		XL PIPELINE PROJECT	-			
1 NARIATION TYPE: Definement		OTE VARIATION TO			Danima	
VARIATION TYPE: Refinement:	Reroute:		Footprint:	X	Design:	
Centerline:	Pump Station:		Valve Site:	Х	CAR:	Х
2 LOCATION: Sketch:			Pictures: N	/A		
	untu: Moodo Hookon		_		-	
	nge: Meade, Haakon 16E, (18E)		Quad Map: N	ee attached ma	n sheet	
Section: 35, (014)	Centerline:	7/13/2012	MP:	XXX.X	to	XXX.X
			_		_	
3 REASON FOR ROUTE VARIATION (Please	include reason for route	e variation):				
This report consists of 2 proposed Valve MLV lying area to an easily accessible location for						
As per the PHMSA condition 32 - Mainline ar Keystone XL system based on the worst case 195.260 and by taking into consideration eleve the pipeline. Mainline valves must be placed To comply with spacing requirement, Keystor the following steps to mitigate the issue: Relocated the valve after a thorough analys Bringing remote actuation to the downstrear Adding a new remotely actuated mainline value.	e discharge as calculate ration, population, and e based on the analysis a ne determined areas its is of the resulting spill v m manual ball valve of a	d by 49 CFR § 194.105 environmentally sensitive bove or no more than to current valve spacing do olume and assuring the	is. Keystone shale locations, to no wenty (20) miles esign exceeded original intent of	I locate valves in hinimize the constance apart, whichever a spacing of 20	in accordance was equences of a ver is smaller. O miles and emp	vith 49 CFR § release from
DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describ	pe route variation in deta	ail).				
RV-315-01: Listed in "Supplemental Info" Tat						
RV-315-02: Listed in "Supplemental Info" Ta	b.					
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any	•	•				
RV-315-01: MLV-18 relocation: CAR-093 (to SD-ME-11040.000 (Freda Wilson, Life Estate ML-SD-ME-01170.000 (Wink Cattle Co.) - Pr	e, Linda Grenz, Jennifer	Silbaugh) - New MLV-1		ad) will be littpa	oteu, Tracis iiii	Jacted. IVIE-
Cost Analysis: For 315-01: The cost associated with relocati 148 ~624 ft. at \$50/ft.) ~\$31,200 and site buil						
For 315-02: Cost associated to actuate CK-N	/ILV-19 is \$250,000.					
1- 4h			V		Ma	X
Is there an increase/decrease in the number	or crossings?		Yes_		No_	
If yes, please list:						^
						^
COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved fr	om the route variation)					^
COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved fr	om the route variation)	ft		F -	\$	
Additional length of route realignment:	om the route variation)	ft.				360/ft
Additional length of route realignment Additional length of side-hill construction:	om the route variation)	ft.		-	\$	360/ft 19/ft
Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction:	om the route variation)	ft.		\$ - \$ -	_ _ _ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft
Additional length of route realignment Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR):	om the route variation)	ft.	<u>.</u>	5 - 5 -	\$ _ _ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft 540/ft
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:		ft.	<u>.</u>	5 - 5 -	\$ _ _ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft
Additional length of route realignment Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR):		ft.	<u>.</u>	5 - 5 -	\$ \$ \$ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft 540/ft
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:	ds, etc.):	ft. ft. ft.	4 <u>:</u>	5 - 5 - 5 -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft 540/ft 30,000/EA
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:	ds, etc.): 35 - 65' +	ftftftftftftftftftftftft	4 <u>1</u>	5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft 540/ft 30,000/EA
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:	ds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19'	ft.	4 <u>1</u>	5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft 540/ft 30,000/EA 185,000/EA 77,250/EA
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, pon	ds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19'	0 E/O E/O E/O	A	5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft 540/ft 30,000/EA 185,000/EA 77,250/EA
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, pon	ds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10'	0 E-0 0 E-0 0 m	A S	5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 7	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft 540/ft 30,000/EA 185,000/EA 77,250/EA 32,500/EA
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, pon	ds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10' Civil: ural:	0 E/O E/O MM	A S	5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft 540/ft 30,000/EA 185,000/EA 77,250/EA 32,500/EA
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, pondational water body crossing) Additional survey required:	ds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10' Civil: ural: jical:	0 E, 0 E, 0 E, 0 E, 0 E, 0 m 0.00 m	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7 - 7	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	360/ft 19/ft 195/ft 540/ft 30,000/EA 185,000/EA 32,500/EA 5,000/mile 2,800/mile
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, pondadditional survey required:	ds, etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10' Civil: ural: jical:	0 E/ 0 E/ 0 0 E/ 0 0 E/ 0 0 E/ 0 0 0 m 0.00 m	A A Sile Sile Sile Sile Sile Sile Sile Sile	5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 -	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	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 2,800/mile (1,109,125)

