KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT - STEELE CITY SEGMENT PIPELINE ROUTE VARIATION FORM						
1 VARIATION TYPE: Refiner	ment: X		Reroute:			
Centerline: X		Valve Site:		Pump	Station:	
2		valve Site		Pullip	Station	
LOCATION: Sketch:		Attached	Pictures: Se	ee attached.		
State: SD Co	unty: Haakon		Quad Map: N/A	١		
	ange: 23E	_	· -	e attached map sheet		
Section: 23, 24	Centerline	e: 3/26/2010	MP:	470.59	to <u>471.48</u>	
REASON FOR ROUTE VARIATION (Please	e include reason for re	oute variation):				
This reroute is proposed to accommodate la		<u> </u>	y Heeb) request t	o avoid any constru	iction impacts to the	
side slope of a pond on the landowner's prop	perty.					
DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please descri	ibe route variation in	detail):				
The proposed reroute starts at the PI near M						
direction for 2,210 ft towards until it complete toward the east and continues for ~2,490 ft t			the pond to its no	ortheast. From here	, the centerline turns	
	•					
The proposed reroute is civil surveyed by co	nsulting with the land	lowner.				
					I	
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS / Places include applied	v additional impacts v	which may affect east; a	raccingo industica	a banda lata):		
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any The proposed reroute is ~5 ft longer than the	•	which may affect cost, cl	rossings, induction	n bends, etc.).		
The proposed revolue is -5 it longer than the	s current route.					
Is there an increase/decrease in the number	of crossings?		Yes		NoX	
If yes, please list:						
COST ANALYSIS (seets in sured as seed of						
COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved f Additional length of route realignment	rom the route variation	5 fi	:. \$	1,800.00	\$ 360/ft	
Additional length of side-hill construction:		-250 ff	_	_	\$ 300/ft	
Additional length of wetland construction:		-250 II			\$ 195/ft	
Additional bore length (Road, RR):					\$ 195/II \$ 540/ft	
Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings:			<u></u> :A \$		\$ 30,000/EA	
Additional water body crossing (streams, por	nds etc.):		<u>_</u>		\$ 30,000/LA	
radiational water body crossing (circums, por	35 - 65' +		:A \$. 1	\$ 185,000/EA	
	10' - 19'		-Δ -Δ -S		\$ 77,250/EA	
	Less than 10'		ΕA \$		\$ 32,500/EA	
Additional survey required:	LC33 triair 10		<u>Ψ</u>		₩ 02,000/EA	
	Civil:	0.40 n	nile \$	2,000.00	\$ 5,000/mile	
	tural:		nile \$		\$ 2,500/mile	
Biolog			nile \$		\$ 2,800/mile	
Biolo	g.03i.		J	1,120.00	ψ <u>2,000///////</u>	
Miscellaneous costs saved or added due to	route variation from A	DDITIONAL IMPACTS	listed above:			
Overall estimated costs of the route variation	1:	\$	1,170 (\$	See "Additional Im	pacts" above)	

4			
LAND / UNIVERSAL FIELD Doug Reichley			
a) Is a new landowner affected by the proposed variation?	Yes		No X
b) Is proposed realignment outside the easement/workspace?	Yes	X	No
c) Is realignment proposed to satisfy landowner request?	Yes		No
-If yes, name of landowner(s)/track number(s):	WL-5D-HK-014	60 (Edwin & Becky	/ neeb)
d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	Yes	X	No
If no, please explain why:			
5 ENGINEERING/CONSTRUCTION / STATE PM David Guien			
		100	e4
a) Maximum deviation perpendicular to proposed alignment:	V	100	
b) Has the centerline been staked for construction?	Yes		No X
c) Does route variation affect HDD crossing alignment?	Yes		No X
d) Is realignment proposed for engineering/construction reasons?	Yes		No X
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 / TROW 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:			
e) Environmental reatures.			
Added (+): None	Subtracted (-):	None	
	_		
Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands:			
f) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	Yes	Х	No
If no, please explain why:			
7			
ENGINEERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS 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? N/A to PS Engine	eeı Yes		No
d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific discipline?	Yes		No
If no, please explain why:			
8			
STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL Bud Andersen			
a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders?	Yes		No
b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups?	Yes		No
c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request?	Yes		No
-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		No
If no, please explain why:			
ii iio, picace explain wity.			
9		10	
Originator: Land		Received by:	
Date: 11/9/2010		Date:	11/9/2010
1102010		_	Fax to: ?
11		12	
Assigned Tracking Number: 0188-SD-P2-470.6-471.5-I		Filed by:	
		Date:	

0188-SD-P2-470.6-471.5-I

0188-SD-P2-470.6-471.5-I

KEYSTONE PIPELINE PROJECT - U.S. PHASE IV (STEELE CITY SEGMENT) ROUTE VARIATION AUTHORIZATION FORM					
Date: 11/9/2010 Description: Reroute to avoid side slope of a pond.	Tracking Number: 0188-SD-P2-470.6-471.5-I MP: 470.6 to 471.5 Originated By: Land Variation Form Attached: Yes X No				
Universal Field - Land Doug Reichley Comments:	Variation: Approved X Rejected Doug Reichley Date: 11/9/2010 If Rejected Why?				
State PM - Construction / Eng. David Guien Comments:	Variation: Approved X Rejected David Guien Date: 11/9/2010 If Rejected Why?				
Trow - Environmental Jonathan Minton Comments:	Variation: Approved X Rejected Jonathan Minton Date: 11/10/2010 If Rejected Why?				
AECOM -Risk Assesment Heidi Tillquist Comments: This reroute does not significantly alter risk to HCAs and is therefore acceptable from a risk perspective.	Variation: Approved X Rejected Heidi Tillquist Date: 11/15/2010 If Rejected Why?				
Project Management Butch Wallace Comments:	Variation: Approved X Rejected R.E. Wallace Date: 11/16/2010 If Rejected Why?				
Stakeholder Relations Bud Andersen Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: If Rejected				
Facilities: Sandra Gigovic Comments:	Variation: Approved X Rejected Sandra Gigovic Date: 11/15/2010 If Rejected Why?				
TransCanada: Alan Lietz Comments:	Variation: Approved X Rejected Alan Lietz Date: 11/16/2010 If Rejected Why?				
Forward to: Butch Wallace X Jonathan David Guien X Bud Ande Doug Reichley X Sandra Gi	ersen X Alan Lietz X				
Dispute Resolution, if Required: Yes Comments:	No Teleconference Required: YesNo Decision:				
Database - Filed By: Date: Fax to: 2	Database - Filed By: Date: Ear to: 2				

