KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT PIPELINE ROUTE VARIATION FORM							
VARIATION TYPE:	Refinement:		Reroute:	х	Footprin	t:	Design:
	Centerline:	x	Pump Station:		Valve Site		CAR:
2	Ceriterinic.	_	r unip otation.		Valve one		OAK.
LOCATION:	Ske	etch:	Attacl	ned	Pictures	s: <u>N/A</u>	
State:	SD	County:	Meade		Quad Map		
Township:	011N	Range:	012E, (013E)			See attached ma	
Section:	012, (07)		Centerline:	6/11/2013	MF	P: 387.02	to <u>387.67</u>
3 REASON FOR ROUTE	VARIATION (P	lease includ	de reason for route v	ariation):			
The primary reason for t verified by civil survey.	this CL reroute is	s to shift CL	away from drainage	e channel per 90%	% alignment shee	et review. This CL	reroute has been field
This reroute is requested by Engineering.							
DETAIL ROUTE VARIA	ATION (Please d	lescribe rou	te variation in detail)	:			
The proposed reroute be southeasterly for ~1,589	-				It extends for ~	1,855 ft in this dire	ection before turning
Tracts Impacted: ML-SD-ME-00240.000 (Lyle D. Weiss, et ux) ML-SD-ME-00260.000 (Lyle D. Weiss, et ux)							
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):							
The proposed route vari	iation falls within	the current	t environmental surv	eyed corridor, so	no additional cos	sts associated with	surveys will be incurred.
Is there an increase/dec	rease in the nur	mber of cros	ssings?		Ye	s	No X
If yes, please list:							
COST ANALYSIS (cost	s incurred or say	ved from th	e route variation)				
Additional length of route	-		_	14	ft.	\$ 4,907.62	\$ 360/ft
Additional length of side			_		ft.	\$ -	_ \$ 19/ft
Additional length of wetle		n:	_	-356	ft.	\$ (69,420.00)	=
Additional bore length (F			_		ft.	\$ -	\$ 540/ft
Additional foreign line/pi			_		EA	\$ -	\$ 30,000/EA
Additional water body cr	ossing (streams						
			35 - 65' +	0	_EA	\$ -	\$ 185,000/EA
			10' - 19'	0	EA	\$ -	\$ 77,250/EA
		ı	_ess than 10'	0	EA	\$ -	_ \$ 32,500/EA
Additional survey require	ed:						
		Civil:	_	0.00	mile	\$ -	\$ 5,000/mile
		Cultural:	-	0.00	mile	\$ -	\$ 2,500/mile
		Biological:		0.00	mile	\$ -	\$ 2,800/mile
Miscellaneous costs sav	ved or added du	e to route v	ariation from ADDIT	IONAL IMPACTS	S listed above:	_	
Overall estimated costs	of the route vari	iation:	3	5	(64,512.38	(See "Addition	al Impacts" above)

4 LAND / TransCanada	Tina Hall		
	Tina Hall Yes		No X
a) Is a new landowner affected by the proposed variation?			
b) Is the affected landowner/tract a possible condemnation?	Yes		. No X
c) Does proposed route variation impact Tribal Lands?	Yes		NoX
d) Does proposed route variation impact any Federal/State Land	s? Yes		No X
-If yes, name type (i.e. USFWS, BLM, etc.):			
e) Is proposed realignment outside the easement/workspace?	Yes	X	No
f) Is realignment proposed to satisfy landowner request?	Yes		No X
-If yes, name of landowner(s)/track number(s):			
-ii yes, name of landowner(s), track number(s).			
g) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe	cific discipline? Yes	X	. No
If no, please explain why:			
5 ENGINEERING/CONSTRUCTION - TransCanada	Meera Kothari		
a) Maximum deviation perpendicular to proposed alignment:		152	ft
	MDEO Carridara		
b) Does variation (CL) (including workspaces) falls within 500 ft.			. 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	cific discipline? Yes	X	No 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	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):			
g) Environmental features:			
Added (+):	Subtracted (-):		
Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands:	<u></u>		
		V	N-
h) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe	cific discipline? Yes	X	. No
If no, please explain why:			
7 FNOINTEENING (FACILITIES AND INVESTIGATION	Occupies Oisses		
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	cific discipline? Yes	X	No 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 group			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 database	e):		
d) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this spe	cific discipline? Yes	X	No
If no, please explain why:			
9		10	
Originator: Engineering		Received by:	
Date: 8/8/2013		Date:	8/8/2013
			Fax to: ?
11		12	
Assigned Tracking Number: 0491-SD-P4-387.0-387.7-S		Filed by:	
		Date:	

0491-SD-P4-387.0-387.7-S

## KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT ROUTE VARIATION AUTHORIZATION FORM						
Description: The primary reason for this CL reroul CL away from drainage channel per i alignment sheet review. This CL rero field verified by civil survey.	Tracking Number: 0491-SD-P4-387 0-387.7-S tile is to shift 90% oute has been  Variation Form Attached: Yes X No					
ransCanada - Land Comments.	Tracking Number: 0491-SD-P4-387 0-387.7-S tie is to shift 90% oute has been Originated By: Engineering Ovariation Form Attached: Yes X No  Tina Hall Variation: Approved Rejected Why?					
ransCanada- Engineering M Comments:	Wanation: Approved Rejected  If Rejected Why?					
xp - Engineering Ke comments:	evin McGlynn Variation: Approved Rejected Date: 8-25-13 If Rejected Why?					
ransCanada- Environmental Sa omments	Indra Barnett Variation: Approved Rejected    Rejected					
lantec - Risk Assesment b omments:	redif Tiliquist Variation: Approved Rejected Date:  If:Rejected Why?					
ransCanada - Facilities Sar onments:	ndra Gigovic Variation: Approved Rejected  Date:  If Rejected Why?					
ansCanada - PM (Montana) omments:	Atan Lietz Variation: Approved Rejected  Date:  If Rejected Why?					
ans Canada - PM (South Dakota) J.	rames Odom Variation: Approved X Rejected  Date: 70-4s-13  Why?					
ansCansda - PM (Nebraska) Ro	obert Bradley Variation: Approved Rejected  Date:  If Rejected Why?					
ans Canada - Area Manager rinnents:	Steve Marr Variation: Approved Rejected Date:					
orward to: Tiria Hall Meera Kotbari	Sandra Barnett James Odom Heidi Tiliquist Robert Bradley Sahdra Olgoric Siève Marr					

Document Control Number: KXL10-00006-01-AA-180 (Form 2)