4 LAND / TransCanada	Tina Hall		
a) Is a new landowner affected by the proposed variation?	Yes		No X
b) Is the affected landowner/tract a possible condemnation?	Yes		No No
c) Does proposed route variation impact Tribal Lands?	Yes		No X
d) Does proposed route variation impact any Federal/State Land	ds? Yes		No X
-If yes, name type (i.e. USFWS, BLM, etc.):			
e) Is proposed realignment outside the easement/workspace?	Yes		No X
f) Is realignment proposed to satisfy landowner request?	Yes		NoX
-If yes, name of landowner(s)/track number(s):			
g) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe	ecific discipline? Yes		No
If no, please explain why:	. cc		
ii iio, piease explain wity.			
5 ENGINEERING/CONSTRUCTION - TransCanada	Meera Kothari		
a) Maximum deviation perpendicular to proposed alignment:		N/A 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		No X
d) Does route variation affect HDD crossing alignment?	Yes		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		No X
g) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe			No A
	Some discipline?	^	
If no, please explain why:			
6 ENVIRONMENTAL / TransCanada	Sandra Barnett		
a) Has the corridor been environmentally surveyed?	Yes	X	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		No No
1) was realignment proposed to satisfy agency request:	163		110
-If yes, name of agency(s):	PHMS	SA Condition 32	
g) Environmental features:			
Added (+):	Subtracted (-):		
Added (*).	Subtracted (-).		
Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands	:		
h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe	ecific discipline? Yes		No
If no, please explain why:			
7			
ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable)	Sandra Gigovic		
<u>ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable)</u> a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station?	Sandra Gigovic Yes		No X
	•		No X
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station? b) Will route variation impact hydraulics?	Yes	X	
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?	Yes Yes Yes	X	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 spe	Yes Yes Yes	X	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 spell fino, please explain why:	Yes Yes Yes	X	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 spellf no, please explain why:	Yes Yes Yes	X	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 spell fino, please explain why: 8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable)	Yes Yes Yes ecific discipline? Yes	х	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 spelf no, please explain why: 8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Yes Bud Andersen Yes	х	No No No X
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? b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder group	Yes Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Bud Andersen Yes Yes Yes	х	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 spell fino, 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 or was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request?	Yes Yes Yes Pecific discipline? Bud Andersen Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	х	No No No X
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 spellf 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 database)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Bud Andersen Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y	X	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 spell fino, 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 or was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Bud Andersen Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y	X	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 spellf 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 database)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Bud Andersen Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y	X	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 spell fino, 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 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:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Bud Andersen Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y	X X	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 spellf 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? -If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder databased) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spellf no, please explain why:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Bud Andersen Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y	X	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 spell fino, 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 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:	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Bud Andersen Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y	X X X Received by: Date:	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 spell fino, 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 of 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 spell fino, please explain why: Originator: Engineering Date: 8/14/2012	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Bud Andersen Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y	X X 10 Received by: Date: Fax to:?	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 spell fino, 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 or 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 spell fino, please explain why: Originator: Engineering Date: 8/14/2012	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Pub Andersen Yes Yes Yes Pups? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	X X Received by: Date: Fax to: ?	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 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 groud 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 specific no, please explain why: Originator: Engineering Date: 8/14/2012	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Pub Andersen Yes Yes Yes Pups? Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	X X 10 Received by: Date: Fax to:?	No

