

PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP
Form S-4/A
August 18, 2006

[QuickLinks](#) -- Click here to rapidly navigate through this document

As filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on August 18, 2006

Registration No. 333-135712

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

Washington, D.C. 20549

Amendment No. 1

to

FORM S-4

REGISTRATION STATEMENT UNDER THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

Delaware
(State or other jurisdiction of
incorporation or organization)

4610
(Primary Standard Industrial
Classification Code Number)

76-0582150
(I.R.S. Employer
Identification No.)

**333 Clay Street, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 646-4100**

(Address, including zip code, and telephone number, including area code, of registrant's principal executive offices)

Tim Moore
Vice President and General Counsel
333 Clay Street, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 646-4100

(Name, address, including zip code, and telephone number, including area code, of agent for service)

Copies to:

D. Alan Beck
David P. Oelman
Vinson & Elkins L.L.P.
2300 First City Tower
1001 Fannin Street
Houston, Texas 77002-6760
(713) 758-2222

Irvin Toole, Jr.
President and Chief Executive Officer
Pacific Energy Management LLC
5900 Cherry Avenue
Long Beach, California 90805-4408
(562) 728-2800

Kelly B. Rose
Baker Botts L.L.P.
910 Louisiana
One Shell Plaza
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 229-1234

Approximate date of commencement of proposed sale to the public: As soon as practicable after this registration statement becomes effective and upon consummation of the merger described in the enclosed joint proxy statement/prospectus.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

If the securities being registered on this Form are to be offered in connection with the formation of a holding company and there is compliance with General Instruction G, check the following box.

If this Form is filed to register additional securities for an offering pursuant to Rule 462(b) under the Securities Act of 1933, check the following box and list the Securities Act registration statement number of the earlier effective registration statement for the same offering.

If this Form is a post-effective amendment filed pursuant to Rule 462(d) under the Securities Act of 1933, check the following box and list the Securities Act registration statement number of the earlier effective registration statement for the same offering.

The Registrant hereby amends this Registration Statement on such date or dates as may be necessary to delay its effective date until the Registrant shall file a further amendment which specifically states that this Registration Statement shall thereafter become effective in accordance with Section 8(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 or until this Registration Statement shall become effective on such date as the Commission, acting pursuant to said Section 8(a), may determine.

The information in this joint proxy statement/prospectus is not complete and may be changed. This joint proxy statement/prospectus is not an offer to sell nor should it be considered a solicitation of an offer to buy the securities described herein in any state where the offer or sale is not permitted.

SUBJECT TO COMPLETION dated August 18, 2006

Dear Unitholders:

On June 11, 2006, the board of directors of Plains All American GP LLC, which is the general partner of Plains AAP, L.P., the general partner of Plains All American Pipeline, L.P. ("Plains"), and the board of directors of Pacific Energy Management LLC, which is the general partner of Pacific Energy GP, LP, the general partner of Pacific Energy Partners, L.P. ("Pacific"), agreed to combine the businesses of Plains and Pacific by merging. As a result of the merger, the outstanding general partner and limited partner interests in Pacific will be extinguished, Pacific will be merged into Plains, and the Pacific operating subsidiaries will be directly or indirectly owned by Plains. Plains' management team and board of directors will continue in their current roles and manage the combined company. In the merger, each Pacific common unitholder (other than LB Pacific, LP, the owner of Pacific's general partner) will receive 0.77 common units of Plains for each Pacific common unit that the Pacific unitholder owns. It is generally expected that neither the Plains common unitholders nor the Pacific common unitholders who receive Plains common units in exchange for their Pacific common units will recognize any gain or loss for U.S. federal income tax purposes as a result of the merger.

The approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger and the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement requires the approval of a majority of Plains' outstanding common units. In addition, the merger agreement and the merger must be approved and adopted by a majority of Pacific's outstanding common units (other than Pacific common units held by LB Pacific, LP) and a majority of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units, each voting separately as a class. All of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units are owned by LB Pacific, LP. Plains and Pacific have each scheduled special meetings of their unitholders to vote on these matters on _____, 2006. Regardless of the number of units you own or whether you plan to attend the meeting or meetings in which you would have an interest, it is important that your units be represented and voted at the meeting. Voting instructions are set forth inside this joint proxy statement/prospectus. Abstentions and broker non-votes will have the same effect as a vote against the transactions described in this joint proxy statement/prospectus.

The board of directors of Plains All American GP LLC (the "Plains board") has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement, has determined that it is advisable and in the best interest of Plains and Plains' unitholders, and has approved the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement. Accordingly, the Plains board recommends that Plains' common unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger and vote to approve the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement.

The conflicts committee of the board of directors of Pacific Energy Management LLC (the "Pacific conflicts committee") has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's unitholders (other than LB Pacific, LP). The board of directors of Pacific Energy Management LLC (the "Pacific board") has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's equityholders. Accordingly, the Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board recommend that Pacific's unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

This joint proxy statement/prospectus provides you with detailed information about the proposed merger and related matters. Plains and Pacific both encourage you to read the entire document carefully. **In particular, please read "Risk Factors" beginning on page 24 of this joint proxy statement/prospectus for a discussion of risks relevant to the merger and the combined company.**

Plains' common units are listed on the NYSE under the symbol "PAA," and Pacific's common units are listed on the NYSE under the symbol "PPX."

Chairman and Chief Executive Officer,
Plains All American GP LLC

President and Chief Executive Officer,
Pacific Energy Management LLC

Neither the Securities and Exchange Commission nor any state securities commission has approved or disapproved of these securities or determined if this document is truthful or complete. Any representation to the contrary is a criminal offense.

This document is dated _____, 2006, and was first mailed to unitholders on or about _____, 2006.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

This document incorporates by reference important business and financial information about both Plains and Pacific that is not included in or delivered with this document. Please read "Where You Can Find More Information."

You can obtain any of the documents incorporated by reference into this document from Plains or Pacific, as the case may be, or from the Securities and Exchange Commission's website at <http://www.sec.gov>. Documents incorporated by reference are available from Plains and Pacific without charge, excluding any exhibits to those documents unless the exhibit is specifically incorporated by reference into this document. You may obtain documents incorporated by reference into this document by requesting them in writing or by telephone from the appropriate company as follows:

Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.
333 Clay Street, Suite 1600
Attention: Investor Relations
Houston, Texas 77002
Telephone: (713) 646-4100

Pacific Energy Partners, L.P.
5900 Cherry Avenue
Attention: Investor Relations
Long Beach, California 90805
Telephone: (562) 728-2871

You should request the documents incorporated by reference no later than , 2006 to obtain timely delivery. Please be sure to include your complete name and address in your request. If you request any documents, Plains or Pacific will mail them to you by first class mail, or another equally prompt means, within one business day after receipt of your request.

All information in this document concerning Plains has been furnished by Plains. All information in this document concerning Pacific has been furnished by Pacific. Plains has represented to Pacific, and Pacific has represented to Plains, that the information furnished by and concerning one another is true and correct.

