VARIATION TYPE:			PROJECT - STEE		ENT	
	Refinement:			Reroute:	Х	
			Value Offe			a Otatia a
Cent	terline: X		Valve Site		_ Pum	p Station:
LOCATION:	Sketch:	Att	ached	Pictures:	See attached	
State: SD	County:	Haakon		Quad Map:	N/A	
Township: 1N		25E			See attached map s	
Section: 3,4		Centerline:	11/18/2010	MP:	483.55	to <u>484.13</u>
REASON FOR ROUTE VARI	ATION (Please include	de reason for rou	te variation):			
The primary reason for this re (Dakota, Minnesota & Eastern accommodate this HDD. This	n) near MP 481.1 also	fall in the horizo	ntal directional drill	section. The prop		
The use of an HDD is required at the location until after Augus					-	
This reroute is proposed base	ed on a combination c	of Flyover video o	f Centerline, LIDAR	data, Pictometry	and other aerials.	
		·		•		
DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION	(Places describe rec	uto variation in do	stail\:			
The proposed reroute starts a	<u> </u>			nd continues its d	irection for ~271 ft	Then turns slightly south
and continues in the southeas (DM&E) railroad approximatel MP 484.1.	st direction with the sa	me alignment of	RV-066. It crosses	the Bad River Ro	oad and the Dakota, I	Minnesota & Eastern
From the end point of the rero (false ROW) to prepare the pu						
of the reroute for another ~553	3 ft. Then it parallels	the current cenet	erline for ~419 ft an			•
width of the false ROW require	ed to handle horizont	al directional drill	pipe is 60 ft.			
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Plea	ase include any addit	ional impacts whi	ich may affect cost;	crossings, induc	ion bends, etc.):	
- The proposed reroute is ~84		riginal route, and				
		igiriai route, and	there is a reduction	of bore length (E	ad River Road and the	ne railroad) since these
crossings lie inside the HDD s - The preliminary length of the						
<ul> <li>The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is</li> </ul>	e horizontal directiona s \$4,100.	I drill estimated a	nt ~2,050 ft and estir	mated to cost app	proximately \$1,100,00	00. The approximate
<ul> <li>The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is</li> <li>The banks of the Bad River a</li> </ul>	e horizontal directiona s \$4,100. at this location are hiç	I drill estimated a	t ~2,050 ft and esting the savings from t	mated to cost app	proximately \$1,100,00 (scour) ar approxima	00. The approximate
<ul> <li>The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is</li> </ul>	e horizontal directiona s \$4,100. at this location are hiç	I drill estimated a	t ~2,050 ft and esting the savings from t	mated to cost app	proximately \$1,100,00 (scour) ar approxima	00. The approximate
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional constructio	e horizontal directiona s \$4,100. at this location are hig on and reclamation co	I drill estimated a gh and unstable. osts would be ver	t ~2,050 ft and esting the savings from t	mated to cost app he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)	oroximately \$1,100,00 (scour) ar approxima	00. The approximate ately ~\$500,000.
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional constructions are the conventional constructions.	e horizontal directiona s \$4,100. at this location are hig on and reclamation co	I drill estimated a gh and unstable. osts would be ver ssings?	t ~2,050 ft and esting the savings from t	mated to cost app	oroximately \$1,100,00 (scour) ar approxima	00. The approximate
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional constructio	e horizontal directiona s \$4,100. at this location are hig on and reclamation co	I drill estimated a gh and unstable. osts would be ver ssings?	t ~2,050 ft and esting the savings from t	mated to cost app he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)	oroximately \$1,100,00 (scour) ar approxima	00. The approximate ately ~\$500,000.
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional constructions are the conventional constructions.	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation contains and reclamation contains the number of crother crossing of a road	I drill estimated and unstable. Sets would be veressings? I and a railroad.	at ~2,050 ft and esting The savings from the year to the savings from the year to the savings from the savin	mated to cost app he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)	oroximately \$1,100,00 (scour) ar approxima	00. The approximate ately ~\$500,000.
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease.  If yes, please list: Reduces to	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation contains the number of crother crossing of a roadurred or saved from the	I drill estimated and unstable. Sets would be veressings? I and a railroad.	at ~2,050 ft and esting The savings from the year to the savings from the year to the savings from the savin	mated to cost app he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)	oroximately \$1,100,00 (scour) ar approxima	00. The approximate ately ~\$500,000.
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction Is there an increase/decrease If yes, please list: Reduces to COST ANALYSIS (costs incur	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higon and reclamation continuous in the number of crothe crossing of a road surred or saved from thignment:	I drill estimated and unstable. Sets would be veressings? I and a railroad.	t ~2,050 ft and esting The savings from the year to	nated to cost app he river crossing ate of -\$300,000) Yes	oroximately \$1,100,00 (scour) ar approxima	00. The approximate ately ~\$500,000.
