				E XL PIPELINE ROUTE VARIAT			
VARIATION TYPE:	Refinement:		Reroute			otprint:	Design:
	Centerline:	Х	Pump Station	n:	Valv	ve Site:	CAR:
	-						
LOCATION:	Ske	_		ttached		ctures: N/A	
State:	SD	County:	Jones	_		d Map: N/A	
Township: Section:	02S 20	Range:	031E Centerline	e: 8/15/201		MP: See attached m	to 524.4
Gection.	20		Centeriin	e. 0/15/201		Wir . 324.13	10 324.4
REASON FOR ROUT	TE VARIATION (Ple	ease includ	le reason for rou	ite variation):			
The primary reason for 524.55. The crossing				0	,	es Waterline (WAT-803	4, 2.5 diameter) near MP
This proposed reroute proposed reroute was						s from the CPMS 60% a.	Design Review. The
DETAIL ROUTE VAR	<u> </u>						
turning northeast to	owards the current (CL. This tu	ırn, allows for a	50°crossing of t	he WRLJ waterl	ine. The proposed rero	is direction for ~669.5 ft. oute continues in this dire
or ~119 ft. Then the	reroute turns south	east and c	ontinues for ~57	'6 ft to rejoin the	current CL nea	r MP 524.4.	
DDITIONAL IMPAC	CTS (Please include	any addition	onal impacts wh	ich may affect c	ost; crossings, i	nduction bends, etc.):	
he proposed route v	ariation falls within	the current	environmental:	surveyed corride	or, so no additio	nal costs associated wit	th environmental surveys
					or, so no additio	nal costs associated wi	th environmental surveys
e incurred. Addition	nally, the bore lengt	h is reduce	ed from 30 ft. to		or, so no additio		
e incurred. Addition	nally, the bore lengt	h is reduce	ed from 30 ft. to		or, so no additio	nal costs associated wi	th environmental surveys
e incurred. Addition	nally, the bore lengt	h is reduce	ed from 30 ft. to		or, so no additio		
e incurred. Addition	nally, the bore length	h is reduce	ed from 30 ft. to	10 ft. crossing.	or, so no additio		
e incurred. Addition the there an increase/d yes, please list:	lecrease in the num	h is reduce	ed from 30 ft. to	10 ft. crossing.	or, so no additio		No <u>X</u>
e incurred. Addition s there an increase/d yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. dditional length of ro	elecrease in the num	h is reduced his r	ed from 30 ft. to	10 ft. crossing.		Yes	No <u>X</u>
e incurred. Addition s there an increase/c yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. dditional length of ro	lecrease in the num sets incurred or saviate realignment: ide-hill construction:	h is reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced from the	ed from 30 ft. to	10 ft. crossing.	ft.	Yes	No X
e incurred. Addition s there an increase/o yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. dditional length of ro dditional length of widditional length of widd	elecrease in the number of the same of the number of the n	h is reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced from the	ed from 30 ft. to	10 ft. crossing.	ft.	Yes\$ 7,140.75	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft
e incurred. Addition to there an increase/o yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. dditional length of ro dditional length of w dditional length of w dditional bore length	lecrease in the num bests incurred or save bute realignment de-hill constructions retland construction (Road, RR):	h is reduced his r	ed from 30 ft. to	10 ft. crossing.	ft. ft.	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ -	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft
e incurred. Addition s there an increase/of yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. dditional length of rounditional length of si dditional length of wood income the standard length of wood income the wood income the standard length of wood income the standard len	decrease in the numbers in the numbers incurred or saving the de-hill constructions retland construction in (Road, RR):	h is reduced his r	ed from 30 ft. to	10 ft. crossing.	ft. ft. ft.	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ - \$ (10,800.00	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft
s there an increase/of yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. additional length of six additional length of wadditional length of wadditional bore length additional foreign lines.	decrease in the numbers in the numbers incurred or saving the de-hill constructions retland construction in (Road, RR):	h is reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced from the control of the control	ed from 30 ft. to	10 ft. crossing.	ft. ft. ft.	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ - \$ (10,800.00	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 540/ft
s there an increase/of yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. additional length of six additional length of wadditional length of wadditional bore length additional foreign lines.	decrease in the numbers in the numbers incurred or saving the de-hill constructions retland construction in (Road, RR):	h is reduced his reduced his reduced from the control of the contr	ed from 30 ft. to sessings? e route variation;	10 ft. crossing.	ft. ft. ft. ft.	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ - \$ (10,800.00	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/ft
s there an increase/of yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. Additional length of si. Additional length of w. Additional length of w. Additional length of w. Additional length of w. Additional foreign lines.	decrease in the numbers in the numbers incurred or saving the de-hill constructions retland construction in (Road, RR):	h is reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced from the control of the control	essings? e route variation; c.):	10 ft. crossing.	ft. ft. ft. ft. EA	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ (10,800.00 \$ -	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/ft \$ 3185,000
s there an increase/of yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. Additional length of ro. Additional length of warditional length of warditional bore length additional foreign line additional water body	lecrease in the num sets incurred or save bute realignment: ide-hill construction retland construction n (Road, RR): by pipeline crossings: or crossing (streams,	h is reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced from the control of the control	ed from 30 ft. to sessings? e route variation; 5 - 65' + 0' - 19'	0 0 0 0	ft. ft. ft. ft. EA	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ (10,800.00 \$ - \$ -	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/ft \$ 30,000/ft \$ 185,000 \$ 77,250/ft
	lecrease in the num sets incurred or save bute realignment: ide-hill construction retland construction n (Road, RR): by pipeline crossings: or crossing (streams,	h is reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced from the control of the control	ed from 30 ft. to sessings? e route variation; 5 - 65' + 0' - 19'	0 0 0 0	ft. ft. ft. ft. EA	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ (10,800.00 \$ - \$ -	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/ft \$ 185,000 \$ 77,250/ft \$ 32,500/ft
s there an increase/of fyes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. Additional length of ro. Additional length of ward additional length of ward additional foreign line Additional water body	lecrease in the num osts incurred or save oute realignment ide-hill construction retland con	h is reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced from the control of the control	ed from 30 ft. to sessings? e route variation; 5 - 65' + 0' - 19'	0 0 0 0 0	ftftftftEAEAEA	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ (10,800.00 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/ft \$ 185,000 \$ 77,250/ft \$ 32,500/ft
s there an increase/of fyes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. Additional length of ro. Additional length of ward additional length of ward additional foreign line Additional water body	decrease in the number of the	h is reduced his reduced his reduced his reduced from the control of the control	ed from 30 ft. to sessings? e route variation; 5 - 65' + 0' - 19'	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	ftftftftftEAEAEAEAEA	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ (10,800.00 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 5	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/ft \$ 32,500/ft \$ 32,500/ft
s there an increase/of yes, please list: COST ANALYSIS (co. additional length of roadditional length of wadditional length of wadditional foreign line additional water body	decrease in the num sets incurred or save bute realignment: ide-hill construction retland co	h is reduced his r	ed from 30 ft. to a sesings? e route variation; 5 - 65' + 0' - 19' ess than 10'	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	ftftftftftEAEAEAmilemilemile	\$ 7,140.75 \$ - \$ - \$ (10,800.00 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	No X 5 \$ 360/ft \$ 19/ft \$ 195/ft \$ 30,000/ft \$ 32,500/ft \$ 32,500/ft \$ 2,500/m