Houston, Texas
, 2006

Notice of Special Meeting of Common Unitholders

To the Common Unitholders of Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.:

A special meeting of holders of common units of Plains All American Pipeline, L.P. ("Plains") will be held on _____, 2006 at 10:00 a.m., local time, at _____, Houston, Texas, for the following purposes:

To consider and vote upon the approval and adoption of the Agreement and Plan of Merger dated as of June 11, 2006, by and among Plains, Plains AAP, L.P., Plains All American GP LLC, Pacific Energy Partners, L.P., Pacific Energy Management LLC and Pacific Energy GP, LP, as it may be amended from time to time (the "Merger Agreement"), and the merger contemplated by the Merger Agreement;

To consider and vote upon the approval of the issuance of common units of Plains to the common unitholders of Pacific Energy Partners, L.P. (other than LB Pacific, LP), as provided in the Merger Agreement; and

To transact other business as may properly be presented at the meeting or any adjournments of the meeting.

The board of directors of Plains All American GP LLC (the "Plains board") has unanimously approved and adopted the Merger Agreement, has determined that it is advisable and in the best interest of Plains and Plains' common unitholders, and has approved the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the Merger Agreement. Accordingly, the Plains board recommends that Plains' common unitholders vote to approve and adopt the Merger Agreement and the merger and vote to approve the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the Merger Agreement.

The proposals described above require the affirmative vote of a majority of Plains' outstanding common units. As a result, abstentions and broker non-votes will have the same effect as a vote against the proposals.

Only common unitholders of record at the close of business on _____, 2006 are entitled to notice of and to vote at the meeting and any adjournments of the meeting. Plains will keep at its offices in Houston, Texas, a list of common unitholders entitled to vote at the meeting available for inspection for any purpose relevant to the meeting during normal business hours for the 10 days before the meeting.

YOUR VOTE IS IMPORTANT. WHETHER OR NOT YOU EXPECT TO ATTEND THE MEETING, PLEASE VOTE IN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS:

use the toll-free telephone number shown on the proxy card;

use the internet website shown on the proxy card; or

mark, sign, date and promptly return the enclosed proxy card in the postage-paid envelope. It requires no postage if mailed in the United States.

By order of the Board of Directors of Plains All American GP LLC, as general partner of Plains AAP, L.P., the general partner of Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.

Secretary
Plains All American GP LLC

Long Beach, California
, 2006

Notice of Special Meeting of Unitholders

To the Unitholders of Pacific Energy Partners, L.P.:

A special meeting of holders of common units and subordinated units of Pacific Energy Partners, L.P. ("Pacific") will be held on _____, 2006 at 8:00 a.m., local time, at 5900 Cherry Avenue, Long Beach, California, for the following purposes:

To consider and vote upon the approval and adoption of the Agreement and Plan of Merger dated as of June 11, 2006, by and among Plains All American Pipeline, L.P., Plains AAP, L.P., Plains All American GP LLC, Pacific, Pacific Energy Management LLC and Pacific Energy GP, LP, as it may be amended from time to time (the "Merger Agreement"), and the merger contemplated by the Merger Agreement; and

To transact other business as may properly be presented at the meeting or any adjournments of the meeting.

The conflicts committee of the board of directors of Pacific Energy Management LLC (the "Pacific conflicts committee") has unanimously approved and adopted the Merger Agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's common unitholders (other than LB Pacific, LP). The full board of directors of Pacific Energy Management LLC (the "Pacific board") has unanimously approved and adopted the Merger Agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's equityholders. Accordingly, the Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board recommend that Pacific's unitholders vote to approve and adopt the Merger Agreement and the merger.

The proposals described above require the affirmative vote of a majority of Pacific's outstanding common units (other than Pacific common units held by LB Pacific, LP) and a majority of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units, each voting separately as a class. As a result, abstentions and broker non-votes will have the same effect as a vote against the proposal. All of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units are owned by LB Pacific, LP.

Only unitholders of record at the close of business on _____, 2006 are entitled to notice of and to vote at the meeting and any adjournments of the meeting. Pacific will keep at its offices in Long Beach, California, a list of unitholders entitled to vote at the meeting available for inspection for any purpose relevant to the meeting during normal business hours for the 10 days before the meeting.

YOUR VOTE IS IMPORTANT. WHETHER OR NOT YOU EXPECT TO ATTEND THE MEETING, PLEASE VOTE IN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS:

use the toll-free telephone number shown on the proxy card;

use the internet website shown on the proxy card; or

mark, sign, date and promptly return the enclosed proxy card in the postage-paid envelope. It requires no postage if mailed in the United States.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

By order of the Board of Directors of Pacific Energy Management LLC, as the general partner of Pacific Energy GP, LP, the general partner of Pacific Energy Partners, L.P.

Senior Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary
Pacific Energy Management LLC

JOINT PROXY STATEMENT/PROSPECTUS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions and Answers about the Merger	1
Summary	5
The Merger Parties	5
The Merger	5
Transactions Related to the Merger	6
Directors and Management of Plains Following the Merger	6
Market Prices of Plains and Pacific Common Units Prior to Announcing the Proposed Merger	6
The Special Unitholder Meetings	6
Recommendations to Unitholders	7
Pacific's Reasons for the Merger	8
Plains' Reasons for the Merger	9
Opinions of Financial Advisors	10
Interests of Certain Persons in the Merger; Conflicts of Interest	11
The Merger Agreement	11
U.S. Federal Income Tax Consequences	14
Other Information Related to the Merger	14
Summary of Risk Factors	15
Summary Historical and Pro Forma Financial and Operating Information	17
Summary Historical and Pro Forma Financial and Operating Information of Plains	18
Summary Historical Financial and Operating Information of Pacific	20
Comparative Per Unit Information	22
Market Prices and Distribution Information	23
Risk Factors	24
Risks Related to the Merger and the Related Transactions	24
Risks Related to the Combined Company's Business	27
Risks Related to Plains' Common Units and Risks Resulting from Its Partnership Structure	35
Tax Risks Related to the Merger and to Owning Plains Common Units	38
The Special Unitholder Meetings	41
The Merger	47
Background of the Merger	47
Recommendation of the Board of Directors and Conflicts Committee of Pacific's General Partner and Reasons for the Merger	56
Recommendation of the Board of Directors of Plains' General Partner and Reasons for the Merger	60
Additional Financial Considerations of the Parties	62
Opinions of Financial Advisors	69
Interests of Certain Persons in the Merger	92
No Appraisal Rights	97
Regulatory Matters	98
Listing of Common Units to be Issued in the Merger	98
Accounting Treatment	98
Pending Litigation	98
The Merger Agreement	100
Transactions Related to the Merger	100
Structure of the Merger	100
When the Merger Becomes Effective	101
Effect of Merger on Outstanding Pacific Units	101