0315-SD-P4-XXX.X-XXX.X-

Keystone XL Pipeline - Supplemental Information for Route Variation Report 0315 Prepared: 2012-08-14

RV-ID Status	Previou	us Scenario	New :	Scenario	Relocated Distance (miles)	Downstream distance to next		Previous Scenario	New Scenario	County	State		Previous Scenar	rio		New Scenario		Tag (Motor operated valve)	Tag (Check valve)	Tag (Manual valve)
	Milepost	Valve ID	Milepost	Valve ID				Туре	Type			Legal	Latitude	Longitude	Legal	Latitude	Longitude			
0315-01	424.4	MLV-18	419.6	MLV-18	4.8		6	MOV	MOV	Meade	South Dakota	035-033N-36E	44° 33' 14.671" N	102° 4' 50.936'	' W 035-008N-16	44° 36' 17.249" N	102° 8' 38.204" W	/ 260-FAITH-01A-B0-MLV-01		
0315-02	435.7	CK-MLV-19	435.7	CK-MLV-19	0.0		6	CHECK AND MANUAL	CHECK AND MOV	Haakon	South Dakota	014-06N-018E	44° 28' 26.173" N	101° 54' 20.546'	' W 014-06N-018	44° 28' 26.173" N	101° 54' 20.546" W	,	260-FAITH-02A-B0-CKV-01	260-FAITH-02A-B0-MLV-01

	New S	Scenario		Previous Scenario		New	Scenario	Required	Distance from Road	Distance from CL of	
RV-ID	Milepost	Valve ID	Closest Road	Side	Tract Number	Owner	Tract Number	Owner	building setback	ROW/FENCE to valve (whichever greater) (ft)	Road to valve (ft)
0315-01	419.6	MLV-18	CAR-148; HWY-34	UPSTREAM	ML-SD-ME-01170.000	Wink Cattle Co.	ML-SD-ME-11040.000	Freda Wilson, Life Estate, Linda Grenz, Jennifer Silbaugh	NONE	100	130
0315-02	435.7	CK-MLV-19	202ND Street	UPSTREAM	ML-SD-HK-00170.000	Kelly Blair	ML-SD-HK-00170.000	Kelly Blair	NONE	100	130

Keystone XL Pipeline - Approval form for Route Variation Report 0315 Prepared: 2012-08-14

RV ID		RV-315-01: MLV-18 Relocation	RV-315-02: CK-MLV-19 (Actuation)
	Approval (Y/N)	4	7
LAND (TransCanada) Tina Hall	Comments	·/ -(A 11 A	
	Signature	In Midale	11 1=M. Hrc
	Approval (Y/N)	7	9 ("
ENGINEERING (TransCanada) Meera Kothari	Comments		
	Signature	me	me
	Approval (Y/N)		
ENGINEERING (exp) Butch Wallace	Comments		
	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)		
ENVIRONMENTAL (TransCanada) Sandra Barnett	Comments		,
	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)		
FACILITIES (TransCanada) Sandra Gigovic	Comments		
	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)		
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - MONTANA (TransCanada) Alan Lietz	Comments		
	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)	Y	Y
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - SOUTH DAKOTA (TransCanada) James Odom	Comments		
	Signature	Jan H. Odon	Jan H. Ode
	Approval (Y/N)		
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - NEBRASKA (TransCanada) Robert Bradley	Comments	0	
-	Signature		
VEVOTONE VI MANAGES	Approval (Y/N)		
KEYSTONE XL MANAGER (TransCanada) Steve Marr	Comments		
	Signature	9	

Keystone XL Pipeline - Approval form for Route Variation Report 0315Prepared: 2012-08-14

