KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT PIPELINE ROUTE VARIATION FORM								
1 VARIATION TYPE: Refinement	:	Reroute:	Х	Footprint		Design:		
		_				_		
Centerline 2	1	Pump Station:		Valve Site:		CAR:		
LOCATION:	Sketch:	Attac	hed	Pictures	N/A			
State: SD	County:	Butte/Perkins		Quad Map	N/A			
Township: 014N	Range:	(009E), 010E		Aerial Map	See attached map	sheet		
Section: (13), 18		Centerline:	11/18/2012	MP:	362.03	to	362.59	
3								
REASON FOR ROUTE VARIATION (Please include reason for route variation):								
The primary reason for this route variation is to avoid impacting eligible prehistoric cultural site (SN # 39PE0481 or C710PE001) by shifting the								
CL/workspaces southwest, thus avoiding the need for treatment/mitigation.								
This reroute is requested by Enviro	nmental and ha	s been verified by fi	eld reconnaissan	ce (civil survey).				
DETAIL ROUTE VARIATION (Plea	se describe rou	te variation in detail	1):					
The proposed route variation begin								
continuing for 446 ft. The proposed an ~1,872 ft. stretch that reconnect			nen snins easten	ly and continues if	i this direction for ~	oos II. Deloie	rounding into	
2 Tracts impacted: ML-SD-BU-00120.000 (Dennis Hat	haway)							
ML-SD-PE-00010.000 (Dee Wilcox								
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS / Places in	aluda anu additi	ional impacts which	may affact acet	arancings industic	n handa ata \			
ADDITIONAL IMPACTS (Please include any additional impacts which may affect cost; crossings, induction bends, etc.):								
Additional costs are associated with environmental survey. Additionally, this proposed RV will impact CAR-234 (to be extended towards new proposed CL).								
Miscellaneous cost savings include \$250,000	Miscellaneous cost savings include: Treatment/mitigation (includes: Mitigation plan and approval by agencies, field work and report, etc) ~\$200,000-							
The reroute increases pipe length I	y 114 ft.							
Is there an increase/decrease in th	e number of cro	ssinas?		Yes		No	X	
If yes, please list:								
yee, please liet.								
COST ANALYSIS (costs incurred of	or saved from th	e route variation)						
Additional length of route realignme		,	114	ft.	\$ 40,913.57	\$	360/ft	
Additional length of side-hill constru				ft.	\$ -		19/ft	
Additional length of wetland constru		_		ft.	\$ -		195/ft	
Additional bore length (Road, RR):		_		ft.	\$ -		540/ft	
Additional foreign line/pipeline cros	einae:	_		EA	\$ -		30,000/EA	
Additional water body crossing (str	-	c ).			<u> </u>	Ψ	30,000/LA	
Additional water body crossing (str		85 - 65' +		EA	\$ -	¢	185,000/EA	
		=						
		10' - 19'		EA	Ψ		77,250/EA	
	L	ess than 10'		EA	\$ -	\$	32,500/EA	
Additional survey required:								
	Civil:		0.00	mile	\$ -		5,000/mile	
	Cultural:		0.48	mile	\$ 1,205.63		2,500/mile	
	Biological:		0.48	mile	\$ 1,350.30	\$	2,800/mile	
Miscellaneous costs saved or adde	d due to route v	rariation from ADDIA	TIONAL IMPACT	S listed above:		\$	(250,000)	
Overall estimated costs of the route		ranation from ADDIT			(See "Additiona		(250,000)	
Overall estilliated costs of the fout	variauUII.		U U	1200.030.50	<b>MUSEE AUGILIONA</b>	i iiiiibacts ab	UVE	