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Exchange of Units; Fractional Units	101
Conditions to the Merger	103
Representations and Warranties	104
Covenants and Other Agreements	106
Employee Matters	109
Non-Solicitation	109
Termination	110
Termination Fees and Expenses	111
Amendment; Extension and Waiver	112
The Merger Parties' Businesses	113
Pacific's Business	113
Plains' Business	116
Selected Financial Information of Plains and Pacific	122
Directors and Officers of the Combined Company	125
Directors and Executive Officers	125
Comparison of the Rights of Plains and Pacific Common Unitholders	130
Purpose and Term of Existence	130
Distributions Of Available Cash	130
Operating Surplus and Capital Surplus	131
Subordination Period	133
Incentive Distributions	134
Distributions of Available Cash from Operating Surplus	135
Distributions of Available Cash from Capital Surplus	136
Adjustment to the Minimum Quarterly Distribution and Target Distribution Levels	137
Distributions of Cash Upon Liquidation	138
Merger/Consolidation	141
Disposal of Assets	142
Transfer of General Partner Interest	142
Withdrawal of General Partner	143
Removal of General Partner	144
Limited Call Rights	145
Limited Preemptive Rights	145
Amendment of Partnership Agreement	146
Dissolution of The Partnership	148
Liquidation	149
Management	150
Change Of Management Provisions	150
Meetings, Voting	151
Transfer of Units; Status as a Limited Partner or Assignee	152
Conflicts of Interest	153
Description of Plains' Common Units	155
Status as Limited Partner or Assignee	155
Limited Liability	155
Reports and Records	155
Material Federal Income Tax Consequences	157
The Merger	157
Tax Consequences of Owning Plains Common Units	159
Partnership Status	160
Limited Partner Status	161
Tax Consequences of Plains Common Unit Ownership	162
Tax Treatment of Operations	167

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Disposition of Plains Common Units	168
Uniformity of Plains Common Units	170
Tax-Exempt Organizations and Other Investors	170
Administrative Matters	171
Foreign, State, Local and Other Tax Considerations	173
Submission of Unitholder Proposals	175
Legal Matters	175
Experts	175
Where You Can Find More Information	175
Plains' Filings	176
Pacific's Filings	177
Information Regarding Forward-Looking Statements	178
Index to Unaudited Pro Forma Condensed Combined Financial Statements	F-1
ANNEX A Merger Agreement and First Amendment	A-1
ANNEX B Lehman Brothers Inc. Fairness Opinion to the Board of Directors of Pacific's General Partner	B-1
ANNEX C Petrie Parkman & Co. Fairness Opinion to the Conflicts Committee of Pacific's General Partner	C-1
ANNEX D Simmons & Company International Fairness Opinion to the Board of Directors of Plains' General Partner	D-1

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE MERGER

Q:

Why am I receiving these materials?

A:

Plains and Pacific have agreed to combine their businesses by merging Pacific with and into Plains. The merger cannot be completed without the approval of the unitholders of both Plains and Pacific.

Q:

What will happen to Pacific as a result of the merger?

A:

As a result of the merger, the general partner and limited partner interests of Pacific will be extinguished, Pacific will be merged with and into Plains, and the Pacific operating subsidiaries will be directly or indirectly owned by Plains. Plains' management team and board of directors will continue in their current roles and manage the combined company.

Q:

What will Pacific common unitholders receive in the merger?

A:

Each Pacific common unitholder (other than LB Pacific, LP, the owner of Pacific's general partner) will receive 0.77 Plains common units in exchange for each Pacific common unit that the unitholder owns at the effective time of the merger. If the exchange ratio would result in a Pacific common unitholder being entitled to receive a fraction of a Plains common unit, that unitholder will receive in lieu of such fractional interest cash from Plains in an amount equal to the amount of such fractional interest multiplied by the average closing price of Plains common units on the NYSE during the five trading days ending on the third business day prior to the consummation of the merger.

Q:

What will the owner of Pacific's general partner receive in the merger?

A:

LB Pacific, LP, the owner of Pacific's general partner, will receive cash and will not receive Plains common units in the merger. LB Pacific and Plains have entered into a purchase agreement in connection with the execution of the merger agreement, pursuant to which Plains has agreed, subject to the terms and conditions of the purchase agreement, to purchase from LB Pacific immediately prior to the merger (i) all of the issued and outstanding limited partner interests in Pacific Energy GP, LP, the general partner of Pacific, (ii) the sole member interest in Pacific Energy Management LLC, the general partner of Pacific Energy GP, LP, (iii) 2,616,250 Pacific common units and (iv) 7,848,750 Pacific subordinated units for an aggregate purchase price of \$700 million in cash. The purchase agreement may be terminated by LB Pacific or Plains if the merger agreement is terminated, and is subject to customary closing conditions, including satisfaction of all conditions specified in the merger agreement.

Q:

What will Plains common unitholders receive in the merger?

A:

Plains common unitholders will simply retain the Plains common units they currently own. They will not receive any additional Plains units in the merger.

Q:

What happens to my future distributions?

A:

Once the merger is completed, Pacific common unitholders (other than LB Pacific) will own Plains common units and, when distributions are approved and declared by the general partner of Plains, will receive distributions on their Plains common units in accordance with Plains' partnership agreement. Current Plains common unitholders will continue to receive distributions on their common units. Distributions are made in accordance with Plains' partnership agreement and at the discretion of the Plains board. Plains' management intends to recommend that the Plains board increase Plains' quarterly distribution from the current \$0.725 per unit (\$2.90 annualized) to \$0.80

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

per unit (\$3.20 annualized) following the closing of the merger. On a comparative basis, assuming a \$3.20 annualized Plains distribution rate and giving effect to the exchange ratio, a Pacific unitholder's quarterly distribution would increase 8.5% from the current \$0.5675 per existing Pacific common unit (\$2.27 annualized) to \$0.616 per existing Pacific common unit (\$2.464 annualized) following the closing of the merger. For a description of the distribution provisions of Plains' partnership agreement, please read "Comparison of the Rights of Plains and Pacific Common Unitholders."

Q: *Has Plains' general partner agreed to reduce the incentive distributions it would otherwise receive following the merger?*

A: Yes. Plains' general partner, in support of the transaction, has agreed to reduce the incentive distributions it would otherwise have received by \$65 million in the aggregate over five four-quarter periods following the merger, beginning on the earlier to occur of (i) the first quarterly distribution declared and paid after the closing of the merger that equals or exceeds \$0.80 per unit or (ii) the second quarterly distribution declared and paid after the closing of the merger. The date on which the event described in clause (i) or (ii) above first occurs is referred to in this joint proxy statement/prospectus as the "initial date." The reduction will be equal to \$20 million in the aggregate for the first four quarters after and including the initial date, \$15 million in the aggregate for the second four quarters, \$15 million in the aggregate for the third four quarters, \$10 million in the aggregate for the fourth four quarters, and \$5 million in the aggregate for the fifth four quarters.

Q: *Should Pacific unitholders send in their certificates representing Pacific common units now?*

A: No. After the merger is completed, Pacific common unitholders who hold their units in certificated form will receive written instructions for exchanging their certificates representing Pacific common units. Please do not send in your certificates representing Pacific common units with your proxy card.

