



November 5, 2014

Mr. Jerry Lein
Public Utility Analyst
ND Public Service Commission
600 East Boulevard Avenue, Dept. 408
Bismarck, ND 58505-0480

Dear Mr. Lein:

Carlson McCain has completed the post-construction inspection report for the Hess Corporation Tioga NGL Pipeline Project - Williams County, North Dakota (Case No. PU-11-104). It appears the Project has been constructed in accordance with the ND Public Service Commission (PSC) Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order for the Project.

Please contact me at 701-595-7003 if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ryan Krapp", written in a cursive style.

Ryan Krapp
Natural Resource Specialist

Attachment

Cc:
Mr. Dale Weatherby - Hess Corp Regulatory Advisor
Ms. Vicky Sund - Hess Corp Regulatory

POST-CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION REPORT

Hess Corporation
Tioga NGL Pipeline Project
Williams County, North Dakota

*PSC Case No. PU-11-104
Carlson McCain Project #4287*

Prepared for:

North Dakota Public Service Commission
600 East Boulevard Avenue, Dept. 408
Bismarck, ND 58505-0408

November 5, 2014



600 S. 2nd Street, Suite 105
Bismarck, ND 58504
Tel 701-255-1475
Fax 701-255-1477
www.carlsonmccain.com

ENVIRONMENTAL • ENGINEERING • LAND SURVEYING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
BACKGROUND	2
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Purpose and Scope of Inspection	2
PROJECT REVIEW	3
2.1 Methods	3
2.2 Orders	3
2.3 Certification Relating to Order Provisions – Energy Conversion Facility Siting	4
CONCLUSION	15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

North Dakota Public Service Commission (Commission) approved the application for a certificate of corridor compatibility and for a route permit to the Hess Corporation (Hess) to construct three natural gas liquid (NGL) pipelines. The Project includes two six-inch pipelines and one eight-inch pipeline, from the Hess Tioga Gas Plant (TGP), to the Hess Tioga Rail Terminal (TRT). The pipelines will cross approximately 3.6 miles and have a capacity of approximately 63,000 barrels per day; however, the anticipated average deliveries will be approximately 31,500 barrels per day at this time. The proposed route was selected to construct the pipelines between two fixed assets and within existing corridors to the extent possible. The Project is located in Williams County, North Dakota, originating at the TGP located approximately 1-mile east of Tioga North Dakota, and terminating at the TRT located approximately 1-mile southwest of Tioga.

The Project is under the jurisdiction of the Commission, which issued its Finding of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Order of the Commission in Case No. PU- 11-104 dated July 16, 2012, granting a Certificate of Corridor Compatibility No. 138 to Hess Corporation, designating a corridor for the Project. The Project construction was reported as complete and operational on August 1, 2014, with final right-of-way (ROW) reclamation activities in August of 2014.

The Commission retained Carlson McCain, Inc. (Carlson McCain) to complete construction inspections applying engineering and science principles for the purpose of ensuring that the Project has been constructed in compliance with the North Dakota Century Code (NDCC) 49-22 siting laws, North Dakota Administrative Code (NDAC) Article 69-09 regulations, and applicable Commission orders. The Project construction inspection was on September 25, 2013 and the post-construction inspection was completed on October 6, 2014.

Overall, the Project is constructed as designed with minimal impacts to the surrounding natural and human environment. Following review of the Commission case docket and multiple site inspections, Carlson McCain has found the Hess Tioga NGL Pipeline Project (Case No. PU-11-104) has been constructed in compliance with the siting laws (NDCC 49-22) and rules (NDAC 69-09) and applicable Commission orders.

BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

The Commission approved the application for a certificate of corridor compatibility and for a route permit to the Hess) to construct three NGL pipelines. The Project includes two six-inch pipelines and one eight-inch pipeline, from the Hess TGP to the Hess TRT. The pipelines will cross approximately 3.6 miles and have a capacity of approximately 63,000 barrels per day; however, the anticipated average deliveries will be approximately 31,500 barrels per day, at this time. The proposed route was selected to construct the pipelines between two fixed assets and within existing corridors to the extent possible. The Project is located in Williams County, North Dakota, originating at the TGP located approximately 1-mile east of Tioga North Dakota, and terminating at the TRT located approximately 1-mile southwest of Tioga.