4 LAND / TransCanada	Tina Hall				
a) Is a new landowner affected by the proposed variation?	7,17,0,7,0,1	Yes		No	Х
b) Is the affected landowner/tract a possible condemnation?		Yes		No No	X
c) Does proposed route variation impact Tribal Lands?		Yes		No No	X
d) Does proposed route variation impact any Federal/State Land	ds1	Yes		No 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
		103			
-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:			84	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	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				
	Sanura Dannell	Vee	V	No	
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
., ,		100			
-If yes, name of agency(s):		100			
		100			
-If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features:	Subi				
-If yes, name of agency(s):	Subi	tracted (-):			
-If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features:	Subi				
-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	:	tracted (-):		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	:	tracted (-):		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?	tracted (-):		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:	:	tracted (-):		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?	tracted (-):		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?	tracted (-):			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 evaluation of the examined provided for the specified in the examined provided for	: 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	Yes Yes Yes	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 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	YesYesYesYesYesYesYesYes	X	NoNoNo	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?	YesYesYesYesYesYesYesYes	X	NoNoNo	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	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 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 result in any new stakeholders?	ecific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen	YesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYes	X	No 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 _	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 / 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 aps?	YesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYesYes	X	No 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.	secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen aps?	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 / 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 aps? 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: **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 aps? e):	Yes		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: **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 aps? 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 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 aps? 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: 9	secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen aps? e):	Yes	X	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. b) Does 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: 10/30/2012	secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen aps? 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 specific not 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 specific no, please explain why: **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL (if applicable)** a) Does the variation regulie 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 Originator:** Engineering	secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen aps? e):	Yes	X Received by:	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: **Originator:** Engineering Date:** D	secific discipline? Sandra Gigovic ecific discipline? Bud Andersen aps? e):	Yes	X Received by: Date:	No	X X X X