4 LAND / TransCanada	Tina Hall				
a) Is a new landowner affected by the proposed variation?	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	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 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	Х	No	
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:			301	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		No	X
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				
	Sandra Daniell	Ves	V	No	
a) Has the corridor been environmentally surveyed?		Yes	X	No_	
b) Has the proposed variation been environmentally surveyed?		Yes		No_	X
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	X	No	
f) Mae realignment proposed to eatisfy agency request?				No	X
f) Was realignment proposed to satisfy agency request?		Yes		_	
-If yes, name of agency(s):		165			
		165			
-If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features:	Subtra				
-If yes, name of agency(s):	Subtra	acted (-):		· · · · ·	
-If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features:	Subtra			-	
-If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features:				-	
-If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features:  Added (+):			X	No	
-If yes, name of agency(s): g) Environmental features:  Added (+):  Wetland ID # for newly impacted wetlands		acted (-):	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 spe		acted (-):	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:	cific discipline?	acted (-):	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		acted (-):	X	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 example of the second of the sec	cific discipline?	acted (-): Yes 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	cific discipline?	acted (-):	X	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:  FENGINEERING / 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	acted (-): Yes 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 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?	ecific discipline?  Sandra Gigovic	YesYesYes		NoNo	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:  FENGINEERING / 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	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?	Yes Yes Yes Yes	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:  **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 spell fino, please explain why:  **Stakeholder Relations / TCPL (if applicable)**	ecific discipline?  Sandra Gigovic	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	X	NoNoNoNo	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:  **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 spell 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 Yes	X	NoNoNoNo	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 spe If no, please explain why:  **PRISTAND 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 spe If no, 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 Yes Yes	X	No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_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 spe If no, please explain why:  **PRINTERING / 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 spe If no, 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  secific discipline?  Bud Andersen  sps?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	X	NoNoNoNo	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 spe If no, 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 spe If no, 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  ps?  e):	Yes	X	NoNoNoNoNo	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 spe If no, please explain why:  **PRINTERING / 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 spe If no, 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  ps?  e):	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	X	No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_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 spe If no, 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 spe If no, 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  ps?  e):	Yes	X	NoNoNoNoNo	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 front please explain why:  FENGINEERING / 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 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 specific no, please explain why:	secific discipline?  Sandra Gigovic  ecific discipline?  Bud Andersen  ps?  e):	Yes	X	NoNoNoNoNo	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 for this specific provided for this provided for this specific provided for this provid	secific discipline?  Sandra Gigovic  ecific discipline?  Bud Andersen  ps?  e):	Yes	X X Received by:	NoNoNoNoNo	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 front please explain why:  FENGINEERING / 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 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 specific no, please explain why:	secific discipline?  Sandra Gigovic  ecific discipline?  Bud Andersen  ps?  e):	Yes	X	No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_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 for this specific provided for this provided for this specific provided for this provid	secific discipline?  Sandra Gigovic  ecific discipline?  Bud Andersen  ps?  e):	Yes	X X Received by:	NoNoNoNoNo	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 from the provided from the provided for this specific from the provided from t	secific discipline?  Sandra Gigovic  ecific discipline?  Bud Andersen  ps?  e):	Yes	X X Received by:	No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_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 spe If no, please explain why:  **PRINTERING / FACILITIES AND HYDRAULICS**  BY 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 spe If no, please explain why:  **STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS / TCPL** 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 databased) Has all the evaluation criteria been examined/provided for this specific no, please explain why:  **Originator:**  Date:**  T/10/2013	secific discipline?  Sandra Gigovic  ecific discipline?  Bud Andersen  ps?  e):	Yes	X X  X  Received by: Date:	No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_No_N	x x x x

0514-SD-P4-362.0-362.6-S

## KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT

	ROUTE VARIATION	AUTHORIZATION FORM
Date:	7/10/2013	Tracking Number: 0514-SD-P4-362.0-362.6-S
Description:	The primary reason for this route variation is to avoid impacting eligible prehistoric cultural site (SN # 39PE0481	MP: 362.0 to 362.6
	or C710PE001) by shifting the CL/workspaces southwest, thus avoiding the need for treatment/mitigation.	Originated By: Environmental
		Variation Form Attached: Yes X No
TransCanad	a - Land Tina Hall	Variation: Approved Rejected
Comments:		1-100 Date: 8-21-13
		If Rejected
		Why?
Trans Canad	a- Engineering Meera Kothari	Variation: ApprovedRejected
Comments:		Date:
		If Rejected Why?
		Winy I
Exp - Engine	sering Kevin McGlynn	Variation: pproved Rejected
Comments:		Date: 8-2/-13
		if Rejected
		Why?
		SHOT SHOW THE SHOP THE BOOK SHOWS
TransCanad	a - Environmental Sandra Barnett	Variation: Approved Rejected
Comments:		Ewm Date: 8/21/13
		If Rejected Pending Survey
D1	I to the second of the second	No. of the Control of
Comments:	sk Assesment Heidl Tillquist	Variation: Approved Rejected Date:
Comments.		If Rejected
		Why?
Trans Canad	a - Facilities Sandra Gigovic	Variation: Approved Rejected
	a-radinas	
Comments:	]	Date:
		If Rejected
		Why?
TransCanad	a - PM (Montana) Alan Lietz	Variation: Approved Rejected
Comments:		Date:
Comments.		If Rejected
		Why?
TransCanad	a - PM (South Dakota) James Odom	Variation: Approved X Rejected
	a - PM (South Dakota) James Odom	01101
Comments:		Date: 21-Aug-13
		If Rejected Why?
	a - PM (Nebraska) Robert Bradley	Variation: Approved Rejected
Comments:	l l	Date:
		If Rejected Why?
TransCanad	a - Area Manager Steve Marr	Variation: ApprovedRejected
Comments:		Date:
		If Rejected Why?
		vily i
		A Control of the Cont
Forward to:	Tina Hall Sandra Bi Meera Kothari Heidi Tillq	
	Kevin McGlynn Sandra G Alan Lietz	igovic Steve Marr
	Alan Lietz	

0514-SD-P4-362.0-362.6-S