The Project is under the jurisdiction of the Commission, which issued its Finding of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Order of the Commission in Case No. PU-11-104 dated July 16, 2012, granting a Certificate of Corridor Compatibility No. 138 to Hess Corporation, designating a corridor for the Project. The Project construction was reported as complete and operational on August 1, 2014, with final ROW reclamation activities in August of 2014.

1.2 Purpose and Scope of Inspection

The North Dakota Energy Conversion and Transmission Facility Act (NDCC 49-22) authorizes the Commission to determine that the location, construction, and operation of jurisdictional energy conversion and transmission facilities would produce minimal adverse effects on the environment and the welfare of citizens of North Dakota. Construction inspections ensure the project is constructed in compliance with the siting laws and rules and the Commission's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order (Order).

The Commission retained Carson McCain to complete construction inspections of the Project. The inspection process included a review of the Siting Plan, Order, and other applicable documents to determine Project-specific siting and construction requirements. The review was followed by multiple site visits and inspections of facilities, documentation of compliance, and written findings. These findings include, but are not limited to, documentation of site visit(s) observations, documentation of compliance deficiencies, and a summary of issues that should be addressed for the Project to be considered complete and compliant with the Order.

PROJECT REVIEW

2.1 Methods

Carlson McCain reviewed North Dakota siting laws and rules, the Applications for the Certificate of Corridor Compatibility and Route Permit (Application), and the Order for the Project to identify Project-specific documentation that would be required for compliance. Carlson McCain then reviewed Project documents in the Commission Online Case Search to identify those siting laws and rules and Application and Order assertions that had written verification, those that still required documentation, and those that required physical site verification.

Carlson McCain Inspector Ryan Krapp visited the project site on September 25, 2013, with Mr. Antoine Wright (Safety Advisor at Hess), and again October 6, 2014, with Ms. Victoria Siemieniewski, (Regulatory Analyst at Hess), to inspect project construction and reclamation results.

2.2 Orders

Components of the Project that were asserted in the Application and Order and could be documented during the post-construction inspection to verify compliance with siting laws, rules and the Order for the Project, by either written documentation or physical site verification were ordered by the Commission.

On April 28, 2012, the Commission ordered:

1. The Hearing Officer's July 16, 2012 recommended Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Recommended Order.
2. Hess Corporation's application for a waiver of procedures and time schedules is granted.
3. Certificate of Corridor Compatibility No. 138 is issued to Hess Corporation, designating a corridor for its proposed pipeline project.
4. Route Permit No. 149, 150 and 151 is issued to Hess Corporation, granting authority to construct, operate, and maintain its 3 collocated natural gas liquids pipelines.
5. The April 28, 2012, Certification Relating to Order Provisions-Energy Conversion Facility Siting, with accompanying Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications is incorporated by reference and attached to this Order.
6. To the extent there are any conflicts or inconsistencies between Hess Corporation application and the April 28, 2012, Certification, the Certification provisions control.

2.3 Certification Relating to Order Provisions – Energy Conversion Facility Siting

The Commission issued the Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 138 and Route Permit Certificate Number 149, 150, and 151 on July 17, 2012 and Mr. Richard Fessler (Project Manager at Hess Corporation (Company) with received authority to bind the Company (Hess) to requirements to be set forth by the Commission in its Order and by signature on April 28, 2012 certified the following:

- 1. Company understands and agrees that the Certificate of Site Compatibility will be issued by the Commission subject to the conditions and criteria set forth in NDCC Chapter 49-22 and NDAC Chapter 69-06-08e, and that Company shall be responsible for compliance with this order and conditions and criteria set forth in the applicable laws and rules.**

Docket #24 and #30 – Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, Commission Motion of Adoption. No issues of blatant non-compliance with this order and conditions and criteria set forth in the applicable laws and rules have been found during the post-construction inspection.

Order #1 is considered satisfied.

- 2. Company agrees to hold a preconstruction conference prior to commencement of any construction, which must include a Company representative, its construction supervisor, and a representative of Commission Staff, to ensure that Company fully understands the conditions set forth in the Commission's order.**

Docket #41 – Prehearing Conference Minutes and Docket #42 Email notice of Intent to Start Construction.

Order #2 is considered satisfied.

- 3. Company agrees to comply with the rules and regulations of all other agencies having jurisdiction over any phase of the transmission facility including all city, township, and county zoning regulations.**

Docket #5 and #30 – Covered in Application for waiver of procedures and time schedules and for a corridor certificate and route permit (Docket #5). Commission adoption of Hearings Officer's recommended Order (Docket #30).

Order #3 is considered satisfied.