0383-SD-P4-524.1-524.4-I

	NE XL PIPELINE PROJECT ATION AUTHORIZATION FORM
Date: 10/30/2012 The primary reason for this routs variation is to implicate crossing of the Wear River Lyman Jones Wate (WAT-9034, 25 diameter) near MP 924.5.5 the changle of the pipeline at the waterline is improved fr	rtine cossing
TransCanada - Land Tin	Wariation Approved Rejected Approved Rejected The Control of the
Trans-Canada-Engineering Meera K Comments:	Other Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 12 If Rejected Why?
Exp - Engineering Kevin McComments:	Glynn Variation: Approved Rejected ### Date: /2/17/12 If Rejected Why?
TransCanada-Environmental Sandra B	armett Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 13.7.77 If Rejected Why?
Stantec - Riek Assesment Heidi Till Comments: N/A.	Variation: Approved Rejected Data
TransGanada - Facilities Sandra Gl Comments: N/A. Does not affect facilities	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: If Rejected Why?
TransCanada - PM (Montana)	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: If Rejected Why?
TransGanada - PM (South Dakota) James Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected Compared Rejected Rej
TransCanada - PM (Nebraska) Robert Bri Comments:	Variation: Approved Rejected Date: If Rejected Why?
TransCanada - Area Manader Steve Comments:	Marr Variation: Approved Rejected Date:
Meera Kothan He Kevin McGlynn Sa	ndra Barnett James Odom ildi Tiliquiat Robert Bradley ndra Gigovio Steve Marr

0383-SD-P4-524.1-524.4-I

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT

Date Description 1000/0712 Transfer Number 1000/0712 Tra		KEYATONE X. ROUTE VARIATION	AUTHORIZATION FORM	
Table State - Palitation - Sanda Barrier Colons - Variation - Approved - Pagestal - Pag		The primary reason for this route variation is to improve the crossing of the West River Lyman Jones Waterline	The state of the s	383-SD
Table State - Palitation - Sanda Barrier Colons - Variation - Approved - Pagestal - Pag		single of the pipeline at the waterline is improved from 10°	The proof of the p	-P4-52
Table State - Palitation - Sanda Barrier Colons - Variation - Approved - Pagestal - Pag	The second second second second	The second secon	Data's	4.1-524
Exp. Scholastifie				4
Exe_PANISATION Panish Pan	Company of the Party of the Par		Date:	
Comments: Section Server Present Presen				
TransCabada - Endromental Sandra Barret Volfation - Approved : Rejected : Rej			Esile.	
Strints - RUM Abbatison Transcansia - Facilities Sapera cipos- Variation - Approved Transcansia - Facilities Sapera cipos- Variation - Approved Transcansia - Facilities Sapera cipos- Variation - Approved Transcansia - PA Registration Transc	YransCanad	la-Environmental Sandre Barrett		
Stantes - Risk Assaureni Plead Tiliquis Vadjalion: Approved Date Variation: Approved Date Variation: Approved Date Variation: Approved Date Date Date Date Date Date Date Date			Date: Trans.	
Transcended Facilities Subserved Verificion Approved Rejected Commerce IVA Does not effect faceties Transcended PM (Nontane) Alert Det. Verificion Approved Rejected Transcended PM (Nontane) Alert Det. Verificion Approved Rejected Transcended PM (Nontane) Transcended PM	(Sianida: Rij	Most in 1917 in 1917 in 1917	The state of the s	
Transcender - Parl Montane Capital Capital	Comments	N/A.	I Freeded	gan
Transcanada - PM (Rontana) Alan Line: Variation: Approved Rejected Comments: Frequency Part Part Frequency Frequency Part Frequency Fre	ក្រាស់ ក្រាស់			2012
Commonis: Firefected Mary	Comments	N/A. Does not affect factities		
Iffericated		a PM (Montana) Alan Leiz		
Transcanada P.M.(South Dakota) James Colom Variation Approved Refered Bitility Balance Bitility Balance Balance Bitility Balance Bitility Balance Bitility Balance Balance			reakaca	
BRejected Mby				
TransCenside - PM (Nebraske) Robert Bradey Commerts Interest Bate It Rejected It Rejected Why a TransCenside - Area Manager Slave Man: Validition: Approved: Rejected Why a TransCenside - Area Manager Slave Man: Validition: Approved: Rejected It Rejected It Rejected It Rejected It Rejected It Rejected It Rejected Why a TransCenside - Area Manager Rejected TransCenside - Area Manager Why a TransCenside - Area Manager TransCenside - Area Manager Why a TransCenside - Area Manager TransCenside - Area Manager Why a TransCenside - Area Manager TransCenside - Area Manage			it Rejected	
Trail(Canada: Area Managa: Slave Mar. Valiation: Approved Roseted) Connochia: Date: Date: United Roseted Ro			Variation: Approved Coested	
Transcanada: Ares Manager: Slave Man Variation: Approved : Rejected! Connection: Date: If Rejected: Why? If Rejected: Why? Covered to: Unit Hal Sendra Barnes: James Oddin Machalland: Robert Bradley: Robert Bradley: Sendra Clarotic Stave Man.				
If Belecker Whys Kovend to: Une Hall Sandra Barrier Jaines-Oddin Maera Kothar Hall Tilinast Robert Bradley Kesin (Acatyrin) Sandra Gragorid Staye Hart			Validio Appared Incipality	
Megra Kishari Rebii Tiliquisi Robert Bradley Kevin McOlynn Sandra Olgovici Steve May:				
		Meera Kohari Plebil II Kevin McShrin Sandra	quist Robert Bradley 190V6 Store Usin	

