		XL PIPELINE PRO				
1 VARIATION TYPE: Refinement:	Reroute:		Footprint:	х	Design:	
Centerline:	Pump Station:		Valve Site:		CAR:	x
2	Fullip Station.		Valve Site.		OAIX.	
LOCATION: Sketch:	Atta	ached	Pictures:	N/A		
State: SD County			Quad Map:			
Township: 104N Range		-		See attached m		504.40
Section: 26	Centerline:	3/14/2012	MP:	534.10	to	534.12
3 REASON FOR ROUTE VARIATION (Please inc	lude reason for route	e variation):				
The primary reason for this footprint change is to (Thomas Lands, Inc.). Per land, this shift will aw mixed if the gate was left open, and would prefer This footprint change is requested by Land.	oid a gate at the pro	perty line between	the two tracts. Th			
DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe r	oute variation in det	ail):				
VAR-022 = Current length ~119.4 ft. and perpen easement inside SD-LY-10160. Propsoed VAR Proposed VAR-022 starts at 294th St. and contir towards MLV-22 Valve Site.	length is ~ 117.3 ft.	and offset (measur	ed perpendicularly	) to SD-LY-1016	0 southern boun	idary is ~9 ft.
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any add	ditional impacts which	ch may affect cost;	crossings, induction	n bends, etc.):		
2 tracts are impacted by the reroute: ML-SD-LY-10160.000 (Thomas Lands, Inc.) ML-SD-LY-10170.000 (Steven Juhnke & Dennis No additional costs associated with environment Additionally, costs associated with CAR acquisiti 43,560 sq.ft.). So, for VAR-022: (not including costs of ~\$16.18.	tal survey.  ion costs are as follo permanent ROW po		/as ∼14.3 ft x 15 ft	= 213.95 sq.ft. F	For a total CAR a	acquisition
Is there an increase/decrease in the number of c	rossings?		Yes		No_	X
If yes, please list:						
COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from	the route variation)					
Additional length of route realignment:	the route variation)	0	ft.	\$ -	\$	360/ft
Additional length of side-hill construction:			ft.	\$ -	_	19/ft
Additional length of wetland construction:			ft.	\$ -		195/ft
Additional bore length (Road, RR):			ft.	\$ -	- \$	540/ft
Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings:			EA	\$ -	<del>-</del> \$	30,000/EA
Additional water body crossing (streams, ponds,	etc.):		_		_	
	35 - 65' +	0	EA	\$ -	\$	185,000/EA
	10' - 19'	0	EA	\$ -	\$	77,250/EA
	Less than 10'	0	EA	\$ -	\$	
Additional survey required:						32,500/EA
Civil	l:	0.02	mile	\$ 84.34	<u>.                                    </u>	
, ·		0.02	mile mile	\$ 84.34 \$ -	_	32,500/EA
Civil	l:		_		\$	32,500/EA 5,000/mile
Civil Cultura	l: l:	0.00	mile mile	\$ -	\$	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		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		No X
f) Is realignment proposed to satisfy landowner request?	Yes		No X
-If yes, name of landowner(s)/track number(s):			
-ii yes, name oi iandowner(s)/track number(s).			
	ifidii-li0 V	V	N-
g) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe	ecific discipline? Yes	X	No
If no, please explain why:			
5 ENGINEERING/CONSTRUCTION - TransCanada	Meera Kothari		
a) Maximum deviation perpendicular to proposed alignment:			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	Х	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	ecific discipline? Yes	Х	No
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	Х	No
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 X
-If yes, name of agency(s):			
g) Environmental features:			
Added (+):	Subtracted (-):		
Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands			
h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe			No
If no, please explain why:			
7			
ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS (if applicable)	Sandra Gigovic		
a) Will the route variation require the relocation of a pump station?	Yes		No X
b) Will route variation impact hydraulics?	Yes		No X
c) Are additional valves required at HCA's or water crossing?	Yes		No X
d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe	ecific discipline? Yes	X	No
If no, please explain why:			
8 STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable)	Bud Andersen		
a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders?	Yes		No X
b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups to the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups.			No X
	•		
c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request?	Yes		No X
-If yes, please specify issue type (as it aligns to stakeholder databas	· ·		
d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe	ecific discipline? Yes	X	No
If no, please explain why:		10	
9 Originator		10 Received by:	
Originator: Land			
		Date	5/20/2013
Date: 5/20/2013		Date:	5/20/2013 Fax to: ?
Date: 5/20/2013		12	
Date: 5/20/2013			

