| PIPELINE I | E XL PIPELINE PROJECT ROUTE VARIATION FORM | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1 VARIATION TYPE: Refinement: Rerout | e: X Footprin | t: Desig | n: |
| | | | |
| Centerline: X Pump Statio | n: Valve Site | : CA | R: |
| | ttached Pictures | See attached. | |
| State: SD County: Tripp | Quad Map | : N/A | |
| Township: 102N Range: 78W, (77W) | Aerial Map | See attached map sheet | |
| Section: 024, 025, (030) Centerlin | e: 3/14/2012 MP | : 546.93 to | 548.80 |
| 3 | | | |
| REASON FOR ROUTE VARIATION (Please include reason for rou | <u> </u> | | |
| The primary reason for this proposed route variation is to avoid the encountered near MP 546.9. | difficult terrain (side slopes, bluffs) an | d workspaces inside the drain | nage/creek |
| This reroute is requested by Engineering and is based on recomme | endations from the field reconnaissand | ce. | |
| | | | |
| | | | - 1 |
| | | | - 1 |
| DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe route variation in de | etail): | | |
| The proposed route variation starts near MP 546.9 and deviates ~5 | <u> </u> | in this direction for ~3.811 ft. | The reroute, then |
| turns further southeast and extends for ~1,811 ft. It continues by to | | | |
| | | | - 1 |
| | | | - 1 |
| | | | - 1 |
| ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts wh | ich may affect cost; crossings, inducti | on bends, etc.): | , |
| 4 tracts are impacted by the reroute: | | <u> </u> | |
| ML-SD-TR-10200.000 (Pahapesto Cattle Co., Inc.) | | | - 1 |
| ML-SD-TR-10240.000 (Tresh Swedlund & Sara Swedlund) ML-SD-TR-10250 and ML-SD-TR-10260 (Both Jorgensen Farms, I | nc., a SD Corporation) | | - 1 |
| | | | - 1 |
| Additional Cost savings include: | | | |
| a) To avoid a difficult construction and workspaces paralleling drain | age feature (near MP 547) ~30,000 | | - 1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| ls there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings? | ٧a | 8 | lo Y |
| Is there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings? | Ye | s | lo X |
| Is there an increase/decrease in the number of crossings? If yes, please list: | Ye | s | lo X |
| | | s | loX |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation | | \$ 91,289.29 | Io X |
| If yes, please list: |) | | |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment |)ft. | \$ 91,289.29 | \$ 360/ft |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment Additional length of side-hill construction: | 254 ft. | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: | 254 ft4,530 ft. | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): | 254 ft4,530 ft. ft. ft. | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: | 254 ft4,530 ft. ft. ft. | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: Additional water body crossing (streams, ponds, etc.): | 254 ft4,530 ft. ft. ft. | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: Additional water body crossing (streams, ponds, etc.): 35 - 65' + | 254 ft4,530 ft. ft. ft. EA | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: Additional water body crossing (streams, ponds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' | 254 ft4,530 ft. ft. ft. EA | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA |
| COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: Additional water body crossing (streams, ponds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10' | 254 ft4,530 ft. ft. ft. EA | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA |
| COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: Additional water body crossing (streams, ponds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10' Additional survey required: | 0 EA O EA O EA | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment. Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: Additional water body crossing (streams, ponds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10' Additional survey required: Civil: | 0 EA O EA O EA O EA O Mile | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA \$ 5,000/mile |
| If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from the route variation Additional length of route realignment Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: Additional water body crossing (streams, ponds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10' Additional survey required: Civil: Cultural: | 0 EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 0 EA | \$ 91,289.29 \$ (86,070.00) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA \$ 5,000/mile \$ 2,500/mile |

