| KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT PIPELINE ROUTE VARIATION FORM | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| VARIATION TYPE: Refinement: | Reroute: | | otprint: | Design: | |
| VALUATION THE TREMEMENT. | _ | X 100 | | Deolgii. | |
| Centerline: X | Pump Station: | Valv | e Site: | CAR: | |
| LOCATION: Sketch: | Attached | l Pio | tures: N/A | | |
| State: SD County | | | Map: N/A | | |
| Township: 19N Range | | | Map: See attached map | sheet | |
| Section: 021, 028 | | 8/15/2012 | MP: 319.83 | to 320.64 | |
| | _ | | | | |
| REASON FOR ROUTE VARIATION (Please incl | lude reason for route varia | ation): | | | |
| The primary reason for this route variation is to s 320.45. | shift CL/Workspaces out o | f and away from pond/we | land feature (MABO-S-03 | 58) located near MP | |
| This proposed reroute is requested by Engineering | ng and is proposed based | d on the recommendations | from the CPMS 60% Des | ian Review as well as | |
| from a combination of aerial imagery, Pictometry | | on the recommendations | s iroin the Or MS 00 /0 Des | igii iteview as well as | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Please describe re | route variation in detail): | | | | |
| The proposed route variation starts near MP 319 | | | | | |
| Then, the reroute turns southeast and continues centerline and extends for ~550 ft. to rejoin the c | · · | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | route variation turns south | iwest towards the | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any add | ditional impacts which ma | y affect cost; crossings, ir | duction bends, etc.): | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2 Tracts are impacted by this centerline reroute: | | | | | |
| 2 Tracts are impacted by this centerline reroute: ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 | 0 (both Doolittle Wagner | Ranch LLC) | | | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 | | , | al costs associated with e | nvironmental survevs will | |
| | ent environmental survey | , | al costs associated with e | nvironmental surveys will | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu | ent environmental surveyourrent location. | ed corridor, so no additior | al costs associated with e | nvironmental surveys will | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre | ent environmental surveyourrent location. | ed corridor, so no additior | al costs associated with e | nvironmental surveys will | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu | ent environmental surveyourrent location. | ed corridor, so no additior | al costs associated with e | nvironmental surveys will | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu | ent environmental surveyourrent location. | ed corridor, so no additior | al costs associated with e | nvironmental surveys will | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu | ent environmental surveyourrent location. | ed corridor, so no additior | al costs associated with e | nvironmental surveys will | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu | ent environmental surveyourrent location. | ed corridor, so no additior | al costs associated with e | nvironmental surveys will | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu | ent environmental surveyourrent location. nation issues at the pond of | ed corridor, so no additior | al costs associated with e | nvironmental surveys will | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam | ent environmental surveyourrent location. nation issues at the pond of | ed corridor, so no additior | | | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam | ent environmental surveyourrent location. nation issues at the pond of | ed corridor, so no additior | | | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of | ed corridor, so no additior | | | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cult yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of | ed corridor, so no additior | | | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cu Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cu If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from Additional length of route realignment: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of | ed corridor, so no addition crossing: ~\$20,000. | Yes | NoX | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of | ed corridor, so no addition crossing: ~\$20,000. | Yes | No X \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional length of wetland construction: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of | ed corridor, so no addition crossing: ~\$20,000. | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of | ed corridor, so no addition crossing: ~\$20,000. | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of side-hill construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of the possings? the route variation) | ed corridor, so no addition crossing: ~\$20,000. | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of the possings? the route variation) | ed corridor, so no addition crossing: ~\$20,000. 22 | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of the pond | ed corridor, so no addition crossing: ~\$20,000. 22 | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam ls there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from Additional length of route realignment: Additional length of wetland construction: Additional bore length (Road, RR): Additional foreign line/pipeline crossings: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of the content | 22 ft. 0 ft133 ft. ft. EA 0 EA 0 EA | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclamate Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from 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, | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of the pond | ed corridor, so no addition crossing: ~\$20,000. 22 | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam list there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from 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, Additional survey required: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of the content | 22 ft. 0 ft133 ft. EA 0 EA 0 EA | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 185,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from 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, Additional survey required: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of the content | 22 ft. 0 ft133 ft. EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 EA | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam ls there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from 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, Additional survey required: Civil Cultural | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of crossings? the route variation) etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10' l: | 22 ft. 0 ft133 ft. ft. EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 mile 0.00 mile | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA \$ 5,000/mile \$ 2,500/mile | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam Is there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from 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, Additional survey required: | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of crossings? the route variation) etc.): 35 - 65' + 10' - 19' Less than 10' l: | 22 ft. 0 ft133 ft. EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 EA | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/EA \$ 77,250/EA \$ 32,500/EA | |
| ML-SD-HA-01770.000 and ML-SD-HA-01780.00 The proposed route variation falls within the curre be incurred. It also does not impact MLV-16A cut Costs savings include the elimination of a reclam ls there an increase/decrease in the number of cut If yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred or saved from 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, Additional survey required: Civil Cultural | ent environmental surveyurrent location. nation issues at the pond of the content | 22 ft. 0 ft133 ft. EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 EA 0 mile 0.00 mile 0.00 mile | \$ 7,800.33 \$ - \$ (25,966.42) \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - | \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft \$ 30,000/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? | 7,7,0,7 | Yes | | No | Х |