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crother crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: onstruction:	I drill estimated and unstable. Sets would be veressings? I and a railroad.	t ~2,050 ft and esting The savings from the year to	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes	(scour) ar approxima .  X  (30,153.31)	00. The approximate ately ~\$500,000.  No
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crother crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: onstruction:	I drill estimated and unstable. Sets would be veressings? I and a railroad.	t ~2,050 ft and esting The savings from the year to	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  _ftft.	\$ (30,153.31) \$ -	00. The approximate ately ~\$500,000.  No
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crother crossing of a road surred or saved from thigh ignment: onstruction: RR):	I drill estimated and unstable. Sets would be veressings? I and a railroad.	t ~2,050 ft and esting The savings from the year to th	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft.  ft.  ft.	\$ (30,153.31) \$ -	\$ 360/ft \$ 195/ft
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crother crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: construction: RR): e crossings:	I drill estimated and and unstable. Osts would be veressings? Id and a railroad. The route variation	t ~2,050 ft and esting The savings from the year to th	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.	\$ (30,153.31) \$ - \$ (124,200.00)	\$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 540/ft
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crother crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: construction: arrivation: arrivat	I drill estimated and and unstable. Osts would be veressings? Id and a railroad. The route variation	t ~2,050 ft and esting The savings from the year to th	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.	\$ (30,153.31) \$ - \$ (124,200.00)	\$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 540/ft
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crother crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: construction: RR): e crossings: g (streams, ponds, et	I drill estimated and and unstable. I drill estimated and and a railroad.  The route variation is a control of the control of	The savings from ty substantial (estimate)  -84	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.	\$ (30,153.31) \$ - \$ (124,200.00) \$ -	\$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/EA
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crother crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: construction: RR): e crossings: g (streams, ponds, et	I drill estimated and and unstable. It is sets would be verified and a railroad.  The route variation is set.  The route variation is set.	The savings from t y substantial (estimate) -84 -230	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft. ft. ft. ft. EA	\$ (30,153.31) \$ - \$ (124,200.00) \$ -	\$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crother crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: construction: RR): e crossings: g (streams, ponds, et	I drill estimated and and unstable. It is sets would be verified and a railroad.  The route variation is set.	The savings from t y substantial (estimate) -84 -230	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft. ft. ft. ft. LEA LEA LEA LEA	\$ (30,153.31) \$ - \$ (124,200.00) \$ -	\$ 360/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crothe crossing of a road surred or saved from thigh ignment: construction: RR): e crossings: g (streams, ponds, et	I drill estimated and and unstable. It is sets would be verified and a railroad.  The route variation is set.	The savings from t y substantial (estimate) -84 -230	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft. ft. ft. ft. LEA LEA LEA LEA	\$ (30,153.31) \$ - \$ (124,200.00) \$ -	\$ 360/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crothe crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: construction: RR): crossings: g (streams, ponds, et	I drill estimated and and unstable. Osts would be veressings? Id and a railroad. The route variation of the content of the con	The savings from ty substantial (estimate)  -84  -230	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  EA  EA  EA	\$ (30,153.31) \$ - \$ (124,200.00) \$ - \$ (185,000.00) \$ -	\$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation contains and reclamation contains are the crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: construction: RR): crossings: g (streams, ponds, et contains and contains are contains and contains are contains are contains and contains are contains are contains and contains are contained as a contains are contains and contains are contains and contains are contained as a contained are contained as a co	I drill estimated and and unstable. It is stated and a railroad.  The route variation of th	The savings from ty substantial (estimate)  -84  -230  0.57	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  EA  EA  EA  EA  Mile	\$ (30,153.31) \$ - \$ (124,200.00) \$ - \$ 1.85,000.00) \$ - \$ 2,849.37	\$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA \$ 5,000/mile
- The preliminary length of the estimate for the false ROW is - The banks of the Bad River a - The conventional construction.  Is there an increase/decrease of the second	e horizontal directionals \$4,100. at this location are higher and reclamation continue in the number of crother crossing of a road surred or saved from the ignment: construction: RR): crossings: g (streams, ponds, et givil: (Cultural: (Biological: (Cultural: (Cult	I drill estimated and and unstable. In order would be versely and a railroad.  The route variation of the control of the contr	-230 -1 0 -0.57 0.57	he river crossing ate of -\$300,000)  Yes  ft. ft. ft. ft. EA EA EA EA EA mile mile mile	\$ (30,153.31) \$ (30,153.31) \$ - \$ (124,200.00) \$ - \$ (185,000.00) \$ - \$ 1,424.69	\$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA \$ 5,000/mile \$ 2,800/mile

4		
LAND / UNIVERSAL FIELD Doug Reichley		
a) Is a new landowner affected by the proposed variation?	Yes	NoX
b) Is proposed realignment outside the easement/workspace?	Yes X	No
c) Is realignment proposed to satisfy landowner request?	Yes	No X
-If yes, name of landowner(s)/track number(s):		
ii yoo, name or andowner(o), track name or (o).		
all the cyclyption criteria been examined/provided for this enecific discipline?	Yes	No
d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	162	INO
If no, please explain why:		
5 <b>ENGINEERING/CONSTRUCTION / STATE PM</b> Meera Kothari		
a) Maximum deviation perpendicular to proposed alignment:	158	ft.