| 4 LAND / TransCanada | Tina Hall | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|---|
| a) Is a new landowner affected by the proposed variation? | Yes | S | No X |
| b) Is the affected landowner/tract a possible condemnation? | Yes | | No |
| c) Does proposed route variation impact Tribal Lands? | Yes | | No X |
| d) Does proposed route variation impact any Federal/State Land | | | No X |
| -If yes, name type (i.e. USFWS, BLM, etc.): | | | |
| e) Is proposed realignment outside the easement/workspace? | Yes | s X | No |
| f) Is realignment proposed to satisfy landowner request? | Yes | | No X |
| | 100 | · | |
| -If yes, name of landowner(s)/track number(s): | | | |
| | | | |
| g) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe | ecific discipline? Yes | sX | No |
| If no, please explain why: | | | |
| | | | |
| 5 ENGINEERING/CONSTRUCTION - TransCanada | Meera Kothari | | |
| a) Maximum deviation perpendicular to proposed alignment: | | 555 | ft. |
| b) Does variation (CL) (including workspaces) falls within 500 ft | . MDEQ Corridor? Yes | N/A | No |
| c) Has the centerline been staked for construction? | Yes | s | No X |
| d) Does route variation affect HDD crossing alignment? | Yes | s | No X |
| e) Is realignment proposed for engineering/construction reasons? | Yes | X | No |
| f) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? | Yes | S | No X |
| g) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe | ecific discipline? Yes | X | No |
| If no, please explain why: | | | |
| | | | |
| 6 ENVIRONMENTAL - TransCanada | Sandra Barnett | | |
| | | . v | No |
| a) Has the corridor been environmentally surveyed? | Yes | | No |
| b) Has the proposed variation been environmentally surveyed? | Yes | | No X |
| c) Does proposed route variation impact Sage Grouse areas? | Yes | | No X |
| d) Does route variation impact ABB areas? | Yes | | No X |
| e) Was variation proposed to satisfy environmental issues? | Yes | | No X |
| | | | |
| f) Was realignment proposed to satisfy agency request? | Yes | S | No X |
| f) Was realignment proposed to satisfy agency request? -If yes, name of agency(s): | Yes | S | NO X |
| | Yes | S | X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: | | | X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): | Yes Subtracted (-) | | NO X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: | | | NO_X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: | Subtracted (-) | | NO_X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): | Subtracted (-) | | No X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands | Subtracted (-) | | |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe | Subtracted (-) | | |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spel If no, please explain why: | Subtracted (-) | | |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specified in the second of the seco | Subtracted (-) ecific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic | | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specified in the example of the second of the sec | Subtracted (-) ecific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes | | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specified in the second of the seco | Subtracted (-) ecific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic | | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specified in the example of the second of the sec | Subtracted (-) ecific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes | 5 5 | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spell fino, please explain why: FINGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics? | Subtracted (-) Subtracted (-) Subtracted (-) Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes | \$ | No X No X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spell fino, please explain why: FINGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) 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? | Subtracted (-) Subtracted (-) Subtracted (-) Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes | \$ | No X No X No X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spell fino, please explain why: FINGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) 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 spell fino, please explain why: | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Ye | \$ | No X No X No X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spell fino, please explain why: **Tengineering / Facilities and Hydraulics (if applicable)* 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 spell fino, please explain why: **Stakeholder Relations / TCPL (if applicable)** | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Yes Bud Andersen | \$\$ | No X No X No No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spell fino, please explain why: **Tengineering / Facilities and Hydraulics** (if applicable) 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 spell fino, please explain why: **Stakeholder Relations / TCPL** (if applicable) a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Bud Andersen Yes | | No X No X No No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe If no, please explain why: **PRINTERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable)** 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 spe If no, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable)** a) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups. | Subtracted (-) Pecific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe If no, please explain why: **PRISINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) 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 spe If no, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder group. c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | | No X No X No No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe If no, please explain why: **PRINTERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable)** 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 spe If no, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable)** a) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups. | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe If no, please explain why: **PRINTERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) 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 spe If no, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder group. c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Perific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe If no, please explain why: **PENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable) 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 spe If no, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation reguit in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder group. c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder database) | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Perific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specification, please explain why: **Tengineering / Facilities and Hydraulics (if applicable) 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 specification, please explain why: **Stakeholder Relations / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder group. c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder databased) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specification, please explain why: | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Perific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific to the specific state of the specific stakeholder group of the 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 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 group of the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder databased) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific no, please explain why: Originator: Engineering | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Perific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | To Received by: | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specification, please explain why: **Tengineering / Facilities and Hydraulics (if applicable) 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 specification, please explain why: **Stakeholder Relations / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder group. c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder databased) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specification, please explain why: | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Perific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | | No X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific from the provided from the provided for this specific from the provided from t | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Perific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | lo Received by: Date: | No |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific from the provided from the provided for this specific from the provided from t | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Perific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | To Received by: | No X |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spell fino, please explain why: **PENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable)** 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 spell fino, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable)** a) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder group of the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder databased) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spell fino, please explain why: **Originator: Engineering Date: 8/14/2012** 11 | Subtracted (-) Secific discipline? Yes Sandra Gigovic Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Perific discipline? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y | 10 Received by: Date: | No X |

