KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT - STEELE CITY SEGMENT PIPELINE ROUTE VARIATION FORM					
1 VARIATION TYPE: Refine	ment:		Reroute: X		
			. toroutor		
Centerline: X		Valve Site:		Pump Station:	
LOCATION: Sketch	: <u>A</u>	uttached	Pictures: N/A		
State: SD Co	ounty: Haakon		Quad Map: N/A		
Township: 01N R	ange: 25E		Aerial Map: See atta	ched map sheet	
Section: 4	Centerline	9/21/2011	MP:482	1.96 to 483.24	
3 REASON FOR ROUTE VARIATION (Pleas	e include reason for ro	oute variation):			
Tweak based on Civil survey data of implem			CL away from drop off.		
This reroute is proposed by engineering bas	ed on civil survey data	a			
Trib refeate to proposed by engineering sad	od on own odrycy date	a.			
DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please desc	ribe route variation in o	detail):			
The proposed route variation starts at MP 4 where it rejoins the CL near MP 483.2.	33 and deviates ~14.5	southeast of current co	enterline and parallels R	V-0215-03 for a total of ~1,483 ft	
where it rejoins the GL near MP 463.2.					
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include an	v additional impacts w	hich may affect cost: cro	ossinas, induction bends	s. etc.):	
The proposed reroute is ~18 ft longer than to				,/-	
Reroute avoids a drop off, estimated cost sa					
Is there an increase/decrease in the number	of crossings?		Yes	No X	
If yes, please list:					
COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved	from the route variation	nn)			
Additional length of route realignment:	nom the route variation	18 ft.	\$ 6,	,633.77 \$ 360/ft	
Additional length of side-hill construction:		ft.		- \$ 19/ft	
Additional length of wetland construction:		0 ft.		- \$ 195/ft	
Additional bore length (Road, RR):		ft.		- \$ 540/ft	
Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings:				- \$ 30,000/EA	
Additional water body crossing (streams, po	nds, etc.):		<u> </u>		
, , , , , , ,	35 - 65' +	E	A \$	- \$ 185,000/EA	
	10' - 19'	0 E	A \$	- \$ 77,250/EA	
	Less than 10'	0 E	A \$	- \$ 32,500/EA	
Additional survey required:					
	Civil:	0.00 m	ile \$	- \$ 5,000/mile	
Cu	ltural:	0.30 m	ile \$	750.00 \$ 2,500/mile	
Biolo	gical:	0.30 m	ile \$	\$40.00 \$ 2,800/mile	
		DDITIONAL		(0.555)	
Miscellaneous costs saved or added due to				\$ (6,000)	
Overall estimated costs of the route variation	n:	\$	2,223.77 (See "A	dditional Impacts" above)	

LAND / TRANSCANADA Tim Irons		
a) Is a new landowner affected by the proposed variation?	es	No X
	es X	No No
	es X	No X
		, NO X
-If yes, name of landowner(s)/track number(s):		
d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	es	No
If no, please explain why:		140
II по, рівазе вхрівіт міту.		
5		
ENGINEERING/CONSTRUCTION / STATE PM Meera Kothari	04	4
a) Maximum deviation perpendicular to proposed alignment:	61	
,	es	No X
,	es	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	eses	No X
• •	es	No A
If no, please explain why:		110
in the, produce explain why.		
6		
ENVIRONMENTAL / exp Jonathan Minton		
	es X	No
, , , ,	es	No X
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	es	No X
d) Was realignment proposed to satisfy agency request?	es	No X
-If yes, name of agency(s):		
e) Environmental features:		
Added (+): Subtracted (-).	
Added (1).	7.	
Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands:		
Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands: f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y	es	No
	es	No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	es	No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why:	es	No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic		
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: PENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y	es	No X
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics?	es_	No X
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? Y c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing?	es es	No X No No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: PENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? C) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? Y d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	es_	No X
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? Y c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing?	es es	No X No No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? C) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? Y d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why:	es es	No X No No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: PENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? C) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? Y d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: BENDAL PROVIDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen	es es es	No X No No No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? C) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? Y d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders?	es es es	No X No No No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: **Temory Comparison of the content of	es es es	No X No No N
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: PROGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? You have additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? You has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? You have the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? You have the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request?	es es es	No X No No No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? C) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? Y d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? Y b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? Y -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database):	es es es es	No X No N
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y 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: 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? Y -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?	es es es	No X No No N
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? C) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? Y d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) Bud Andersen a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? Y b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups? Y -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database):	es es es es	No X No N
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: Family Facilities Facilit	es es es es es es	No X No N
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y 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: 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? Y -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?	es es es es	No X No No No No No No No No No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? Y If no, please explain why: ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Y b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? C) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? Y d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: 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: Originator: Engineering Originator: Engineering	es e	No X No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: PAGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) Sandra Gigovic a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? Yh Will route variation impact hydraulics? C) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing? Yh d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: 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:	es es es es es es	No X No No No No No No No No No
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: Facilities Fac	es e	No X No N
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline? If no, please explain why: Tengineering	es e	No X No N