b) Has the centerline been staked for construction?	Yes	No X
c) Does route variation affect HDD crossing alignment?	Yes X	No
d) Is realignment proposed for engineering/construction reasons?	Yes X	No
e) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station?	Yes	No X
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	Yes	No
If no, please explain why:		
6		
ENVIRONMENTAL / exp Jonathan Minton		
a) Has the corridor been environmentally surveyed?	Yes X	No
b) Has the proposed variation been environmentally surveyed?	Yes	No X
c) Was variation proposed to satisfy environmental issues?	Yes	No X
d) Was realignment proposed to satisfy agency request?	Yes	No X
-If yes, name of agency(s):		
e) Environmental features:		
Added (+):	Subtracted (-):	
Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands:		
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	Yes	No
If no, please explain why:		
7		
ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HVDDALILICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic		
ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic	Vaa	NI
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station?	Yes	No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics?	Yes	No
<ul><li>a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station?</li><li>b) Will route variation impact hydraulics?</li><li>c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing?</li></ul>	Yes	No No
<ul><li>a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station?</li><li>b) Will route variation impact hydraulics?</li><li>c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing?</li><li>d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?</li></ul>	Yes	No
<ul><li>a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station?</li><li>b) Will route variation impact hydraulics?</li><li>c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing?</li></ul>	Yes Yes Yes	No No
<ul> <li>a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station?</li> <li>b) Will route variation impact hydraulics?</li> <li>c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing?</li> <li>d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?</li> </ul>	Yes Yes Yes	No No
<ul> <li>a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station?</li> <li>b) Will route variation impact hydraulics?</li> <li>c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing?</li> <li>d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?</li> <li>If no, please explain why:</li> </ul>	Yes Yes Yes	No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8  STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable)  Bud Andersen	Yes Yes Yes	No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8  STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8  STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database):	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database): d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database):	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database): d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database): d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database): d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  9 Originator: Engineering	Yes	No No No No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8  STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database): d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database): d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  9 Originator: Engineering Date: 8/9/2011	Yes	No No No No No No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database): d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  9 Originator: Engineering	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Yes	No
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database): d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:  9 Originator: Engineering Date: 8/9/2011	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes  Yes  Yes	No N

0220-SD-P2-483.5-484.1-S

	KEYS	TONE PIPELINE PROJE ROUTE VARI	ECT - U.S. PHASE I\ IATION AUTHORIZA		Y SEGMEN	NT)	
Date:		8/9/2011	Tracking	Number:	0220-SD	-P2-483.5-484.1-	S
Description:		accommodate a horizonta	al	MP:	483.5	to 484.	1_
	directional drill River	(HDD) crossing of the Ba	ad Origina	ted By:		Engineering	
	L		Variation	Form Attached:	Yes	XNo	_
Universal Fi	eld - Land	Doug Ro	eichley Variation:	Approved	X	Rejected	
Comments:				_	Date:	8/10/2011	_
			If Rejecte Why				
TransCanad	lo Enginocring	Meera I	Kothari Variation:	Approved	V	Painatad	
Comments:	la- Engineering	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	Nothan Variation:	Approved	X Date:	8/10/2011	
Commonto.			If Rejecte	ed	<u> Dato.</u>	0/10/2011	_
			Why				
F Facility		Dortolo M	Malla sa Mariatian	A	V	Deicated	
Exp - Engine		Butch W	Vallace Variation:	Approved	X	Rejected	
Comments:	Not Present.				Date:	8/10/2011	_
			If Rejecte Why				
Tronco	lo Compt		Curbon	Ann	V	Doingts I	
Comments:	la - Constructio	on Bobby C	Curbow Variation:	Approved	X Date:	Rejected	
Comments.			If Rejecte	-d	Date:	0/10/2011	_
			Why				
				L			
Exp - Enviro	onmental	Jonathan	Minton Variation:	Approved	Х	Rejected	
Comments:		eeds environmental field s		приочен	Date:		
			If Rejecte	ed		<u> </u>	_
			Why				
AECOM - Ri	sk Assesment	Heidi T	Fillquist Variation:	Approved		Rejected	
Comments:	N/A.		$\neg \vdash$		Date:		
			If Rejecte				
			Why	/?			
Exp - Safety	!	Jason Mille	enbruch Variation:	Approved		Rejected	
Comments:							
	N/A.				Date:		
	N/A.		$\neg$   $=$		Date:		
	N/A.		If Rejecte		Date:		
	N/A.		If Rejecte Why		Date:		
Facilities:	N/A.	Sandra 0	Why	?	Date:	Rejected	
			Why	?		Rejected	
Facilities: Comments:	N/A. Does not		Gigovic Variation:	Approved	Date:	Rejected	
			Why	Approved ed		Rejected	
			Gigovic Variation:	Approved ed		Rejected	
Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why	Approved ed	Date:		
Comments:		t affect facilities	Gigovic Variation:	Approved ed	Date:	Rejected	
Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  an Lietz Variation:	Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:		
Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why	Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:	Rejected	
Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  an Lietz Variation:  If Rejecte	Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:	Rejected	
Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  an Lietz Variation:  If Rejecte	Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:	Rejected	
TransCanad Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities Ala	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  an Lietz Variation:  If Rejecte	Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:	Rejected	
TransCanad Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities Ala	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  An Lietz Variation:  If Rejecte Why	Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:	Rejected	
TransCanad Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities Ala	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  An Lietz Variation:  If Rejecte Why  Ve Marr Variation:  If Rejecte	Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:	Rejected	