0314-SD-P4-546.9-548.8-S

| A10/2012 The primary reason by this proposed rends remains in a second remains in the difficult terrain (after shopes, Mintig and workspanse Inside the descriptives) comprehend once | College Coll |
|--|---|
| | |
| | 5/10 See 5 |
| | |
| | (Light) |
| AULUS ST | |
| 1977 | |
| ALCOHOLOGICA CONTRACTOR CONTRACTO | |
| | |
| | |
| | Section 2015 |
| The second secon | Parameter Control of the Control of |
| (Ricement) (N/A, Open not affect healthes | Que 1 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| AND A CONTRACT OF THE PROPERTY | |
| A S TOTAL OF THE STATE OF THE S | |
| | |
| San | |
| A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O | |
| | |

0314-SD-P4-546.9-548.8-S

| 8/14 s primary reason for this propose id the difficult terrain (side slope ricappaces inside the drainage/cre 546.9. Land | s, bluffs) and | Tracking Number: 0314-SD-P4-548,9-548.8-S MP: 548.9 to 548.8 Originated By: Engineering Variation Form Attached: Yes X No Variation: Approved Rejected If Rejected Why? |
|--|---|--|
| | | Arthold Date: 9-20-12 |
| Engineering | Meera Kothari | |
| | | Variation: Approved Rejected If Rejected Why? |
| ing · | Butch Wallace | Variation: Approved Rejected |
| Environmentaj | Sandra Barnett | Variation: Approved Rejected The Province Rejected Rejec |
| Assesment A. | Heidl Tillquist | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: |
| Facilities A. Does not affect facilitie | Sandra Gigovic | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: |
| PM (Montana) | Alan Lietz | Why? Variation: Approved Rejected Date: If Rejected Why? |
| PM (South Dakota) | James Odom | Variation: Approved X Rejected Date: Aug 24,7012 If Rejected Why? |
| PM (Nebraska) | Robert Bradley | Variation: ApprovedRejected Date: If Rejected |
| Area Manager | Steve Man | Variation: Approved Rejected Date; If Rejected Why? |
| | Assesment A. Facilities A. Does not affect facilities PM (Montana) PM (South Dakota) | Assesment Heidl Tiliquist A. Facilities Sandra Gigovic A. Does not affect facilities PM (Montana) Alan Lietz PM (Nebraska) James Odom PM (Nebraska) Robert Bradley Area Manager Steve Marr |