Q: *What unitholder approvals are needed to complete the merger?*

A: The following unitholder approvals are needed to complete the merger:

the affirmative vote of the holders of at least a majority of Pacific's outstanding common units (excluding common units held by LB Pacific) and at least a majority of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units, each voting as a separate class; and

the affirmative vote of the holders of at least a majority of Plains' outstanding common units.

As of the record date of the Pacific special meeting, directors and executive officers of Pacific and their affiliates had the right to vote Pacific common units, or approximately % of Pacific's outstanding common units, excluding common units held by LB Pacific. Pacific currently expects that all of the directors and executive officers of Pacific will vote their common units in favor of the merger agreement and the merger, although none of them has entered into any agreement obligating them to do so. In addition, LB Pacific owns all of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units. Pacific currently expects that LB Pacific will vote its subordinated units in favor of the merger agreement and the merger. Pursuant to the purchase agreement, LB Pacific has agreed to use its commercially reasonable efforts to take all appropriate action necessary or advisable to consummate and make effective the transactions contemplated by, and to satisfy the closing conditions of, the purchase agreement and the merger agreement as promptly as practicable.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

As of the record date of the Plains special meeting, directors and executive officers of Plains and their affiliates had the right to vote Plains common units, or approximately % of Plains' outstanding common units. Plains currently expects that all of the directors and executive officers of Plains and their affiliates will vote their common units in favor of the merger, although none of them has entered into any agreement obligating them to do so.

Q: *When do you expect the merger to be completed?*

A: Plains and Pacific are working to complete the merger as soon as possible. A number of conditions must be satisfied before Plains and Pacific can complete the merger, including approval by the unitholders of both Plains and Pacific, the expiration of the applicable waiting period under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (which waiting period expired on July 31, 2006) and the approval of certain state regulatory bodies. Although we cannot be sure when all of the conditions to the merger will be satisfied, Plains and Pacific expect to complete the merger in the fourth quarter of 2006. Please read "The Merger Agreement Conditions to the Merger."

Q: *What are the tax consequences to common unitholders of the transaction?*

A: It is expected that neither the Plains common unitholders nor the Pacific common unitholders who receive Plains common units in exchange for their Pacific common units will recognize any gain or loss for U.S. federal income tax purposes as a result of the merger, except with respect to cash received in lieu of fractional Plains common units and with respect to a net decrease in a unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities. A net decrease in a unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities is not expected to occur as a result of the merger. For a description of the expected material federal income tax consequences of the merger and the holding of Plains common units after the merger, please read the information set forth in "Material Federal Income Tax Consequences."

Q: *What taxes will unitholders of the combined company be subject to?*

A: In addition to federal income taxes, unitholders of the combined company will be subject to other taxes, such as Canadian federal and provincial taxes, state and local taxes, unincorporated business taxes and estate, inheritance or intangible taxes that are imposed by the various jurisdictions in which Plains does business or owns property but in which such unitholders may not reside.

Q: *What do I need to do now?*

A: You should read this joint proxy statement/prospectus carefully. Then, if you choose to vote by proxy, you should do so as soon as possible by following the instructions listed on your proxy card.

Q: *What if I do not vote?*

A: If you do not return your proxy or if you abstain from voting, it will have the same effect as a vote against the proposals. If you sign and return your proxy card but do not indicate how you want to vote, your proxy will be counted as a vote in favor of the proposals.

Q: *If my units are held in "street name" by my broker, will my broker vote my units for me?*

A: Your broker cannot vote your units for or against approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger or the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement unless you tell the broker how you wish to vote. To tell your broker how to vote, you should follow the directions that your broker provides to you. A non-vote by your broker will have the same effect as a vote against the proposals described in this document.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Q:

If I am planning on attending a meeting in person, should I still vote by proxy?

A:

Yes. Whether or not you plan to attend a meeting, you should vote by proxy indicated on your proxy card. Your units will not be voted if you do not vote your proxy or if you do not vote in person at the scheduled special meetings of the unitholders of Pacific and the unitholders of Plains to be held on _____, 2006. This would have the same effect as a vote against the proposals.

Q:

Can I change my vote after I have voted by proxy?

A:

Yes. You can change your vote at any time before your proxy is voted at the meeting by following the procedures set forth in "The Special Unitholder Meetings Voting Procedures Revocation."

Q:

Whom do I call if I have further questions about voting, the meetings or the merger?

A:

Plains unitholders may call Plains' Investor Relations department at (713) 646-4100. If you would like additional copies, without charge, of Plains' proxy statement or if you have questions about the merger, including the procedures for voting your units, you should contact Morrow & Co., Inc., which is assisting Plains in the solicitation of proxies, as follows:

Morrow & Co., Inc.

470 West Avenue 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06902

paalp.info@morrowco.com

Banks and Brokerage Firms, please call (203) 658-9400

All others, please call (800) 607-0088

Pacific unitholders may call Pacific's Investor Relations department at (562) 728-2871. If you would like additional copies, without charge, of Pacific's proxy statement or if you have questions about the merger, including the procedures for voting your units, you should contact D.F. King & Co., Inc., which is assisting Pacific in the solicitation of proxies, as follows:

D.F. King & Co., Inc.

48 Wall Street
New York, NY 10005

PPX.info@DFKing.com

Banks and Brokerage Firms, please call (212) 269-5550

All others, please call (800) 769-4414

SUMMARY

This summary highlights some of the information in this joint proxy statement/prospectus. It may not contain all of the information that is important to you. To understand the merger fully and for a more complete description of the terms of the merger, you should read carefully this document, the documents incorporated by reference and the full text of the merger agreement included as Annex A to this document. Please also read "Where You Can Find More Information."

The Merger Parties (page 113)

Pacific Energy Partners, L.P.

Pacific is a publicly traded Delaware limited partnership engaged principally in the business of gathering, transporting, storing, and distributing crude oil, refined products and other related products. It generates revenue primarily by transporting such commodities on its pipelines, by leasing capacity in its storage tanks, and by providing other terminalling services. Pacific also buys and sells crude oil, activities that are generally complementary to its other crude oil operations. Pacific conducts its business through two business units, the West Coast Business Unit, incorporating activities in California and the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania area, and the Rocky Mountain Business Unit, which includes activities in five Rocky Mountain states and the province of Alberta, Canada.

Pacific's principal executive offices are located at 5900 Cherry Avenue, Long Beach, California 90805, and its phone number is (562) 728-2800.

Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.

Plains is a publicly traded Delaware limited partnership engaged in interstate and intrastate crude oil transportation and crude oil gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage, as well as the marketing and storage of liquefied petroleum gas and other natural gas related petroleum products. In addition, through its 50% equity ownership in PAA/Vulcan Gas Storage, LLC ("PAA/Vulcan"), Plains is engaged in the development and operation of natural gas storage facilities.

Plains is one of the largest midstream crude oil companies in North America. As of June 30, 2006, Plains owned approximately 15,000 miles of active crude oil pipelines, approximately 39 million barrels of active terminalling and storage capacity and over 500 transport trucks. Currently, Plains handles an average of over 3 million barrels per day of physical crude oil through its extensive network of assets located in major oil producing regions of the United States and Canada.