| b) Is the affected landowner/tract a possible condemnation? | | Yes | | No | X |
| c) Does proposed route variation impact Tribal Lands? | | Yes | | No | X |
| d) Does proposed route variation impact any Federal/State Land | ls1 | 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 | | No No | X |
| | | 103 | | 140_ | |
| -If yes, name of landowner(s)/track number(s): | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 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: | | | 105 | 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 | Х |
| d) Does route variation affect HDD crossing alignment? | | Yes | | No | Х |
| 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 | Х |
| 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 | | | | |
| | Sandra Damett | Vas | V | No | |
| a) Has the corridor been environmentally surveyed? | | Yes | X | No_ | |
| b) Has the proposed variation been environmentally surveyed? | | Yes | X | 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): | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: | Subtracts | | | | |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): | Subtracte | | | | |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: | Subtracte | | | | |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: | | | | | |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): | | | | . No_ | |
| -If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features: Added (+): Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands | | ed (-): | | _ 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 | | ed (-): | | 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 spill fino, please explain why: | ecific discipline? | ed (-): | | _ 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 | | Yes | | | |
| -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 evaluation of the examined provided for the specified in the examined provided for | ecific discipline? | Yes | | 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 specified in the second of the seco | ecific discipline? | Yes | | | X 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 specified in the second of the seco | ecific discipline? | 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 spel If no, 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? | ecific discipline? Sandra Gigovic | YesYes | X | No_ 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 spel If no, 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? | ecific discipline? Sandra Gigovic | Yes Yes Yes Yes | X | No No 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: | ecific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? | Yes Yes Yes Yes | X | No No 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: STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable) | ecific discipline? Sandra Gigovic | Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes | X | No No No No | X 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 spill 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 spill fino, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable)* a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? | ecific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen | Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes | X | No No No No | X 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 spill fino, 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 spill fino, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL** (if applicable) a) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups. | ecific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen | Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes | X | No No No No No | X X 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 spill 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 spill fino, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable)** a) Does the variation result in any new stakeholders? b) Does the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic secific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? | Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes | X | No No No No | X 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 spill fino, please explain why: **Tengineering / Facilities and Hydraulics** 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 spill fino, please explain why: ***Stakeholder Relations / TCPL** b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups b) Does the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder groups **Tengine** **Tengine | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic secific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? | Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes | X | No No No No No | X X 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 spill 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 spill 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. c) Was the variation proposed to satisfy stakeholder request? | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? e): | Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes | X | No No No No No | X X 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 spill 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 spill fino, 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) | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? e): | YesYesYesYesYesYesYesYes | | No No No No No | X X 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 spill 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 spill 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 spill fino, please explain why: 9 | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? e): | YesYesYesYesYesYesYesYes | X | No | X X 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 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 reguire follow-up with specific stakeholder group of the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder group of the variation require follow-up with specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been examined/provided for this specific stakeholder databased of the variation criteria been exam | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? e): | Yes | X Received by: | No No No No No No | X X X 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 spill 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 spill 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 spill fino, please explain why: 9 | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? e): | Yes | X | No N | X X 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 spill fino, please explain why: **Tengineering** ENGINEERING / 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 spill 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 spill fino, please explain why: **Originator: Engineering Date: 10/29/2012 | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? e): | Yes | X Received by: | No No No No No No | X X X 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 spill fino, please explain why: **Tengineering** ENGINEERING / 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 spill 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 spill fino, please explain why: **Originator: Engineering Date: 10/29/2012 | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? e): | Yes | X Received by: | No N | X X X 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 spill 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 spill 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 spill fino, please explain why: **Originator:** Engineering Date:** Date:** Date:** Date:** Engineering Date:** Date: | secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen sps? e): | Yes | X Received by: Date: | No N | X X X X |