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

| AOUIE VARIATION | AUTHORIZATION FORM |
|---|--|
| ste: 8/10/2012 | AUTHORIZATION FORM Tracking Number: 0314-SD-P4-546.9-548.8-S MP: 646.9 to 548.8 Originated By: Engineering Variation Form Attached: Yes X No Variation: Approved Rejected Output If Rejected Withy? |
| scription: The primary reason for this proposed route variation is to avoid the difficult terrain (side slopes, bluffs) and workspaces inside the drainage/creek encountered near | MP: 546,9 to 548,8 |
| WP 546.9. | Variation Form Attached. Yes X No C |
| <u>ansCanada - Land</u> Tina Hall | Variation: Approved Rejected |
| mments: | Q |
| | #Rejected ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## # |
| | |
| ansCanada- Engineering Meera Kolhari | Variation: Approved Rejected |
| mments: | Date: |
| | If Rejected Why? |
| L | |
| p - Engineering Jeff Amelorsano | Variation: Approved Rejected |
| xrunents: | Date: |
| | #Rejected |
| | Why? |
| aneCanada Environmental Sandra Ramelt | Variation: Approved Rejected |
| ansCanada- Environmental Sandra Barnett mments: [| Variation: Approved Rejected Date: |
| | # Rejected |
| | Why? |
| antec - Risk Assesment Hekli Tillquist | Variation: Approved Rejected |
| mments: NA. | Date |
| | If Rejected |
| | Why? |
| | |
| ansCanada - Facilities Sandra Gigovic | |
| mments: N/A. Does not affect facilities | A Dale: |
| | If Rejected |
| | Why? |
| ansCanada - PM (Montana) Alan Lietz | Variation: Approved Rejected |
| mments: | Date: |
| | If Rejected Why? |
| | |
| ansCanada - PM (South Dakota) James Odom | |
| giments: | Date: |
| | If Rejected |
| | Why? |
| | |
| ansCanada - PN (Nebraska) Robert Bradley | |
| mments: | Date: |
| | Why? |
| | |
| <u>ansCanada - Area Manager</u> Steve Marr | Variation: Approved Rejected |
| mments: | Date: |
| | If Rejected Why? |
| NS 10 NS 10 NS 1 ■ | |

| | Cate 8/19/2012 Description The promary reason for the proposed much vesselson is to equal the difficult turnies (side alopes, biddly) and surfacement buddle the distinguishes is wroughtened once and 540.8. | Treating Number 9314-SD-P4-649 0-649.3-5 CO MPP 668.0 10 249.0 CO Childright By Brainsonn West X No. 14 |
|------------|--|--|
| | | 546.9-548.8-6 |
| | Comments | |
| | General Communication of the C | Control Contro |
| | | Guration: Approvide Painted Date: Painted (Rejector) |
| | Company 1 page | Control Contro |
| | Communities Supering Gigores | |
| | Double Country of Manager 1 | Vertilitier Albrinde Physical |
| Lonnie De | Jole to sign off 2t this time as working where is working | 8/24/12 I would like to wait until the |
| with Crown | Jones on the Jones on the Jones on the Total to we The Hall Tira Hall | Landowner issue is resolved before assessing this saule variation for approval. |
| | | James Odon |

| | ROUITEV | STONE XL PIPE PARIATION AU | THORIZATION | FORM | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|---|--------------|
| avoid ti | 8/14/2012 mary reason for this proposed route verte difficult terrain (side slopes, bluffs) aces inside the drainage/creek encounts. | variation is to and and untered near | Originated E Variation Form | MP(| 0314-SD- 546,9 Yes | P4-546,9-548 to <u>54</u> Engineering X No | .8-S 18.8 |
| ransCanada - La Comments: | 18 | Tina Hall | Variation: Ap | pproved | Date | Rejected | |
| ransGanada- Eng comments: | aineering Me | pera Kothari | If Rejected | pproved | Date: | Rejected | |
| ixp - Engineering | But | tch Wallace | Why? | pproved | Date; | Rejected | |
| ransCanada- En | vironmenta <u>í</u> Sar | ndra Barnett | if Rejected Why? | pproved | | Rejected | |
| Comments: | | | If Rejected Why? | | Date: | | |
| Stantec - Risk As Comments: N/A. | eeame <u>nt</u> H | eidi Tiilquist | Variation: A | pproved | Date: | Rejected | |
| TransGanada - Fa | cilities San | ndra Gigovic | Veriation: A | pproved | Date: | Rejected | Active |
| TransCanada - P! | M (Montena) | Alan Lietz | Why? | pproved | Date: | _Rejected | |
| TransCanada - P | M (South Dakota) | ames Odom | If Rejected Why? | Approved | X | Rejected | |
| Comments: | | | If Rejected Why? | · Hel | | 19-Sept | 20 12 |
| TransCanada - P | <u>M (Nebraska)</u> Ro | bert Bradley | Variation: A | Approved | Date: | Rejected_ | |
| TransCanada - A | vea Manager | Steve Marr | | Approved | Date: | Rejected | |
| | Hall | Sandra Ba | | | James C | | |

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

-