Plains' principal executive offices are located at 333 Clay Street, Suite 1600, Houston, Texas 77002, and its phone number is (713) 646-4100.

The Merger (page 47)

Pursuant to the merger agreement, at the effective time of the merger, Pacific will merge with and into Plains, and the outstanding common units of Pacific (other than the common units owned by LB Pacific) will be converted into the right to receive Plains common units. Pacific will cease to exist following the merger. Each Pacific common unitholder (other than LB Pacific) will receive 0.77 Plains common units in exchange for each Pacific common unit that the unitholder owns at the effective time of the merger. If the exchange ratio would result in a Pacific common unitholder being entitled to receive a fraction of a Plains common unit, that unitholder will receive in lieu of such fractional interest cash from Plains in an amount equal to the amount of such fractional interest multiplied by the average closing price of Plains common units on the NYSE during the five trading days ending on the third business day prior to the consummation of the merger.

Once the merger is completed, Pacific common unitholders (other than LB Pacific) will own Plains common units in lieu of their Pacific common units and, when distributions are declared by Plains' general partner and paid by Plains, they will receive distributions on their Plains common units in accordance with Plains' partnership agreement. Plains' management intends to recommend that the Plains board increase Plains' quarterly distribution from the current \$0.725 per unit (\$2.90 annualized) to \$0.80 per unit (\$3.20 annualized) following the closing of the merger. Additionally, Plains' general partner, in support of the transaction, has agreed to reduce the incentive distributions it would otherwise receive by \$65 million in the aggregate over five four-quarter periods following the merger, beginning on the earlier to occur of (i) the first quarterly distribution declared and paid after the closing of the merger that equals or exceeds \$0.80 per unit or (ii) the second quarterly distribution declared and paid after the closing of the merger. The reduction will be equal to \$20 million in the aggregate for the first four quarters after and including the initial date, \$15 million in the aggregate for the second four quarters, \$15 million in the aggregate for the third four quarters, \$10 million in the aggregate for the fourth four quarters, and \$5 million in the aggregate for the fifth four quarters. For a description of the distribution provisions of Plains' partnership agreement, please read "Comparison of the Rights of Plains and Pacific Common Unitholders."

Transactions Related to the Merger (page 100)

In connection with the execution of the merger agreement, Plains entered into a purchase agreement with LB Pacific as of June 11, 2006, pursuant to which Plains has agreed, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the purchase agreement, to purchase from LB Pacific immediately prior to the merger (i) all of the issued and outstanding limited partner interests in Pacific Energy GP, LP, the general partner of Pacific, (ii) the sole member interest in Pacific Energy Management LLC, the general partner of Pacific Energy GP, LP, (iii) 2,616,250 Pacific common units and (iv) 7,848,750 Pacific subordinated units, for an aggregate purchase price of \$700 million in cash. The purchase agreement may be terminated by LB Pacific or Plains if the merger agreement is terminated, and is subject to customary closing conditions, including satisfaction of all conditions specified in the merger agreement.

Directors and Management of Plains Following the Merger (page 125)

Plains' management team and board of directors will continue in their current roles and will manage the combined company.

Market Prices of Plains and Pacific Common Units Prior to Announcing the Proposed Merger

Plains' common units are traded on the NYSE under the symbol "PAA." Pacific common units are traded on the NYSE under the symbol "PPX." The following table shows the closing unit prices of Plains and Pacific common units on June 9, 2006 (the last full trading day before Plains and Pacific announced the proposed merger) and the average closing unit price of Plains and Pacific common units during the 20-day trading period prior to and including June 9, 2006.

Date/Period	Plains Common Units	Pacific Common Units
June 9, 2006	\$ 46.10	\$ 32.09
20-day average	46.23	31.14

The Special Unitholder Meetings (page 41)

Pacific Special Unitholder Meeting

Where and when: The Pacific special unitholder meeting will take place at 5900 Cherry Avenue, Long Beach, California, on , 2006 at 8:00 a.m., local time.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

What you are being asked to vote on: At the Pacific meeting, Pacific common unitholders (other than LB Pacific) and the Pacific subordinated unitholder will separately vote on the approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger. Pacific unitholders also may be asked to consider other matters as may properly come before the meeting. At this time, Pacific knows of no other matters that will be presented for the consideration of its unitholders at the meeting.

Who may vote: You may vote at the Pacific meeting if you owned Pacific common units (excluding LB Pacific) or Pacific subordinated units at the close of business on the record date, _____, 2006. On that date, there were _____ Pacific common units (excluding common units held by LB Pacific) and _____ Pacific subordinated units outstanding. You may cast one vote for each outstanding Pacific common unit or Pacific subordinated unit, as applicable, that you owned on the record date. All of the outstanding Pacific subordinated units are owned by LB Pacific.

What vote is needed: The affirmative vote of at least a majority of Pacific's outstanding common units (excluding common units held by LB Pacific) and the affirmative vote of at least a majority of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units, each voting as a separate class, is required to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

Plains Special Unitholder Meeting

Where and when: The Plains special unitholder meeting will take place at _____, Houston, Texas, on _____, 2006, at 10:00 a.m., local time.

What you are being asked to vote on: At the Plains meeting, Plains unitholders will vote on the approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger. Additionally, the Plains unitholders will vote on the approval of the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement, which Plains currently estimates to be approximately 22.3 million Plains common units. Plains unitholders also may be asked to consider other matters as may properly come before the meeting. At this time, Plains knows of no other matters that will be presented for the consideration of its unitholders at the meeting.

Who may vote: You may vote at the Plains meeting if you owned Plains common units at the close of business on the record date, _____, 2006. On that date, there were _____ Plains common units outstanding. You may cast one vote for each Plains common unit that you owned on the record date.

What vote is needed: The affirmative vote of at least a majority of Plains' outstanding common units is required to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger and to approve the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement.

Recommendations to Unitholders

To Pacific Unitholders (page 56):

The conflicts committee (the "Pacific conflicts committee") of the board of directors (the "Pacific board") of Pacific Energy Management LLC, the general partner of Pacific Energy GP, LP, the general partner of Pacific (unless the context requires otherwise, Pacific Energy Management LLC and Pacific Energy GP, LP are collectively referred to as "Pacific's general partner"), comprised of directors who are deemed to be independent of the interests of Pacific's general partner, has considered the benefits of the merger as well as the associated risks and has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's common unitholders (other than LB Pacific). Accordingly, the Pacific conflicts committee recommends that Pacific unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

The Pacific board has considered the benefits of the merger as well as the associated risks and has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's equityholders. Accordingly, the Pacific board recommends that Pacific unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

Pacific's unitholders are urged to review carefully the background and reasons for the merger described under "The Merger" and the risks associated with the merger described under "Risk Factors."