- 4. Company understands and agrees that it shall obtain all other necessary licenses and permits, and shall provide copies of all licenses and permits to the Commission prior to construction activity associated with the energy conversion facility that requires said license or permit.**

Docket #44 – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and assurance of compliance with Permit No. NDR10-0000, Authorization to discharge water under the ND Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NDPDES). No issues of blatant non-compliance with this order and conditions and criteria set forth in the applicable laws and rules have been found during the post-construction inspection.

Order #4 is considered satisfied.

- 5. Company agrees to inform the Commission and the Commission's third-party construction inspector of its intent to start construction on the transmission facility prior to the commencement of construction. Once construction has started, Company shall keep the Commission and the Commission's third-party construction inspector updated of construction activities on a weekly basis.**

Docket # 42 – Email Notice of Intent to Start Construction. Docket #'s 44-50 & 52-58 - Hess TGP Pipeline weekly construction reports. Additionally, by request Hess has recently supplied the SWPPP reports for the 2014 rights-of-way activities to the third-party construction inspector, Carlson McCain and Commission that discuss the final reclamation activities. No issues of blatant non-compliance with this order and conditions and criteria set forth in the applicable laws and rules have been found during the post-construction inspection.

Order #5 will be considered satisfied upon confirmation of receipt and/or posting of the missing reports to the Commission website.

- 6. Company understands and agrees that the pipeline will be buried to a minimum depth from the ground surface to the top of the pipe of 48 inches in range land, 48 inches for cultivated land, 48 inches at the bottom of the ditch for road crossings, and 72 inches across undeveloped sections lines.**

Hess recently submitted confirmation in an email dated October 31, 2014 that the pipelines were laid in a trench 72 inches in depth and covered with a minimum of 60-inches of fill. Measurements were not taken at the initial on-site inspection during construction; however, no concerns of non-compliance were found during the construction or post-construction inspection.

Order #6 is considered satisfied.

- 7. Company understands and agrees that the Certificate of Corridor Compatibility or Route Permit issued by the Commission is subject to suspension or revocation and may, in an appropriate and proper case, be suspended or revoked for failure to comply with the Commission's order, the conditions and criteria of the certificate or subsequent modification, or failure to comply with the applicable statutes, rules, regulations, standards, and permits of other state or federal agencies.**

No concerns of non-compliance with the Certificate of Site Compatibility have been found during the post-construction inspection.

Order #7 is considered satisfied.

- 8. Company agrees to maintain records that will demonstrate that it has complied with the requirements of the Commission's order and the Certificate of Corridor Compatibility or Route Permit, and that it will preserve these records for Commission inspection at any reasonable time upon reasonable notice.**

Carlson McCain believes Hess has maintained and submitted records that demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Commission's order and the Certificate of Site Compatibility.

Order #8 is considered satisfied.

- 9. Company agrees to construct and operate the transmission facility in the manner described in Company's application, in any late filed exhibits, and supplemental materials, (Application). To the extent there are any conflicts or inconsistencies between Company's Application and the provisions in this Certification Relating to Order Provisions, the Certification provisions control.**

Hess has constructed and is operating as indicated in "Application". Site inspections confirmed that wetlands were not permanently impacted and the stream, road crossings, and the railroad embankment were bored under, and cultural resources were not impacted.

Order #9 is considered satisfied.

- 10. Company agrees to report promptly to the Commission the presence in the permit area of any critical habitat of threatened species, endangered species, bald eagles, or golden eagles that Company becomes aware of and which were not previously reported to the Commission.**

Discussions with Hess personnel during the post-construction on-site visit and email confirmation (October 31, 2014) indicated that no threatened species, endangered species, bald eagles, or golden eagles were discovered in or near the Project during construction and therefore no documents were submitted.

Order #10 is considered satisfied.

- 11. Company understands and agrees that all cultural resource mitigation plans must be submitted to the North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and approved prior to the start of any fieldwork and construction activity in the affected area.**

Docket #4 - Hess submitted cultural resource reports to SHPO. The SHPO verified that no cultural resources would be affected.

Order #11 is considered satisfied.

- 12. Company understands and agrees that if any cultural resource, paleontological site, archeological site, historical site, or grave site is discovered during construction, it must be marked, preserved and protected from further disturbances until a professional examination can be made by the State Historical Society, a report of such examination is filed with the Commission, and clearance to proceed is given by the Commission.**

Carlson McCain and the Hess project manager discussed these issues and no unanticipated cultural resources were discovered; therefore, no additional documentation was necessary. Email dated October 31, 2014 from Hess confirmed that no additional cultural resources were encountered during construction.