0439-SD-P4-534.1-534.1-I

## KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT

0439-SD-P4-534.1-534.1-I

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT ROUTE VARIATION AUTHORIZATION FORM				
Date: Description:	5/20/2013  The primary reason for this footprint change is to shift Valve Access Road VAR-22 – 9 ft. south to avoid VAR easement Impact to ML-SD-LY-10180 (Thomas Lands, Inc.).	Tracking Number:   0439-SD-P4-534.1-534.1-1     MPI   534.1   to   534.1		
TransCanac Comments:		Variation: Approved X Rejected  Little Date: 5/22/13		
		if Rejected Why?		
TransCanac Comments:	da- Engineering Meera Kothen	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 77 If Rejected Why?		
Exp - Engin	eering Kevin McGlynn	Variation: Approved Rejected Date:		
		If Rejected Why?		
TransCanac Comments:	ia- Environmental Sandra Barnett	Varietion: Approved Rejected  Rejected  Why?  Rejected  Rejected  Why?		
Stantec - Ri Comments:	sk Assesment Heidl Tillquist	Variation: Approved Rejected Date:  If Rejected Why?		
	N/A. Does not affect facilities	Variation: Approved Rejected Date:		
TransCanac	ia - PM (Montana) Alan Lietz	Why?  Variation: Approved Rejected  Date:		
TransCapan	la - PM (South Dakota) James Odom	Variation: Approved Rejected		
Comme <b>nts</b> :		Rejected Why?		
TransCariac Comments:	ia - PM (Nebraska) Robert Bradley	Variation: ApprovedRejected  Date:  If Rejected Why?		
TransCanad	ta - Area Manager Steve Man	Variation: Approved Rejected .  Date:  If Rejected Why?		
Forward to:	Tine Hall Sandrà B Meera Kothari Heldi Tiliq Kevin McGlyrin Sandra G Alan Lletz	uist Robert Bradley Igovic Steve Marr		

## KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT

	PIPELINE PROJECT AUTHORIZATION FORM
Date: 5/20/2013	Tracking Number: 0439-50-P4-534.1-534.1-1
Description: The primary reason for this footprint change is to shift Valve necess Road VAR-22 - 9 ft is such to avoid VAR easement impact to ML-SD-LY-10160 [Thomas Lands [66]]	MP: 534.1 to 534.1   Originated By:   Land   Variation Form Atlached   Yes   X   No   No   No   No   No   No   No
TransCanada - Land Tina Hall	Variation: Approved Rojected
Comments:	AUTHORIZATION FORM
TransCanada- Engineering Meera Kothari	Variation: Approved Rejected
Comments:	Uste: H Rejected Why?
Exp - Engineering Kevin McGlynn Comments:	Variation: ApprovedRojected Date:
Continuents	If Rejected V-hy?
TransCanada- Environmental Sandra Barnett Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected  Date  If Rejected  Why?
Stantec - Risk Assesment Heidi Türquist Comments: [TVA	Variation: ApprovedRejected  Date:
	If Rejected Why?
TransCanada - Facilities Sandra Gigo/ic Comments: N/A Doos not affect facilities	Variation: Approved Rejected  Signature A Date: 17 any 26, 201  If Rejected Why?
TransGanada - P.M [Montana] Alan Lieiz	Variation: Approved Rojected
Comments:	Date:  WRejected  Virty?
TransCanada - PM (South Dekola) James Odom Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected
	If Rejected Why?
TransCanada - PM (Hebraska) Robert Bradlay Comments:	Variation: ApprovedRejected
	11 Rejected Why?
TransCanada - Area Manager Steve Marr Comments:	Variation: ApprovedRejected  Date:
	If Rejected Vity?
Forward to: Tina Ha'l Sandra   Meera Kothari Heidi Të Kevin McGlynu Sandra   Alan De	lquist Robert Bradley Bigovic Steve Marr