To Plains Unitholders (page 60):

The entire board of directors of Plains All American GP, LLC (the "Plains board"), the general partner of Plains AAP, L.P., the general partner of Plains (unless the context requires otherwise, Plains All American GP LLC and Plains AAP, L.P. are collectively referred to as "Plains' general partner"), including those directors who are independent of the general partner interest, has considered the benefits of the merger as well as the associated risks and has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement, has determined that it is advisable and in the best interest of Plains and Plains' common unitholders, and has approved the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement. Accordingly, the Plains board recommends that Plains' common unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger and vote to approve the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement.

Plains' common unitholders are urged to review carefully the background and reasons for the merger described under "The Merger" and the risks associated with the merger described under "Risk Factors."

Pacific's Reasons for the Merger (page 56)

The Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee consulted with management and legal and financial advisors and considered many factors in approving and adopting the merger agreement and the merger, including the following expected benefits of the merger to Pacific and its unitholders:

that the holders of Pacific's common units (other than LB Pacific) will be entitled to receive 0.77 Plains common units for each Pacific common unit, an exchange ratio that the Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board viewed as attractive in light of Pacific's historic and current trading price, and which represented an implied premium of 14.3% over the average closing unit price during the 20 trading days prior to and including June 9, 2006 (the last day of trading prior to the committee's and the board's respective determinations) and 10.6% over the closing unit price on June 9, 2006;

that the merger is expected to be accretive on the basis of distributable cash flow per common unit of Pacific;

that Plains' management intends to recommend that the Plains board increase Plains' quarterly per unit distribution and that Pacific unitholders would receive such increased distribution following the merger, and that the increase in per unit distribution may ultimately result in the appreciation of Plains' unit price in the market, making the exchange ratio even more favorable to Pacific's unitholders;

that the incentive distributions that would otherwise have been payable to Plains' general partner will be reduced by \$65.0 million in the aggregate over five four-quarter periods following the merger, making additional cash available for general partnership purposes, which may include, as deemed appropriate by Plains' general partner, future distributions, capital investment or reduction of debt;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

- that the merger will result in potential operating, general and administrative and interest cost savings;
- that Pacific unitholders will benefit from the application of Plains' commercial expertise to Pacific's current assets;
- that the combined business of Plains and Pacific following the merger will have complementary growth opportunities;
- that the combined company will represent a substantially larger business than Pacific on a stand-alone basis, mitigating execution risk associated with Pacific's Pier 400 project and other projects;
- that the merger will result in significant business and geographic diversification;
- that the combined company is expected to have investment grade credit ratings; and
- that, as unitholders of Plains following the merger, Pacific unitholders will have greater liquidity for their units.

The Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee also considered a number of risks associated with the merger, including the following:

- that Plains is currently at the 50% incentive distribution level for its general partner, as compared to Pacific, which is at the 15% incentive distribution level for its general partner, which increases the cost of equity capital for future growth;
- that Plains' investment grade credit rating might be reduced as a result of the transaction;
- the possibility that Plains' unit price could diminish prior to closing, reducing the premium available to Pacific's common unitholders (other than LB Pacific);
- that regulatory approvals must be obtained to complete the merger; and
- that the merger might not be completed in a timely manner, or at all, which could result in significant costs and disruption to Pacific's normal business.

Plains' Reasons for the Merger (page 60)

The Plains board consulted with management and legal and financial advisors and considered many factors in approving and adopting the purchase agreement and the merger agreement and approving the issuance of Plains' common units in the merger, including the following expected benefits of the merger to Plains, its unitholders and the combined company:

- the significant potential cost savings and operating synergies derived by combining two public entities and eliminating duplicative costs;
- the complementary asset bases of Plains and Pacific in California, the Rocky Mountains and Canada, with minimal asset overlap but attractive potential vertical integration opportunities;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

the opportunity to generate incremental value by applying Plains' commercial business model to Pacific's assets and organic growth opportunities;

the combination of Plains' in-progress organic growth projects, for which substantial equity capital has been raised and/or debt capital arranged, with Pacific's longer lead-time organic growth projects, which are anticipated to extend growth visibility for several years regardless of future acquisitions;

the opportunity to augment Plains' existing organization with talent from Pacific and expand the breadth and depth of its organization;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

the expanded inventory of internal growth projects helping to mitigate the adverse impacts of potential delays associated with any one project, such as those caused by permitting, weather, availability of materials or other factors;

the positive impact that Pacific's tariff and fee-based activities should have on Plains' credit rating;

the acceleration of Plains' expansion into the refined products infrastructure business afforded by Pacific's products terminals on the West Coast and in the Northeast and its products pipeline in the Rockies;

the ability to capitalize on increasing domestic demand for refined products provided by Pacific's refined products assets; and

the combination of Plains' tariff-based pipeline business and commercial and fee-based gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage business with Pacific's predominately tariff- and fee-based pipeline and terminalling businesses, resulting in a stronger, more diversified and more resilient business profile for the combined company.

In addition to considering the foregoing, the Plains board consulted with its management and Plains' legal and financial advisors, and considered a variety of other factors, including:

information regarding the business, operations, financial condition, liabilities, earnings, prospects and potential strategic opportunities of Plains and Pacific;

near-term dilution, offset by anticipated long-term accretion, of distributable cash flow per unit;

the visibility of future distribution increases and long-term value of Plains' common units;

the abilities of the parties to complete the merger and other transactions contemplated by the purchase agreement and the merger agreement;

the risks associated with integrating Pacific's assets, operations and business activities into Plains' assets, operations and business activities;

the risks associated with financing certain components of the purchase price as well as the ongoing capital requirements of the combined company;

the risks associated with delay in development, or non-development, of key internal growth projects; and

the risks associated with the merger, including those described under "Risk Factors Risks Related to the Merger and the Related Transactions."

Opinions of Financial Advisors (page 69)

The opinions of the Pacific board's financial advisor, the Pacific conflicts committee's financial advisor and the Plains board's financial advisor are attached to this joint proxy statement/prospectus as Annexes B, C and D, respectively. You are encouraged to read those opinions carefully, as well as the descriptions of the analyses and assumptions on which the opinions were based set forth under "The Merger Opinions of Financial Advisors." *Each opinion is directed to the board of directors or conflicts committee of the applicable general partner, and does not constitute a recommendation to any unitholder as to any matter relating to the merger.*

Opinion of Financial Advisor to Pacific

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Lehman Brothers Inc., financial advisor to Pacific, delivered its opinion to the Pacific board on June 11, 2006 to the effect that, as of the date of its opinion and based on and subject to various

assumptions made, matters considered and limitations described in the opinion, from a financial point of view, the aggregate consideration to be offered to all of the holders of the partnership interests in Pacific in the proposed transaction is fair to such holders. Pacific's general partner is deemed to be an affiliate of Lehman Brothers Inc. through a 59% ownership interest in Pacific's general partner held by certain entities controlled by Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., the parent entity of Lehman Brothers Inc.

Opinion of Financial Advisor to the Conflicts Committee of Pacific

Petrie Parkman & Co., financial advisor to the Pacific conflicts committee, delivered its opinion to the Pacific conflicts committee on June 11, 2006 to the effect that, as of the date of its opinion and based on and subject to various assumptions made, matters considered and limitations described in the opinion, the exchange ratio of 0.77 Plains common units for each Pacific common unit in the merger is fair, from a financial point of view, to Pacific's common unitholders, other than LB Pacific and its affiliates.