0381-SD-P4-319.8-320.6-I

| KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT ROUTE VARIATION AUTHORIZATION FORM | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Description: The primary reason for this route variation is to shift CL/Workspaces out of and away from pond/wetland feature (MABO-S-0358) located near MP 320.45. | Tracking Number: 0381-SD-P4-319.8-320.6-1 MP: 319.8 to 320.6 Originated By: Engineering Variation Form Attached: Yes X No | | | | |
| TransCanada - Land. Tina Hall. Comments: | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 17 - 5 - 7 2 If Rejected Why? | | | | |
| TransCanada- Engineering Meera Kothari Comments: | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 11 2 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 | | | | |
| ExpEngineering Kevin McGlynn Comments: | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 1-1/12 If Rejected Why? | | | | |
| TransGanada- Environmental Sandra Barnett Comments: | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: Date: Why? | | | | |
| Stantec - Risk Assesment Heldi Tillquist Comments: N/A. | Variation: Approved Réjected Date: If Rejected Why? | | | | |
| Trans-Canada - Facilities Sandra Gigovic Comments: N/A. Does not affect facilities | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: If Rejected Why7 | | | | |
| TransCanada - PM (Montana) Alan Lietz Comments: | Variation: Approvad Rejacted Date: If Rejected Why? | | | | |
| TransCanada - PM (South Dakota) James Odom Comments: | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 12 10 12 If Rejected Why? | | | | |
| TransCanada - PM (Nebrasica) Robert Bradley Comments: | Variation: Approvad Rejected Date: If Rejected Why? | | | | |
| TransCarlada - Area Manager Sieve Marr Comments: | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: If Rejected Why? | | | | |
| Forward to: Tina Hali Sandre Ba Meera Kothari Heldi Tiliqi Kevin MoGlynn Sandra Gi Alan Lletz | uist Robert Bradley | | | | |

0381-SD-P4-319.8-320.6-I

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT

| | AUTHORIZATION FORM | o |
|--|--|--------------------------|
| Dita: 10/29/2012 Description: The primary reason for this route variation is to shift CLIV/forispaces out of and away from | Tracking Number: 0381-SD-P4-319.8-320.8-1 | 381-SI |
| pond/witland feature (MABO-S-0358) located near MP 320.45. | Originaled By: Engineering Variation Form (Alakhed: Yes! X No | D-P4-3 |
| renscander ans | Variation: Approved Rejected | 9.00 |
| Comptal | If Rejected With 1 | 0381-SD-P4-319.8-320.6-I |
| TransGanada-Engineering Heara Kothad | Variation: Approved Rejected | |
| Control | Bata? | |
| Esp Englosering Kawa McChynn | Variation: Approved SRelegions | - |
| Compens | Faire Supplies | |
| Figure Consider Equipmental Section Remove | Variation: Approped Rejected | |
| Common and the second s | Helpale: | 1 |
| STATE STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE STATE OF | Variation: Approved [Rejected] | |
| Conneils IVA | I Pate San | |
| | Variation Approved Rejected Rejected | 0 10 |
| Comments: [VIA. Does not affect facilities | FRededed Why? | 2012 |
| archiconcorrabilition(m) | | |
| Connection | Dine: | Q. |
| | | |
| Terns Ganada - PM (South Dakoia) James Odom Commercia | Variation: Approved Rejected Date: | |
| | | |
| TranaGanada - P.M. (Nebraska) Robert Bradley | | |
| Consists | Bale | |
| LYANGC IDADA - Area Managar Stave Man | Verlator (pproved Relocat) | |
| Conneils | STREAM STREAM | |
| Enverolio Tina Hal Surviva | | |
| Heera Kothan Rica Ta Kelun Mccalynn Sanora C Abot Le | Signoria Sig | |