Order #12 is considered satisfied.

- 13. Company understands and agrees that all buried facility crossings of graded roads shall be bored unless the responsible governing agency specifically permits Company to open cut the road.**

The buried facilities (pipelines) were constructed under government roads during Project construction. Construction inspections confirmed that the pipelines bored under all road crossings and under the railroad embankment.

Order #13 is considered satisfied.

- 14. Company understands and agrees that all pre-existing township and county roads and lanes used during construction must be repaired or restored to a condition that is equal to or better than the condition prior to the construction of the transmission facility and that will accommodate their previous use, and that areas used as temporary roads or working areas during construction must be restored to their original condition.**

No adverse effects to the adjacent graveled roads or paved surfaces were evident at time of inspections. If they were adversely impacted at times during construction they were repaired or restored to a condition that is equal to or better than the condition prior to construction.

Order #14 is considered satisfied.

- 15. Company understands and agrees that construction must be suspended when weather conditions are such that construction activities will cause irreparable damage to roads or land, unless adequate protection measures approved by the Commission are taken.**

Docket #44-50 and #52-58 - Hess TGP Pipeline weekly construction reports and the recently supplied the SWPPP reports for the 2014 rights-of-way activities documented occasional adverse weather conditions and appropriate responses to conditions. Final reclamation activities were delayed until the summer of 2014 due to the extreme wet conditions.

Order #15 is considered satisfied.

- 16. Company understands and agrees that all topsoil, up to or topsoil to the depth of cultivation, whichever is greater, over and along areas where cuts will be placed must be stripped and segregated from subsoil. Except along segments of the line using the double ditching method, any area on which excavated subsoil will be placed must also be stripped of topsoil. After backfilling is completed, any excess subsoil must be placed over the excavated area, blending the grade into existing topography. Topsoil must be replaced over areas from which it was stripped only after the subsoil is replaced.**

Docket #51 – Carlson McCain’s construction inspection on September 25, 2013, documented adequate topsoil stripping and storage areas. The post-construction site inspection on October 6, 2014 did not reveal any areas where topsoil was not properly redistributed.

Order #16 is considered satisfied.

17. Company understands and agrees that reclamation, fertilization, and reseeding is to be done according to the Natural Resources Conservation Service recommendations, unless otherwise specified by the landowner and approved by the Commission.

The majority of the ROW occurred across cultivated agricultural lands; however, Hess reseeded a similar grass mix as the pre-disturbance condition in areas where grasslands were impacted. The on-site inspection revealed that these areas, seeded in the fall of 2013 and summer of 2014, were becoming well established (Appendix A). The agricultural lands were returned to production in spring 2014. Hess personnel indicated there had been no complaints from landowners on subsidence issues or crop growth deficiencies.

Order #17 is considered satisfied with the Company commitment to monitor and coordinate with landowners on any issues that may arise.

18. Company understands and agrees that its obligation for reclamation and maintenance of the right-of-way will continue throughout the life of the transmission facility.

*A post-construction inspection of the ROW on October 6, 2014 documented silt fencing and/or straw wattles in place at the edges of the seeded ROW's in sloping areas, the installation of fiber matting near the highway ditch, and the establishment and effectiveness of soil water bars on replanted slopes. A few noxious weed plants, Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*) were found in the reseeded ROW. Weedy species such as Russian thistle (*Salsola kali*) and kochia (*Bassia scoparia*) were prevalent across the recently replanted areas where the grass has not fully established. Hess personnel indicated monitoring of the ROW will occur indefinitely and steps to control noxious weeds and remedy or reseed any problem areas will occur as necessary.*

Order #18 is considered satisfied with the Company commitment to monitor and maintain the ROW as necessary.

19. Company understands and agrees that its obligation for reclamation and maintenance of the transmission facility, associated facilities and roadway will continue throughout the life of the transmission facility.

Docket #24 and #30 - Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, Commission Motion of Adoption. Hess agreed and understands these conditions.

Order #19 is considered satisfied.

20. Company agrees to comply with the Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications.

Five trees or shrubs were recorded within the 50-foot-wide construction ROW and documented in Docket #5 the Application (Appendix D)..During construction Hess personnel directed contractors to avoid these shrubs. Carlson McCain discussed this matter with Hess personnel. The on-site confirmed that no trees or shrubs were removed within the Project ROW. Hess personnel certified this by email on October 31, 2014. Therefore, no tree and shrub mitigation was necessary.