TransCanad Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities Ala	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  an Lietz Variation:  If Rejecte Why  ve Marr Variation:	Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:	Rejected	
TransCanad Comments:	N/A. Does not	t affect facilities Ala	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  An Lietz Variation:  If Rejecte Why  Ve Marr Variation:  If Rejecte	Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:	Rejected	
TransCanad Comments:	N/A. Does not  la - Senior PM  la - Manager  Doug Reichley	Ala Stev	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  An Lietz Variation:  If Rejecte Why  Ve Marr Variation:  If Rejecte Why  Jonathan Minton	Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved  X	Date:  X Date:  X Alan Lietz	Rejected	
TransCanad Comments:  TransCanad Comments:	N/A. Does not	Ala  Stev	Gigovic Variation:  If Rejecte Why  An Lietz Variation:  If Rejecte Why  Ve Marr Variation:  If Rejecte Why	Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved  Approved	Date:  X Date:  X Date:	Rejected	

0220-SD-P2-483.5-484.1-S

he Reason for each Route Variation (RV) is given with the respective RV file. hese reroules are proposed based on aerial/pictometry/Lydar/flyover analysis of current line through Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska.  ETALL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe route variation in detail):  see respective Route Variation Files. No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variations.  Vs included: issuesed prior to 6/20/2011: (estern Prairie Fringe Orchid Reroute (RV-0194) - hin Harter Reroute (RV-0195)  usek Reroute (RV-0195)  issuesed during 6/20/2011 Meeting: eroute away from sidehill (SOM Land) (RV-0209)  issuesed during 6/21/2011 Meeting: eroute away from sidehill (SOM Land) (RV-0219)  P 475 Reroute (RV-020)  P 475 Reroute (RV-020)  issuesed during 6/21/2011 Meeting: eroutes to avoid vaterwell; fence (RV-0214) eroutes to avoid vaterwell; fence (RV-0215) eroutes to avoid vaterwell; fence (RV-0216) eroutes to avoid vaterwell; fence (RV-0217)  scussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: WY 75 Reroute (RV-02196) WY 56 Reroute (RV-02196)  WY 56 Reroute (RV-02196)  WY 56 Reroute (RV-02197)  scussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: WY 77 Reroute (RV-0217)  scussed form River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220) P 398 Reroute (RV-0221)  Jellowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227)  Berakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229)  K-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  DDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):	ARIATION TYPE:		Refinement:			Reroute:	X		
State: Multiple Township: Multiple Section: Multiple Date: 8112/2011 Section: Multiple Section: Multiple Date: 8112/2011 Section: Multiple Date: 8112/2011 Section: Multiple S		Centerilne:	X		Valve Site:	X		Pump Station:	
Township: Multiple Range: Multiple Centerles: 11/18/2010 MRP See attached map sheet Section: Multiple Centerles: 11/18/2010 MRP SOURCE CENTER	OCATION:		Sketch:	Attached	Mestor III	Pictures: S	ee attached		
Section   Multiple   Cemeters   11/18/2010   MP   XOCX   to XOXX	State:	Muitiple	County: Mu	Itiple		Quad Map: N	I/A		
REASON FOR ROUTE VARIATION (Please include reason for route variation): The Reason for each Route Variation (RV) is given with the respective RV file. These reroutes are proposed based on aerial/pictometry/Lydar/flyover analysis of current line through Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska.  DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe route variation in detail): See respective Route Variation Files. No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variations.  EVS included: Isocussed prior to 620/2011: Research Prairie Fringe Orchid Reroute (RV-0194) Alborith frater Reroute (RV-0195) Isocussed during 620/2011 Meeting: Reroute away from aidebill (SOM Land) (RV-0209) Isocussed during 621/2011 Meeting: Reroute away from aidebill (SOM Land) (RV-0209) Isocussed during 621/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid dividence (RV-0191) Isocussed during for RV-0200) Isocussed during RV-0200 (RV-0213) Isocussed during RV-0201 (RV-0213) Isocussed during RV-0201 (RV-0213) Isocussed during RV-0201 (RV-0213) Isocussed during RV-0201 (RV-0217) Isocussed during RV-0201 (RV-0218) Isocussed during RV-0201 (RV-0201 (RV-02018) Isocussed du	Township:	330	all of the same	and a second second		Total Control of State		map sheet	124,725
The Reason for each Route Variation (RV) is given with the respective RV (iii). These reroutes are proposed based on aerial/pictometry/Lydar/flyover analysis of current line through Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska.  DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe route variation in detail):  See respective Route Variation Files, No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variations.  Vizi included:  Jacussed prior to 6/20/2011:  Western Prairle Fringe Orchito Reroute (RV-0194)  Jacussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting:  Reroute away from aidehill (SOM Lend) (RV-0299)  Jacussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting:  Reroute away from aidehill (SOM Lend) (RV-0299)  Jacussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting:  Reroute so avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199)  Aff 3 Reroute (RV-0200)  Jacussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting:  Reroutes to avoid vastervel; fence (RV-0214)  Reroutes to avoid vastervel; fence (RV-0213)  Reroutes to avoid dreeks, droports, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215)  Reroutes to avoid dreeks, droports, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215)  Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217)  Jacussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  WY 57 Reroute (RV-0219)  Jacussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  WY 58 Reroute (RV-0219)  Jacussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  WY 58 Reroute (RV-0229)  Jacussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  WY 58 Reroute (RV-0229)  Jacussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  Jacussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  Jacussed Beroute (RV-0229)  Jacussed Jacussed Jacusses (RV-0229)  Jacussed Jacusses (RV-0229)  Jacusses (RV-02	Section:	Multiple		Centerline: 11/1	8/2010	MP:	XXX.X	to	XXX.X
The Reason for each Route Variation (RV) is given with the respective RV file. These reroutes are proposed based on aerial/pictometry/Lydar/flyover analysis of current line through Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska.  DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe route variation in detail):  See respective Route Variation Files. No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variations.  Vivy included:  Vivy			W. W. W. W. S.						