RV ID		RV-315-01: MLV-18 Relocation	RV-315-02: CK-MLV-19 (Actuation)
	Approval (Y/N)		
LAND (TransCanada) Tina Hall	Comments		
	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)		
ENGINEERING (TransCanada) Meera Kothari	Comments		
	Signature		
144	Approval (Y/N)	7	Y
ENGINEERING (exp) Butch Wallace	Comments	ac. 1.111.	00.111
	Signature	1. Charles	16.C. Waltice
	Approval (Y/N)		
ENVIRONMENTAL (TransCanada) Sandra Barnett	Comments		
	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)		
FACILITIES (TransCanada) Sandra Gigovic	Comments		
	Signature .		
	Approval (Y/N)		
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - MONTANA (TransCanada) Alan Lietz	Comments		
	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)		
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - SOUTH DAKOTA (TransCanada) James Odom	Comments		
	Signature		
DDG ISOT MANAGENETIC	Approval (Y/N)		
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - NEBRASKA (TransCanada) Robert Bradley	Comments		
-	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)		
KEYSTONE XL MANAGER (TransCanada) Steve Marr	Comments		
	Signature		

Keystone XL Pipeline - Approval form for Route Variation Report 0315 Prepared: 2012-08-14

RV ID		RV-315-01: MLV-18 Relocation	RV-315-02: CK-MLV-19 (Actuation)
	Approval (Y/N)	4	Y
LAND (TransCanada) Tina Hall	Comments	·/ -44 11 0	
	Signature	In Milarle	11 1-41. Dec
	Approval (Y/N)	7.	9 (, , ,
ENGINEERING (TransCanada) Meera Kothari	Comments		
	Signature	me -	me.
	Approval (Y/N)		
ENGINEERING (exp) Butch Wallace	Comments		
	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)		
ENVIRONMENTAL (TransCanada) Sandra Barnett	Comments		
	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)	7	7
FACILITIES (TransCanada) Sandra Gigovic	Comments	Sept 2 2012	Sejot 7, 2012
The state of the s	Signature	Gigarda	G.90,CA.
	Approval (Y/N)		
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - MONTANA (TransCanada) Alan Lietz	Comments		
	Signature		
200 (507)	Approval (Y/N)	Y	Y
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - SOUTH DAKOTA (TransCanada) James Odom	Comments		
	Signature	Cham H. Odon	Cra II Ol
DDO IFOT WALL OF LIFE AND ALL OF LOW	Approval (Y/N)		
PROJECT MANAGEMENT - NEBRASKA (TransCanada) Robert Bradley	Comments		V
•	Signature		
	Approval (Y/N)		
KEYSTONE XL MANAGER (TransCanada) Steve Marr	Comments		
	Signature		

TransCanada In business to deliver PROPOSED VALVE RELOCATION (MLV-18 - RV-0315-01) CC03-SD-ME-11060.000 NEW VALVE LOCATION OLD VALVE LOCATION ML-SD-ME-11050.000 THE HUGH G. HUDSON & BEVERLY J. HUDSON FAMILY TRUST T 7N R 16E MP 420 VICINITY MAP Hughes KEYSTONE XL PROJECT PREPARED BY: LEGEND PROPOSED VALVE RELOCATION **exp** Energy Services Inc. Ziebach (MLV-18 - RV-0315-01) t: +1.850.385.5441 | f: +1.850.385.5523 1300 Metropolitan Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32308 U.S.A. Perkins MILEPOST SURVEYED FENCE COUNTY: MEADE DRAWN BY: KEYSTONE XL CL (2012-03-14) STATE: SOUTH DAKOTA CHECKED BY: JP PROPOSED ROUTE VARIATION CULTURAL SITE REV. NO.: REVISION DATE Meade ISSUED FOR REVIEW. SECTION LINE WETLAND ACCESS ROAD WATERBODY The new identity of Trow Engineering Consultants, Inc. **PRELIMINARY** PUMP STATION 500FT MDEQ CORRIDOR • BUILDINGS • EARTH & ENVIRONMENT • ENERGY • • INDUSTRIAL • INFRASTRUCTURE • SUSTAINABILITY • HDD ENTRY / EXIT Keystone XL Project PROJECTION: NAD83 | UTM13 N XL-30-P-9200 SHEET