Order #20 is considered satisfied.

21. Company understands and agrees that it shall repair or replace all fences and gates removed or damaged during all phases of construction and operation of the transmission facility.

Fences and gates disturbed during construction were repaired and are functioning as verified during post-construction inspection on October 6, 2014.

Order #21 is considered satisfied.

22. Company understands and agrees that it shall repair or replace all drainage tile broken or damaged as a result of construction and operation of the proposed energy conversion facility.

No drainage tile was present in the project construction ROW.

Order #22 is considered satisfied.

23. Company understands and agrees that staging areas or equipment shall not be located on land owned by a person other than Company unless otherwise negotiated with landowners.

Hess personnel assured Carlson McCain that all staging areas and equipment stayed within their property boundaries. Landowners were reported to be satisfied with Hess's operations.

Order #23 is considered satisfied.

24. Company understands and agrees that it shall remove all waste that is a product of construction and operation, restoration, and maintenance of the site, and properly dispose of it on a regular basis.

Hess indicated that construction waste was properly disposed of on a regular basis during the construction inspection. Waste materials or trash produced during construction was not found along ROW during post-construction inspection on October 6, 2014.

Order #24 is considered satisfied.

25. Company agrees that it shall, as soon as practicable upon the completion of the construction of the transmission facility, restore the area affected by the activities to as near as is practicable to the condition as it existed prior to the beginning of construction.

See Order #17.

Order #25 is considered satisfied with Hess's commitment to monitor and maintain good relations with landowners along the ROW.

26. Company understands and agrees that it shall provide any necessary safety measures for traffic control or to restrict public access to the transmission facility.

A chain-link fence is located around the Terminal and Plant that encloses two valves for each pipeline. Access to this area is controlled by Hess Security and was in place during each inspection.

Order #26 is considered satisfied.

27. Company understands and agrees that it shall advise the Commission of any extraordinary events which take place at the site of the transmission facility, including injuries to any person, the death of any threatened or endangered species within five business days of such event.

See Order #10. Hess indicated that no reportable personal injuries were recorded.

Order #27 is considered satisfied.

28. Company understands and agrees that it shall implement a procedure for how complaints concerning the transmission facility will be handled by Company.

Docket #24 and #29 - Hess has committed to work with landowners as needed to alleviate any concerns or issues along ROW as issued in the Order and signed Certification. Hess personnel indicated that no complaints have been reported.

Order #28 is considered satisfied.

29. Upon request, Company agrees to provide the Commission with engineering design drawings showing surveyed structure(s) prior to construction.

Docket #5 - Construction plans and engineering drawings were supplied in Appendices A & B of the Application.

Order #29 is considered satisfied.

30. Company understands and agrees that it shall inform the Commission in writing of any plans to modify the transmission facility, or of any plans to modify the site plan for the transmission facility. Company understands and agrees to obtain written approval from the Commission prior to any modifications to the site plan or the transmission facility, associated facilities, and roadway locations. Approval may be granted after notice and opportunity for hearing.

Docket #24 - During the on-site visit discussions and in an email received on October 31, 2014, Hess confirmed that there were no changes to the construction plans or route after the Orders were issued.

Order #30 is considered satisfied.

31. Company agrees to provide the Commission with both an electronic and paper copy of the corridor approved by the Commission, and will provide this information within 3 months of the Commission order approving the corridor. Company also agrees to provide an electronic version of the approved corridor that can be imported into ESRI GIS mapping software within 3 months of the Commission order approving the corridor. This electronic map data must be referenced to the North Dakota coordinate system of 1983, North and/or South zones US Survey feet (NAD 83) UTM Zone 13N or 14N feet (NAD 83), or geographic coordinate system (WGS 84) feet. The vertical data must be in the appropriate vertical datum for the coordinate system used. All submissions must specify the datum in which the data was developed.

Docket #5 - Project maps and GIS files were submitted as part of the Application to the Commission for inclusion on February 8, 2012.

Order #31 is considered satisfied.

32. Company agrees to provide the Commission with both an electronic and a paper copy of the design specifications for the construction of the transmission facility showing the location of the transmission facility as built, and will provide this information within 3 months of the completion of the construction. Company also agrees to provide an electronic version of the as-built facility design specifications that can be imported into ESRI GIS mapping software within 3 months of the completion of the construction. This electronic map data must be referenced to the North Dakota coordinate system of 1983, North and/or South zones US Survey feet (NAD 83) UTM Zone 13N or 14N feet (NAD 83), or geographic coordinate system (WGS 84) feet. The vertical data must be in the appropriate vertical datum for the coordinate system used. All submissions must specify the datum in which the data was developed.

