



13710 FNB Parkway, Suite 300
Omaha, NE 68154-5200

July 25, 2013

North Dakota Public Service Commission (ND PSC)
(Sent via email PDF letter)



Re: TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, Fort Ransom Pump Station
11948 – 58th St., Ransom County N.D.
Noise Issue Update, July, 2013

Dear Commissioners:

This communication is intended as a follow-up to our April 5, 2013 correspondence summarizing our recent actions and status of same to address noise issues at the Fort Ransom Pumping Station (Station).

As was shared in our past correspondence TransCanada developed a plan to plant trees outside the fenced perimeter (on 3 sides) of our Station. This request for tree planting was based on the initial general feedback from neighboring residents and acted on by TransCanada as a good neighbor gesture. The work scope and status for tree planting is noted below:

- 1) Acquire additional easement area (from existing landowner D. Anderson) outside of the Station property boundary to allow for tree planting. (Tree planting on north side of station was not completed to respect power line easement setbacks and future growth of trees)
 - a) Complete
- 2) Develop options to source trees and contractor to plant trees
 - a) Complete
- 3) Execute and complete tree planting
 - a) Completed as of mid-July (approximately 105, 6 foot mature spruce trees planted in 2 rows as shown in pictures Exhibit A attached)

Additionally, we have conducted an internal review with input from an external acoustical consultant with the objective to seek reasonable, practical solutions that make a measureable difference in the sound levels from the Station. This review looked at a wide range of available options and involved understanding the benefits, drawbacks, complexity, effectiveness and timing of actions considered. This review was balanced with the knowledge that we are operating this station below and therefore in compliance with, the permitted criteria for pump station noise.

Input from past formal noise surveys at nearby residences and the Station (2011 and 2012) and feedback from residents over the past several months who provided times and dates of noise events was also factored into our review.

Mitigation Options Reviewed (Ranked in Order of Magnitude and Complexity)

Option	Benefit(s)	Drawbacks
<p><u>Pump and Unit Enclosures</u> (Engineered for site operational access to equipment and meeting all applicable code requirements)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces pump unit (motor) noise at source 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational access restrictions (unit change outs, etc.) and increased operational issues (heat, ventilation, offset required for code requirements, etc.) • Would not reduce any other noise from valve or piping • Option involves significant engineering and operational consideration and will require detailed design • Approximate 6 to 12 month completion time from approval to installation.
<p><u>Acoustical Barrier Walls</u> (Noise reduction materials around pump units and Station perimeter in key locations)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigates noise near the source • Acoustical modeling has shown a small reduction at nearest residences • Known technology used at other sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational access issues requiring removal of barriers in some circumstances • Drifting snow around units could be an issue • May not completely eliminate reported noise issues • Approximate 4 – 5 month completion time from approval to installation
<p><u>Earth Berms Around Site</u> (Placed between pump units – noise sources and residences on Station property)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pump station would not be visible • Can act to absorb noise if close enough to noise source • Approach has been used at one other site (placed during site construction on one side) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Berms need to be same height as pump units (10' to 30' high) • Would require bringing in significant amounts of material • Large footprint of berms could be an issue in layout placement • Will not completely eliminate noise • Maintaining berms could pose issues long term (erosion, weeds, etc.) • Costs will vary as to sourcing earth for berm, design, contractor costs and additional lands possibly needed for berms • Summer fall construction period with completion taking 2 – 3 months from time of approval

Option	Benefit(s)	Drawbacks
<p><u>Station Pressure Control Valve (PCV) Change Out</u> (Existing PVC Valve replaced with larger and heavier valve with possible enclosure for same - throttles Station pressure for flow control and unit operation)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known equipment change that is now in process (on order and being scheduled) • Existing valve and operation of same is known noise source • Both feedback from residences (documented dates and times) and near source testing have suggested this is a predominant noise source • Noise reduction could be gained with newer, heavier and physically larger valve combined with enclosure • Another similar station pressure control will be changed out at end of July at a different site and results of same with newer valve will be known this fall • Replacement valve now on order and tentative station outage scheduled for 2014 installation of same. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Might not reduce any pump unit noise • Requires Station outage and will not be installed until Q1 or Q2 2014

TransCanada also reviewed several other options for mitigation including:

- Active Noise Cancellation Technology
- Privacy Fencing with Screening (installation of a high perimeter fence with heavy gage slates for privacy)

Both of these options above were viewed to not have any value in noise reduction for the investment made and were not seriously analyzed.

At this time TransCanada's Senior Management are engaged in reviewing all of the above possible viable options with decision making expected by mid to late September. The additional time will be used to understand the benefits of installing and operation of the new Station Pressure Control Valve (PCV) at another similar site and factor those results into our final decision making.

We will continue to communicate formally with neighbors and nearby agencies in the same fashion as we have previously, at key milestones of this review in seeking possible solution(s).

TransCanada understands that the nature of our station operations has affected some in the community and also has led to comments in the media regarding the same. We stand by our commitment to seek reasonable and practical solutions that make a measurable difference in sound levels from the station.

We welcome any new evidence or feedback concerned with any aspect of our Station operation and seeking a reasonable resolution to this matter with all parties involved.

Sincerely,

Robert Latimer

Robert S. Latimer
Community Outreach Specialist
TransCanada
Ph. 402-492-7454 (office)
Ph. 402-332-8122 (cell)
Email: rob_latimer@transcanada.com
Web: www.transcanada.com

c.c.

Virgil Pfennig – Glacial Lakes Area Manager, TransCanada Great Plains Region

Area Property Owners / Agencies noted below (hard copies mailed 040813):

- B. Pantzke (neighboring landowner)
- W. Kiebke (neighboring landowner)
- L Hanson (past Township Supervisor)
- K. Bishop (neighboring landowner)
- M. Hammer (neighboring landowner / tenant of land where Station is located)
- D. Anderson (property owner of land where Station is located)
- T. & L. Hanson (neighboring landowners)
- B. Keopplin (Chairperson, Sheyenne River Valley)
- J. Kwapinski (Park Ranger, Fort Ransom State Park)

Attachment (Exhibit A)