These reroutes are proposed based on aerial/pictometry/Lydar/flyover analysis of current line through Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska.  DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe route variation in detail):  See respective Route Variation Files. No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variations.  PVs included:  Discussed prior to 6/20/2011:  Western Prairie Fringe Orchid Reroute (RV-0194)  Iohin Harler Reroute (RV-0195)  Discussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting:  Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199)  PM 475 Reroute (RV-020)  Paroutes to lessen/reduce Pis (RV-0219)  Paroutes to lessen/reduce Pis (RV-0213)  Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0214)  Reroutes to avoid deselopes/Pilis (RV-0215)  Reroutes to avoid deselopes/Pilis (RV-0217)  Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  Reroutes to avoid deselopes/Pilis (RV-0218)  Reroutes to avoid deselopes/Pilis (RV-0219)  Reroutes to avoid deselopes/Pilis (RV-0219)  Reroutes to avoid deselopes/Pilis (RV-0219)  Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217)  Piscussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  HWY 36 Reroute (RV-0219)  Reroutes (RV-0219)  Reroutes (RV-0219)  Reroutes (RV-0229)  PB Reroute (RV-0220)  PB Reroute (RV-022	NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.			AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF					
DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe route variation in detail):  See respective Route Variation Files. No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variations.  Vivi included:  Discussed prior to 6/20/2011:  Western Prairie Fringe Orchic Reroute (RV-0194)  John Harlar Reroute (RV-0195)  Busuek Reroute (RV-0197)  Discussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting:  Reroute away from sidehill (SOM Land) (RV-0209)  Discussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting:  Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199)  MP 475 Reroutes (RV-0200)  Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0213)  Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0214)  Reroutes to avoid orseks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215)  Reroutes to avoid orseks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215)  Reroutes to avoid orseks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215)  Reroutes to avoid pivol centers (RV-0217)  Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  WY 36 Reroute (RV-0219)  Bad Rilver HDD Retry Pt (RV-0220)  AP 396 Reroute (RV-0224)  Filerolates to RV-024 (RV-0219)  Bad Rilver HDD Retry Pt (RV-0227)  Pi Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0238)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  Date: 8/12/2011  Pass Rerouse (RV-0219, RV-0219, RV-021						ne through Mon	tana. South E	Dakota, and Net	oraska
See respective Route Variation Files. No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variations.  1Vs included:  1Secused prior to 6/20/2011:  Western Prairie Fringe Orchid Reroute (RV-0194)  John Harter Reroute (RV-0197)  Jiscussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting:  Reroute away from sidehili (SOM Lend) (RV-0209)  Jiscussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting:  Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199)  Jiscussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting:  Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199)  Jiscussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting:  Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0213)  Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0214)  Reroutes to avoid dreeks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215)  Reroutes to avoid creeks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215)  Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217)  Jiscussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  WWY 3R Reroute (RV-0198)  Jiscussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  WWY 3R Reroute (RV-0219)  Jiscussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  WWY 3R Beroute (RV-0229)  Refoliowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0220)  Jiscussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  WWY 5R Beroute (RV-0224)  (reliowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0220)  Jiscussed during 8/10/2011 Water selocation (RV-0230)  DDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  Date: 8/12/2011  Pate: 8/12/2011	5 11							and the	Jidona.
See respective Route Variation Files. No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variations.  1Vs included:									
See respective Route Variation Files. No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variations.  RVs included: Discussed prior to 6/20/2011: Western Prairie Fringe Orchid Reroute (RV-0194) John Harter Reroute (RV-0197) Discussed during 8/20/2011 Meeting: Reroute away from slothill (SOM Land) (RV-0209) Discussed during 8/21/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199) MP 475 Reroute (RV-0200) Reroutes to avoid creek (RV-0213) Reroutes to avoid areasynature Pis (RV-0213) Reroutes to avoid steelers (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid steelers (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid steelers (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: HWY 58 Reroute (RV-0196) Reroutes to avoid phot centers (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: HWY 58 Reroute (RV-0219) Sade River HDD Pt (RV-0220) MP 306 Reroute (RV-0224) Fellowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227) Pl Tereskdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) XX-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230) ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  Originator:  Multiple  Date:  8/12/2011  Revolus RV-0220, RV-0203,	DETAIL DOLLTE VAN	HATION (D)					THE RESERVE		T. COMMUNIC
AVS included:    Discussed prior to 6/20/2011:   Mostern Prairie Fringe Orchid Reroute (RV-0194)     Dohn Harler Reroute (RV-0195)     Dohn Harler Reroute (RV-0197)     Discussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting:   Reroute way from sidehili (SOM Land) (RV-0209)     Discussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting:   Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199)     RF 475 Reroute (RV-0200)     Reroutes to avoid drevel (RV-0213)     Reroutes to lessen/reduce Pts (RV-0213)     Reroutes to avoid stateoryealitis (RV-0214)     Reroutes to avoid stateoryealitis (RV-0215)     Reroutes to avoid stateoryealitis (RV-0217)     Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:   RV-0219      Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:   RVY 73 Reroute (RV-0219)     Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:   RVY 78 Reroute (RV-0220)     P 396 Reroute (RV-0221)     Discussed during 8/10/2011     P 10/2011     P 10/2011     P 10/2011     P 10/2011     P 10/2011     P 10/2011     P 20/2011     P 20/2012     P 20/2011		THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY.	AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF		he proposed to	ute variations		TWINSTON SAN	THE VEW EX
Western Prairie Fringe Orchid Reroute (RV-0194) John Harler Reroute (RV-0197)  Discussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting: Reroute away from sidehill (SOM Land) (RV-0209)  Discussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting: Reroute away from sidehill (SOM Land) (RV-0209)  Discussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199)  WP 476 Reroute (RV-0200)  Reroutes to lessen/reduce Pla (RV-0213) Reroutes to lessen/reduce Pla (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid watervell; ferne (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid dreves, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215) Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hills (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hills (RV-0217)  Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: HWY 73 Reroute (RV-0196) HWY 58 Reroute (RV-0196)  WP 596 Reroute (RV-0219)  Band River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220)  WP 396 Reroute (RV-0224)  Fellowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227)  Discussed CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  Originator:  Originator:  Multiple  Date:  8/12/2011  Received by:  Date:  8/12/2011	RVs included:		new landowners	andoted by t	no proposed IC	ote variations.			