Opinion of Financial Advisor to Plains

Simmons & Company International, financial advisor to Plains, delivered its opinion to the Plains board on June 11, 2006 to the effect that, as of the date of its opinion and based on and subject to various assumptions made, matters considered and limitations described in the opinion, the aggregate consideration to be paid by Plains as set forth in the merger agreement and in the purchase agreement with LB Pacific is fair, from a financial point of view, to Plains and Plains' common unitholders (other than those unitholders holding a direct or indirect interest in Plains' general partner).

Interests of Certain Persons in the Merger; Conflicts of Interest (page 92)

In considering the recommendations of the Pacific board, the Pacific conflicts committee and the Plains board with respect to the merger, unitholders of both partnerships should be aware that some of the executive officers and directors of the general partners have interests in the transaction that may differ from, or may be in addition to, the interests of unitholders generally. For example, the owners of Pacific's general partner will receive cash in the transaction, a portion of which will be distributed to certain members of the Pacific board.

In addition, owners of Plains' general partner have interests that differ materially from owners of Plains' limited partner interests. Even giving effect to the reduction in incentive distribution payments otherwise payable to Plains' general partner, the merger is expected to be accretive to Plains' general partner on a distributable cash flow basis beginning in 2007. Based on Plains' projected results, the effect of the merger is not expected to be accretive on a distributable cash flow per unit basis to Plains' existing limited partners until 2008.

The Merger Agreement (page 100)

The merger agreement is attached to this joint proxy statement/prospectus as Annex A and is incorporated by reference into this document. You are encouraged to read the merger agreement because it is the legal document that governs the merger.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

What Needs to be Done to Complete the Merger

Plains and Pacific will complete the merger only if the conditions set forth in the merger agreement and the purchase agreement are satisfied or, in some cases, waived. The obligations of Plains and Pacific to complete the merger are subject to the following conditions:

the adoption and approval of the merger agreement and the merger by the requisite vote of the Pacific common unitholders (not including LB Pacific) and the Pacific subordinated unitholder (which is LB Pacific);

the adoption and approval of the merger agreement and the merger by the requisite vote of the Plains common unitholders, and the approval of the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement by the requisite vote of the Plains common unitholders;

the expiration or early termination of the waiting period under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, which waiting period expired on July 31, 2006;

the approval of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California and the Public Service Commission of the State of Wyoming (and in the case of Wyoming, any protest period subsequent to such approval having lapsed without a protest or, if a protest has been filed, such protest having been resolved to the reasonable satisfaction of the parties);

the consent of the Federal Communications Commission, or FCC, to effect transfers of certain licenses;

satisfaction of requirements under the *Competition Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-34 of Canada, or Competition Act, which requirements have been satisfied;

approval of the merger and sale transactions under the *Investment Canada Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. 28 (1st Suppl.), or Investment Canada Act, or notice that approval of the merger and sale transactions is not required under the Investment Canada Act;

receipt of all other governmental consents and approvals, the absence of which would, individually or in the aggregate, have a material adverse effect on Pacific or Plains;

the continued effectiveness of the registration statement of which this joint proxy statement/prospectus is a part;

the approval for listing on the NYSE of the Plains common units to be issued in the merger, subject to official notice of issuance; and

the absence of any decree, order, injunction or law that prohibits the merger or makes the merger unlawful.

Plains' obligation to complete the merger is further subject to the following conditions:

the representations and warranties of Pacific set forth in the merger agreement being true and correct (without regard to materiality requirements in the merger agreement) as of the closing, other than such failures to be true and correct that would not in the aggregate result in a material adverse effect, and Pacific having performed all of its obligations under the merger agreement in all material respects;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

each of the directors of Pacific Energy Management LLC having tendered his resignation effective as of the effective time of the merger; and

Plains having received an opinion of Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. as to the treatment of the merger for U.S. federal income tax purposes and as to certain other tax matters.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Pacific's obligation to complete the merger is further subject to the following conditions:

the representations and warranties of Plains set forth in the merger agreement being true and correct (without regard to materiality requirements in the merger agreement) as of the closing, other than such failures to be true and correct that would not in the aggregate result in a material adverse effect, and Plains having performed all of its obligations under the merger agreement in all material respects; and

Pacific having received an opinion of Baker Botts L.L.P. as to the treatment of the merger for U.S. federal income tax purposes and as to certain other tax matters.

Either Plains or Pacific may choose to complete the merger even though any condition to its obligation has not been satisfied if the necessary unitholder approvals have been obtained and the law allows it to do so.

No Solicitation

Pacific and Pacific's general partner have agreed that they and Pacific's subsidiaries will not, directly or indirectly, and will direct and use their reasonable best efforts to cause such parties' representatives not to, initiate or continue any discussions with any other person with respect to a business combination while the merger is pending or to engage in any of those discussions unless the failure to do so would be reasonably likely to constitute a violation of their fiduciary obligations under applicable law.

Termination of the Merger Agreement

Plains and Pacific can agree to terminate the merger agreement at any time without completing the merger, even after unitholder approvals have been obtained. In addition, either party may terminate the merger agreement on its own without completing the merger if:

the merger is not completed by November 30, 2006 (which is referred to as the outside date), other than due to a breach of the merger agreement by the terminating party; but, if the merger is not completed by the outside date solely because regulatory approvals have not been obtained, then the outside date will automatically be extended to February 28, 2007;

any legal prohibition to completing the merger has become final and non-appealable;

the necessary unitholder approvals are not obtained at the respective unitholder meetings; or

any condition to the closing of the merger cannot be satisfied.

Termination Fees

Pacific will pay Plains a fee of \$40 million if:

the merger agreement is terminated because the Pacific board or Pacific conflicts committee changes its recommendation regarding the transaction or fails to reaffirm its recommendation of the transaction, or recommends, adopts or approves (or proposes publicly to do so) any other takeover proposal;

the Pacific conflicts committee terminates the merger agreement to accept a superior transaction; or

a termination occurs pursuant to the outside date provision after a competing proposal to acquire Pacific has been made, and Pacific consummates another acquisition transaction pursuant to which Pacific is acquired within twelve months of such termination.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Additionally, if Pacific's unitholders vote not to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger, Pacific will pay Plains a fee of \$10 million. If the negative vote occurs after a competing proposal to acquire Pacific has been made, Pacific will pay Plains an additional fee of \$30 million if Pacific consummates another acquisition transaction pursuant to which Pacific is acquired within twelve months of the negative vote.

Plains will pay Pacific a fee of \$40 million if:

the merger agreement is terminated because the Plains board changes its recommendation regarding the transaction; or

a termination occurs pursuant to the outside date provision after a competing proposal to acquire Plains has been made, and Plains consummates another acquisition transaction pursuant to which Plains is acquired within twelve months of such termination.