0239-SD-P2-482.9-483.2-I

X
HV-0231, HV-0237, HV-0239, HV-0240, HV-0241
-0239, HV-0240, HV-0241

VARIATION TYPE:		Refinement:	Х		Reroute:	Х			
Centerli	Centerline:	X	Valve Site:		X		Pum	- Pump Station:	
OCATION:		Sketch:	Atta	ched	Pictures:	N/A			
State:	Multiple	County:	Multiple	51104	Quad Map:				
Township:	Multiple	Range:	Multiple		Aerial Map:		hed man s	sheet	
Section:	Multiple	, anger	Centerline:	11/18/2010	MP:			to	XXX.X
EASON FOR ROU he Reason for each									
DETAIL DOUTE VA	PIATION (Place	a dosoriba routa	supriotion in data	.:n.					
DETAIL ROUTE VA			variation in deta	ıil):					
See respective Rout RVs Discussed during									
		-							
Montana - MDEQ mandated re	routes (RV-023	31)							
			alve [MLV-10] Re	elocation (RV-0237)					
Refinement based				L away from dropof					
Refinement based				L away from dropoft aterwell fence) (RV-					
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refinement based of Nebraska -	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w						
Refinement based of Refine	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w	aterwell fence) (RV-	0240)	on hends	etc):		
Refinement based of Refine	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w		0240)	on bends,	etc.):		
Refinement based of Refine	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w	aterwell fence) (RV-	0240)	on bends,	etc.):		
Refinement based of Nebraska - To avoid crossing I	on civil survey	data of RV-0214	4-04 (to avoid w	aterwell fence) (RV-	0240)	on bends,	etc.):		
Refinement based of Refine	TS (Please inc	banks location	nal impacts which	aterwell fence) (RV-	ossings, inducti		etc.):	No	
Refinement based of Refine	TS (Please inc	banks location	nal impacts which	aterwell fence) (RV-	0240)		etc.):	No_	
Refinement based of Refine	TS (Please inc	banks location	nal impacts which	aterwell fence) (RV-	ossings, inducti		etc.):	No_	
Refinement based of Refine	TS (Please inc	banks location	nal impacts which	aterwell fence) (RV-	ossings, inducti		etc.):	No_	
Refinement based of Refine	TS (Please inc	banks location	nal impacts which	aterwell fence) (RV-	ossings, inducti	10	etc.):	No_	
Refinement based of Refine	on civil survey of the civ	banks location	nal impacts which	aterwell fence) (RV-	ossings, inducti	10			/2011
Refinement based of Refine	CTS (Please includerease in the	banks location	nal impacts which	aterwell fence) (RV-	ossings, inducti	10 Recei	ved by:		/2011
Refinement based of Refine	CTS (Please includerease in the	banks location	nal impacts which	h may affect cost; cro	ossings, inducti	10	ved by:	11/1.	/2011
Refinement based of Refine	CTS (Please includerease in the	banks location lude any addition number of cross	nal impacts which	aterwell fence) (RV-	ossings, inducti	10 Receiv	ved by:	11/1.	//2011
Refinement based of Refine	CTS (Please includerease in the	banks location lude any addition number of cross	nal impacts which	h may affect cost; cro	ossings, inducti	10 Receiv	ved by:	11/1.	/2011