John Harter Reroute (RV-0197)  Buzek Reroute (RV-0197)  Discussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting: Reroute away from sidehill (SOM Land) (RV-0209)  Discussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199)  MP 475 Reroute (RV-0200)  Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199)  Reroutes to avoid averwell; fence (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid drevel; fence (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid drevel; fence (RV-0215) Reroutes to avoid drevel; fence (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid privot centers (RV-0217)  Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:			oute (RV-0104)						
Discussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting: Reroute way from sidehill (SOM Land) (RV-0209) Discussed during 6/20/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199) MP 475 Reroute (RV-0200) Reteroutes to avoid vaterwell; fence (RV-0213) Reroutes to avoid vaterwell; fence (RV-0213) Reroutes to avoid vaterwell; fence (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid vaterwell; fence (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hillis (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hillis (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0218) Bad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220) RP 396 Reroute (RV-024) (reliowatione River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0220) RP 396 Reroute (RV-024) (reliowatione River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0220) RP 396 Reroute (RV-024) (reliowatione River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0220) RDDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  Discussed/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes No  In Received by: Date:  Received by: Date: RV-018-018-018-018-018-018-018-018-018-018			/ulo (NY-V134)						
Reroute away from sidehili (SOM Land) (RV-0209)  Discussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199) MP 475 Reroute (RV-0200) Reroutes to lessen/reduce Pis (RV-0213) Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid dreeks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215) Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hilis (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217)  Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: HWY 73 Reroute (RV-0199) HWY 58 Reroute (RV-0219) Sad River HDD Farlignment reroute (RV-0220) MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224) Fellowstone River HDD Entry Pt. (RV-0227) Pl Breatdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):    Ves.   Date:									
Reroute away from sidehili (SOM Land) (RV-0209)  Discussed during 6/21/2011 Meeting: Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199) MP 475 Reroute (RV-0200) Reroutes to lessen/reduce Pis (RV-0213) Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid dreeks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215) Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hilis (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217)  Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: HWY 73 Reroute (RV-0199) HWY 58 Reroute (RV-0219) Sad River HDD Farlignment reroute (RV-0220) MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224) Fellowstone River HDD Entry Pt. (RV-0227) Pl Breatdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):    Ves.   Date:	Discussed during 6/2	0/2011 Meeting							
Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199) MP 475 Reroute (RV-0200) Reroutes to lessen/reduce Pis (RV-0213) Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid creeks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215) Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hills (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hills (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: HWY 73 Reroute (RV-0219) Bad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220) MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224) Fellowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227) P Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  S there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  I yes, please list:  Originator:  Multiple  Date:  8/12/2011  Multiple  Date:  8/12/2011  Fax to: 7									
Reroutes to avoid creek Crossings (RV-0199) MP 475 Reroute (RV-0200) Reroutes to lessen/reduce Pis (RV-0213) Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid creeks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215) Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hills (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hills (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: HWY 73 Reroute (RV-0219) Bad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220) MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224) Fellowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227) P Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  S there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  I yes, please list:  Originator:  Multiple  Date:  8/12/2011  Multiple  Date:  8/12/2011  Fax to: 7	Discussed during 6/2	1/2011 Meeting:	12						
Reroutes to lessen/reduce Pis (RV-0213) Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid reseks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215) Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hills (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217) Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: 1/WY 73 Reroute (RV-0196) Bad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220) MP 396 Reroute (RV-0229) Bad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220) MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224) PI Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230) ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  S there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes No  Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Received by: Date: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?	Reroutes to avoid co	eek Crossings							
Reroutes to avoid waterwell; fence (RV-0214) Reroutes to avoid creeks, dropoffs, wetlands, etc. (RV-0215) Reroutes to avoid sideslopeshills (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217)  Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  1WY 73 Reroute (RV-0196) -1WY 73 Reroute (RV-0196) -1WY 56 Reroute (RV-0219)  Bad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220)  MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224) -2 Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) -2 Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228) -2 Revolute (RV-024) -3 Reroute (RV-024) -4 DDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):			0212)						
Reroutes to avoid sideslopes/hills (RV-0216) Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217)  Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  1WY 73 Reroute (RV-0196) 1WY 56 Reroute (RV-0219) 3ad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220)  MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224)  Pi Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229)  CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  S there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes No  Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Received by:  Date: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?									9
Reroutes to avoid pivot centers (RV-0217)  Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:				0215)					
Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting:  1WY 73 Reroute (RV-0196)  1WY 56 Reroute (RV-0219)  3ad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220)  3dd River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220)  3dd River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227)  Pi Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229)  2K-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  a there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes No  Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?									
