote on this proposal, your broker will deliver a non-vote on this proposal.

Board of Directors’ Recommendation

Our Board of Directors recommends a vote FOR approval of a non-binding, advisory vote on named executive officer compensation every ONE YEAR.

Table of Contents

COMPENSATION OF DIRECTORS

2016 Director Compensation

We provide both cash and equity compensation to all of our non-employee directors (all of our directors except our Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Rykhoek, who is not compensated as a director) so as to attract, motivate and retain experienced and knowledgeable persons to serve as our directors and to align the interests of our directors with our stockholders.

In setting 2016 director compensation, the Compensation Committee engaged Meridian to perform a director compensation review of the peer group of companies utilized for the executive compensation review (see Executive Compensation – Compensation Discussion and Analysis – Roles in Setting Executive Officer Compensation – Role of the Independent Compensation Consultant) to help determine 2016 director compensation. Based on the analysis prepared by Meridian in 2015, and recommendations from the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee and Compensation Committee, the Board determined not to adjust total Board compensation (cash and equity) for 2016, with average targeted compensation approximating just below the 50th percentile level of the peer group’s anticipated 2016 board compensation levels. The Board has not increased its annual retainer and equity grant value since 2013 and did not approve an increase for 2017.

In 2016, our directors were paid an annual retainer fee of \$80,000. Additionally, (i) Mr. Dielwart, the Chairman of the Board, received an annual retainer of \$107,000, (ii) Mr. Meyers, the Lead Technical Director, received an annual retainer of \$20,000, (iii) the chairpersons of the Audit Committee, Compensation Committee, Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee, Reserves and HSE Committee and Risk Committee received annual retainers of \$35,000, \$17,000, \$15,000, \$15,000 and \$15,000, respectively and (iv) members of those committees received additional retainers of \$10,000, \$7,500, \$5,000, \$5,000 and \$5,000, respectively. The chart below presents the annual chairperson and member fees information in a tabular format. We also reimburse our non-employee directors for out-of-pocket travel expenses in connection with each Board meeting attended in person.

	Annual Chairperson Fee	Annual Member Fee
Board of Directors	\$ 107,000	\$ 80,000
Audit Committee	35,000	10,000
Compensation Committee	17,000	7,500
Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee	15,000	5,000
Reserves and HSE Committee	15,000	5,000
Risk Committee	15,000	5,000

Each non-employee director also received an annual equity incentive grant of restricted common stock valued at \$161,800 on the date of our annual stockholders meeting, which fully vests one year from the date of grant. In total, during 2016, each non-employee director received 41,487 shares of restricted common stock on May 24, 2016 (an approximate value of \$161,800 on the date of grant). All restricted shares vest upon death, disability or a change in control of the Company. Our Director Deferred Compensation Plan allows directors to elect to defer receipt of their equity incentive grants to a later date.

Table of Contents

2016 Director Compensation Table

The total compensation paid to our non-employee directors during 2016 is described in the following table.

Director	Fees Earned or Paid in Cash ⁽¹⁾	Stock Awards ⁽²⁾
----------	--	-----------------------------------