		S. PHASE IV (STEELE CITY SEGMENT) AUTHORIZATION FORM
	Date: 11/1/2011	Tracking Number: RV-0231, RV-0237, RV-0239, RV-0240, RV-
	Description: (MDEQ mandated reroutes (RV-0231). New Valves (CK-ML V-068 and ML-V-064) and 1 Valve (ML-V-07). Relocation (RV-0237). Refinement based on ovid survey data of RV-0215-05 (or more CL away from droppd) (RV-0239). Refinement based on ovid survey data of RV-0215-05 (V). To avoid data of RV-0215-05 (V).	Originated By: Variation: Form Attached: Variation: Approved Date: If Rejected Why?
	crossing HWY 56 at high banks location (RV-0241)	Variation Form Attached: Yes X No
	TransCanada - Land Tim Irons Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 11/9/11
		If Rejected Why?
	TransCanada-Engineering Meera Kothari	Variation Approved Rejected
	Comments:	If Rejected Why?
	Exp - Engineering Butch Wallace Comments:	Varietion: Additived Rejected Rejected Date: 11-7-2011
		If Rejected Why?
	IransCanada - Construction Bobby Curbow Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected Date:
	Comments.	If Rejected Why?
Pula noone and and and	Exp - Environmental Jonathan Minton	Variation: Approved Rejected
RV-0231-04 passes through 2 eligible cultural sites. Atternates should	Comments: looking for options to 023+ of RV-0231-05 puns parallel for Pending all survey for rest	Date:
be considered	AECOM - Risk Assesment Heidi Tiliquist	Variation: Approved Rejected
Approved pending lditional changes 0231-ou and 31-05. All others proved pending cruey completion	Comments: N/A.	If Rejected Why?
0231-04 and	Facilities: Sandra Gigovic	Variation: ApprovedRejected
31-05. All others	Comments: N/A. Does not affect facilities	Date:
proved pending		If Rejected Why?
Ney completion		Wilyr
- pres	Comments: Pewsing Dig Coling	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: ///7///
	surex clearance.	If Rejected Why?
1.5 DORDRELT	TransCanada - PM (South Dakota)	Variation: Approved Rejected Rejected Date: /2-12-11
45 DELAYED		If Rejected NEBRASKA
Y OTHERS AND		REROSTE
DL'T REACH	TransCanada - PM (NG) Filters Stadiley	Variation: Approved Rejected
4 BRSK UNTIL	Comments: Duly siquing for S.D.	Date: 01-12-12
H2-12-12-12-12-12-	0.000	M/3.
UE TO THE	TransCanada - Phase IV Area Manager Steve Marr	Variation: Approved Rejected
L. REROVE	Comments:	1 Rejected Date: 03-16-12
IAT IS CORRELTLY		Why?
UDDWAY THIS	Forward to: Tim Irons X Jonathar	
E. ADROUTE 15	Meera Kothari	X Steve Marr X
OCT. TIM	OR DOCUMENTATE	ON PURPOSES DALY

	S. PHASE IV (STEELE CITY SEGMENT) LUTHORIZATION FORM
Date: 9/22/2011 Description: Reroute based on civil survey data of RV-215-03 (reroute away from dropoft).	Tracking Number: 0239-SD-P2-482.9-483.2-1 MP: 483.0 to 483.2 Originated By: Engineering Variation Form Attached: Yes X No
TransCanada - Land Tim Irons	Variation: Approved X Rejected
Comments:	If Rejected Why?
TransCanada- Engineering Meera Kothari Comments:	Variation: Approved X Rejected Date:
Exa - Engineering Butch Wallace Comments:	Variation: Approved X Rejected Date: If Rejected Why?
TransCanada - Construction Bobby Curbow Comments:	Variation: Approved X Rejected Date: If Rejected Why?
Exo - Environmental Jonathan Minton Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 11/15/11 Rejected Why?
AECOM - Risk Assessment Heidi Tiliquist Comments: N/A.	Variation: Approved Rejected If Rejected Why?
Facilities: Sandra Gigovic Comments: N/A. Does not affect facilities	Variation: Approved Rejected Date:
TransCanada - PM (Montans) Alan Lletz Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: If Rejected Why?
TransCanada - PM (South Dakota) James Odom Comments:	Variation Approved Rejected Projected Date: 01 12 12 Projected Why?
TransCanada - PM (Nebraska) Robert Bradley Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected Date:
TransCanada - Phase IV Area Manager Steve Marr Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: If Rejected Why?
Forward to: Tim Irons Jonathan Meera Kothari Heidi Till Butch Wallace Sandra G	Miriton James Odom quist Robert Bradley

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