HWY 73 Reroute (RV-0196) HWY 56 Reroute (RV-0219) Bad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220) MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224) Veilowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227) Pl Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230) ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  So there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes No  Originator: Multiple Date: 8/12/2011  RV-0194-0197, RV-0198-0200, RV-0209, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0209, RV-0219-0209, RV-0219-0209, RV-0219-0209, RV-0219-0209, RV-0219-0219, RV-0219-0209, RV-0219-0219, RV-0219-0209, RV-0219-0219,									
HWY 56 Reroute (RV-0219)  Bad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220)  MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224)  (eliowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227)  Pl Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229)  CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  s there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes			Washington Mil						
MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224) (ellowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227) Pl Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230) ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  s there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes  No  Originator:  Multiple  Date:  8/12/2011  RV-0194-0197, RV-0199-0200, RV-0209, RV-0219-0219-0220 RV-0219-0220 RV-0219-022		100							
/eliowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227) Pt Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):    ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):    Sthere an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?   Yes			∌ (RV-0220)						
Pl Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)  ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  s there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes No  f yes, please list:  Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Received by: Date: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?			₹V_0227)						
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):  s there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes  No  Originator:  Multiple  Date:  8/12/2011  Received by:  Date:  8/12/2011  Fax to: ?	Pi Breakdowns of al	previous RV's	for new CL (RV-022	28 and RV-0229)					
S there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?  Yes No  Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Received by: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?	TO SECURITY OF THE PARTY OF THE	- CANCARD THE EN	NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, WHEN				Part Service College	NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.	
Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Received by: Date: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?	ADDITIONAL IMPAC	rs (Please inclu	ide any additional imp	oacts which may a	ffect cost; cros	sings, induction	bends, etc.):		
Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Received by: Date: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?									
Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Received by: Date: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?		Will be the							
Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Pate: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?  RV-0194-0197, RV-0199-0200, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0209, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0209, RV-0224, RV-0223, RV-0233-0217, RV-0219-0209, RV-0233-0217, RV-0219-0219, R	s there an increase/d	ecrease in the r	number of crossings?			Yes		No	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Date: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?  RV-0194-0197, RV-0199-0200, RV-0209, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0200, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0210, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0210, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0210, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0210, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0217, RV-0219	yes, please list:			Commence of the second					17 AVE 11 AVE
Originator: Multiple  Date: 8/12/2011  Date: 8/12/2011  Fax to: ?  RV-0194-0197, RV-0199-0200, RV-0209, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0200, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0210, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0210, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0210, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0210, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0217, RV-0219		THE REAL PROPERTY.					- 1974 C - 1974		2800
Date: 8/12/2011	The state of the s	Multipl				10			
RV-0194-0197, RV-0199-0200, RV-0209, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-	Originator	widitpi						With the same of the	
RV-0194-0197, RV-0199-0200, RV-0209, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-		0110100	11				Dat		2/2011
020 RV.0224 RV.0237.0230		8/12/20							
Piled by:						12			
	Date:	F			, RV-0219-	12		4.61	

## KEYSTONE PIPELINE PROJECT - U.S. PHASE IV (STEELE CITY SEGMENT)

	KEYSTONE PIPELINE PROJECT ROUTE VARIATIO	- U.S. PHASE IV (STEELE C ON AUTHORIZATION FORM	ITY SEGMENT)
Date:	8/12/2011	Tracking Number:	RV-0194-0197, RV-0199-0200, RV-0209, RV-0213-0217, RV-0219-0220, RV-0224, RV-0227-0230
John Harter Buzek Rero	airie Fringe Orchid Reroute (RV-0194) r Reroute (RV-0195) rute (RV-0197) ay from sidehii (SOM Land) (RV-0209)	Originated By:  Variation Form Attache	P: XXX.X to XXX.X Multiple
Universal Field - Land	Doug Reichl		X Rejected
Comments: 1ent	vil sur Jey	If Rejected Why?	P. A. 10/5) 11
TransCanada- Engine	ering Meera Koth	arl Variation Approved	X Rejected
Comments: and by Da meetings.	avid Guien on the 8/20 and 6/21	If Rejected Why?	Date: <u>6/20, 6/21, &amp; 8/10/11</u>
Exp - Engineering	Butch Wallac	ce Variation: Approved	X Rejected
Comments:		If Rejected Why?	Date: 6/20, 6/21, & 8/10/11
TransCanada - Constr	nuction Bobby Curbo	A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	X Rejected
Comments:		If Rejected Why?	Date: 8/20, 6/21, & 8/10/11
Exp - Environmental	Jonathan Minto	on Variation: Approved	X Rejected
Comments:		If Rejected Why?	Date: 6/20, 6/21, & 8/10/11
AECOM - Risk Assesm	nent Heidi Tiliqui	st Variation: Approved	N/A Rejected
Comments: N/A.	A MEG (TV) (CTE)	If Rejected Why?	Date:
facilities:	Sandra Gigovi	c Variation: Approved	N/A Rejected
Comments: N/A. Does	not affect Facilities.	If Rejected Why?	Date:
ranaCanada - PM (NE	1 Robert Bradle	y Variation: Approved	X Rejected
comments:		If Rejected Why?	Date: 8/10/2011
ransCanada - Senior I	PM Alan Liet	z Variation: Approved	X Rejected
comments:	ry appropriate	If Rejected Why?	Date: 6/20, 6/21, & 8/10/11
ransCanade - Manage	Steve Mar	r Variation: Approved	Rejected
omments:	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	If Rejected	Date: 2/3////
		Why?	