Hess provided maps and electronic As-Built files (shapefiles) that can be imported into ESRI GIS Mapping software for the Project. Files were submitted to the Commission for inclusion as docket on October 31 and November 4, 2014.

Order #32 is considered satisfied.

33. Company understands and agrees that the authorizations granted by the Certificate of Corridor Compatibility or Route Permit issued by the Commission for the transmissions facility are subject to modification by order of the Commission if deemed necessary to protect further the public or the environment.

The Commission did not order any modifications to the Project to protect further the public or the environment.

Order #33 is considered satisfied.

- 34. Company understands and agrees that in the event Company desires to construct, within any corridor granted by a Certificate of Corridor Compatibility in this proceeding, a transmission facility or energy conversion facility that was not included in Company's application in this proceeding, Company shall apply to the Commission for a Route Permit or Site Certificate for the facility.**

Docket #24 - Hess understood that any other facility construction will require a new application for a Certificate of Site Compatibility for such facility. .

Order #34 is considered satisfied.

- 35. Company shall notify the Commission, as soon as reasonably possible, if any damage, as defined by North Dakota Century Code Chapter 49-23, occurs to underground facilities during construction conducted under the certificate or permit issued in this proceeding. In the event of any damage to underground facilities, Company shall suspend construction in the vicinity of the damage until compliance with One-Call Excavation Notice System requirements under North Dakota Century Code Chapter 49-23 has been determined and clearance to proceed has been given by the Commission.**

No damage to underground facilities occurred during construction. Hess understood that continuation of facility construction would require a new utility clearance with the One-Call system and clearance from Commission.

Order #35 is considered satisfied.

- 36. Company understands and agrees that the corridor certificate and route permit are subject to suspension or revocation and may, after hearing, be suspended or revoked for failure to comply with the Commission's order, requirements of the One-Call Excavation Notice System under North Dakota Century Code Chapter 49-23, the conditions and criteria of the certificate or permit or subsequent modification, or failure to comply with applicable statutes, or rules, regulations, standards, and permits of other state or federal agencies.**

The contractor retained by Hess for this project, Boots and Smith Oilfield Services, LLC, ensures that the One-Call Excavation Notice System was utilized before any construction digging. The One-Call Excavation Notice System is part of standard pre-construction procedure of all Hess construction projects where a contractor is responsible. Hess provided documentation of the One-Calls on November 5, 2014 to Carlson McCain and to the Commission

Order #36 will be considered satisfied upon confirmation of receipt and/or posting to the Commission website.

CONCLUSION

Based on field inspections, the Project has been constructed as designed and with minimal impacts to the surrounding natural and human environment. Thereby, after review of the Commission case docket and multiple site inspections Carlson McCain has found the Hess Tioga NGL Pipeline Project (Case No. PU-11-104) has been constructed in compliance with the siting laws and regulations (NDCC 49-22 and NDAC Article 69-09), and with applicable Commission Orders.

Appendix A

FIGURES

*Post-Construction Inspection Report
Hess Corporation Tioga NGL Pipeline Project – Williams County
Case No. PU-11-104*



Figure 1. Pipeline ROW exiting the Hess Tioga Gas Plant. Seeded grass is becoming established and Hess will continue to monitor seeded areas.



Figure 2. Reclaimed ROW within cultivated agricultural field. In 2014 the area was planted with spring wheat. Crop productivity did not seem to be negatively affected and no trench subsidence was evident.



Figure 3. Appearance of ROW along ephemeral drainage. Water bars were established, grass had been planted (August), straw waddles were in place, and silt fencing was maintained at toe slope above the wetland.



Figure 4. Reclamation in east ditch of Highway 40. Directional drilling equipment was sataged in this area. Seeding, fiber matting, straw waddles, and rock rip-rap have been placed adequately to secure the disturbed slope.



Figure 5. Riparian/wetland area crossing. Directionally drilling was used to avoid impacts to this area. Wooden matting was laid upon the surface for equipment movement along the ROW during construction and had been removed. Riparian vegetation has rebounded to pre-disturbance condition and the seeding of the ROW above the crossing has reestablished to greater than 70% coverage.