orward to: Doug Reich		an Minton X	Alan Lietz X
Meera Koth Butch Walls Bobby Curb	ace X Robert	iliquist X Bradley X	Steve Marr X

Document Control Number: KXL10-00006-01-AA-180 (Form 2)

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT - STEELE CITY SE PIPELINE ROUTE VARIATION FORM	GMENT
1 VARIATION TYPE: Refinement: Rero	oute: X
Centerline: X Valve Site: X	Pump Station:
2 LOCATION: Sketch: Attached Pictu	res: See attached
State: Multiple County: Multiple Quad M	Map: N/A
Township: Multiple Range: Multiple Aerial M	Map: See attached map sheet
Section: Multiple Centerline: 11/18/2010	MP: XXX.X to XXX.X
REASON FOR ROUTE VARIATION (Please include reason for route variation):	Pump Station:  Pump Station:  Incres: See attached  Map: N/A  Map: See attached map sheet  MP: XXX.X to XXX.X
The Reason for each Route Variation (RV) is given with the respective RV file. These reroutes are proposed based on aerial/pictometry/Lydar/flyover analysis of current line through	
DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe route variation in detail):	
See respective Route Variation Files. No new landowners were affected by the proposed route variat RVs included: Discussed during 8/10/2011 Meeting: HWY 73 Reroute (RV-0196) HWY 56 Reroute (RV-0219) Bad River HDD realignment reroute (RV-0220) MP 396 Reroute (RV-0224) Yellowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227) PI Breakdowns of all previous RV's for new CL (RV-0228 and RV-0229) CK-MLV-06 and CK-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)	ions.
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, inc	luction bends, etc.):
Is there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings?	YesNo
If yes, please list:	3
9	10
9 Originator: Multiple	Received by:
Date: 8/12/2011	10   Received by:
11	Fax to: ?
RV-0196, RV-0219-0220, RV-0224, RV-0227-0230 Assigned Tracking Number:	Filed by:
. adjude Hedding Helinor.	]
	Date:   6

<sup>\*</sup> Evaluation Criteria is located in Route Refinement and Reroute Process, Section 3

		.S. PHASE IV (STEELE CITY SEGMENT) AUTHORIZATION FORM	T <sub>R</sub>
Date:	8/12/2011	Tracking Number: RV-0196, RV-0219-0220, RV-0224, RV-0227-0230	RV-0196, RV-C
River HD: 0224); Ye of all prev	Reroute (RV-0196): HWY 56 Reroute (RV-0219): 8ad D resilignment reroute (RV-0220): MP 396 Reroute (RV- Blowstone River HDD Entry Pt (RV-0227): Pl Bresidowns isous RV's for new Ct. (RV-0228 and RV-0229); CK-MLV- K-11 Valves relocation (RV-0230)	MP: XXX.X to XXX.X  Originated By: Multiple  Variation Form Attached: Yes X No	RV-0219-0220, RV-0224, RV-0227-0230
Universal Field - La Comments:	Doug Reichley	Variation: Approved X Rejected	224, RV
7em	is Survey	If Rejected Why? Dr. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	0227-0230
TransCanada- Engl Comments:	Meering Meera Kothari	Variation: Approved X Rejected  Date: 8/10/2011  If Rejected Why?	
Exp - Engineering Comments:	Butch Wallace	Vadatiog: Approved X Rejected  K. C. M. M. M. Rejected  K. C. M. M. M. Rejected  Why?  If Rejected  Why?	
TransCanada - Con Comments:	Bobby Curbow  WIND MANUTE 1.	Variation: Approved X Rejected  Date: 8/10/2011  If Rejected Why?	
Exp - Environmental Comments: Pe	Jonathan Minton	Variation: Approved X Rejected  Date: 8/10/2011  Ti Rejected	
ImnsCanada - Envi	ronmental Stephen Craycroft	Variation Administration X Rejected  Date: 8/10/2011  If Rejected ASS UMAN TO LESS Why AND ENLY RESULTS	W COMPLETED
Facilities: Comments: N/A. Do	Sandra Gigovic es not affect Facilities.	Variation: Approved N/A Rejected  Date:	0219 Hun4 56 REROUTE
TransCenada - PM () Comments:	Robert Bradley	Variation: Approved X Rejected  Date: 8/10/2011  If Rejected Why?	REROUTE
TransCanada - Senis Comments: CANO	Alan Jetz	Variation: Approved —X Rejected	
TransCanada - Mana Comments:	ger Steve Marr	Variation: Approved Rejected  Date: If Rejected	
Forward to: Doug Re Meera Ke Butch We Bobby Ci	othari X Stephen C allace X Robert Bra	raycroft X Steve Marr X	