Additionally, if Plains' unitholders vote not to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger, Plains will pay Pacific a fee of \$10 million. If the negative vote occurs after a competing proposal to acquire Plains has been made, Plains will pay Pacific an additional fee of \$30 million if Plains consummates another acquisition transaction pursuant to which Plains is acquired within twelve months of the negative vote.

U.S. Federal Income Tax Consequences (page 157)

Tax matters are very complicated. The tax consequences of the merger to you will depend on your own situation. You are urged to consult your tax advisor for a full understanding of the U.S. federal, state, local and foreign tax consequences of the merger to you.

For U.S. federal income tax purposes, except with respect to cash received in lieu of fractional Plains common units and as described below with respect to a net decrease in a unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities, no gain or loss will be recognized by a Pacific unitholder or a Plains unitholder as a result of the merger. The merger will, however, result in the recalculation of each Plains and Pacific unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities. Each Plains unitholder and Pacific unitholder will be treated as receiving a deemed cash distribution equal to the excess, if any, of the unitholder's share of the nonrecourse liabilities immediately before the merger over the unitholder's share of the nonrecourse liabilities immediately following the merger. If the amount of the deemed cash distribution received by a Pacific unitholder or Plains unitholder exceeds such unitholder's basis in its partnership interest, such unitholder will recognize gain in an amount equal to such excess.

The application of the rules governing the allocation of nonrecourse liabilities in the context of the merger is complex and subject to uncertainty. While there can be no assurance, Plains and Pacific do not anticipate that there will be a material decrease in the amount of nonrecourse liabilities allocable to a Pacific unitholder or a Plains unitholder as a result of the merger.

Other Information Related to the Merger

No Appraisal Rights (page 97)

Neither Plains unitholders nor Pacific unitholders have appraisal rights under applicable law or contractual appraisal rights under their respective partnership agreements or the merger agreement.

Antitrust and Regulatory Clearance (page 98)

The merger is subject to both state and federal antitrust laws. Plains and Pacific made the required filings with the Federal Trade Commission, or FTC, and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, or DOJ, relating to the merger on June 30, 2006, and the applicable waiting period expired on July 31, 2006. Plains and Pacific have made required filings with Canadian regulatory authorities, and

with the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California and the Public Service Commission of the State of Wyoming, the approval of which are conditions to the merger (and in the case of Wyoming, any protest period subsequent to such approval shall have lapsed without a protest or, if a protest has been filed, such protest shall have been resolved to the reasonable satisfaction of the parties). Plains or Pacific may receive requests for information concerning the proposed merger and related transactions from the FTC or individual states.

Listing of Common Units to be Issued in the Merger (page 98)

Plains expects to obtain approval to list on the NYSE the common units to be issued pursuant to the merger agreement, which approval is a condition to the merger.

Accounting Treatment (page 98)

Plains will account for the merger using the purchase method of accounting. Under that method of accounting, the aggregate consideration that Plains pays for Pacific will be allocated to Pacific's assets and liabilities based on their fair values, with any excess being treated as goodwill. Plains currently expects to record approximately \$784 million of goodwill upon completion of the merger, but that estimate is subject to change.

Comparison of the Rights of Pacific and Plains Common Unitholders (page 130)

Pacific common unitholders (other than LB Pacific) will own Plains common units following the completion of the merger, and their rights associated with the Plains common units will be governed by, in addition to Delaware law, Plains' partnership agreement, which differs in a number of respects from Pacific's partnership agreement.

Pending Litigation (page 98)

On June 15, 2006, a lawsuit was filed against Pacific and certain of the officers and directors of Pacific's general partner. The lawsuit seeks class action status, and asserts claims of self-dealing and breach of fiduciary duty in connection with the merger and related transactions. Pacific believes that the lawsuit is without merit and intends to defend against it vigorously. There can be no assurance that additional claims will not be made or additional lawsuits filed, the substance of which may be similar to the allegations described above or that otherwise might arise from, or in connection with, the merger agreement and the transactions it contemplates.

Summary of Risk Factors

You should consider carefully all the risk factors together with all of the other information included in this joint proxy statement/prospectus before deciding how to vote. The risks related to the merger and the related transactions, the combined company's business, Plains' common units and risks resulting from its partnership structure are described under the caption "Risk Factors" beginning on page 24 of this joint proxy statement/prospectus. Some of these risks include, but are not limited to, those described below:

Plains may not be able to successfully integrate Pacific's operations with its operations;

Pacific unitholders cannot be sure of the market value of the Plains common units that they will receive;

The transactions contemplated by the merger agreement may not be consummated even if unitholder approvals for the merger are obtained;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

While the merger agreement is in effect, Plains and Pacific may be limited in their ability to pursue other attractive business opportunities;

Regulatory agencies may delay approval of the merger;

The closing of the merger may trigger a repurchase obligation with respect to Pacific's outstanding senior notes and will effectively require the amendment or refinancing of Pacific's credit facility;

Some of the directors and executive officers of Plains' and Pacific's general partner have interests that differ from those of Plains' and Pacific's unitholders;

No ruling has been requested or obtained with respect to the tax consequences of the merger;

The merger may result in income recognition by Pacific and Plains unitholders;

The intended tax consequences of the merger are dependent upon each of Plains and Pacific being treated as a partnership for tax purposes; and

Unitholders of the combined company will be subject to foreign, state and local taxes and return filing requirements in jurisdictions where they do not live.

SUMMARY HISTORICAL AND PRO FORMA FINANCIAL AND OPERATING INFORMATION

The following tables set forth, for the periods and at the dates indicated, summary historical financial and operating information for Plains and Pacific and summary pro forma financial information for Plains after giving effect to the proposed merger with Pacific. The summary historical income statement and balance sheet data for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2005 are derived from and should be read in conjunction with the audited financial statements and accompanying footnotes for such periods incorporated by reference into this joint proxy statement/prospectus. The summary historical income statement data for the six-month periods ended June 30, 2005 and 2006 and balance sheet data at June 30, 2006 are derived from and should be read in conjunction with the unaudited financial statements and accompanying footnotes for such periods incorporated by reference into this joint proxy statement/prospectus.

The summary pro forma financial statements of Plains show the pro forma effect of Plains' proposed merger with Pacific. For a complete discussion of the pro forma adjustments underlying the amounts in the table below, please read the section titled "Unaudited Pro Forma Condensed Combined Financial Statements" beginning on page F-1 of this document.

Plains' unaudited pro forma condensed statements of combined operations for the year ended December 31, 2005 and for the six months ended June 30, 2006 assume the transactions occurred on January 1, 2005. Plains' unaudited pro forma condensed combined balance sheet shows the financial effects of the transactions as if they had occurred on June 30, 2006.

**SUMMARY HISTORICAL AND PRO FORMA FINANCIAL
AND OPERATING INFORMATION OF PLAINS**

	Plains Consolidated Historical					Plains Pro Forma	
	For the Year Ended December 31,			For the Six Months Ended June 30,		For the Year Ended December 31,	For the Six Months Ended June 30,
	2003	2004	2005	2005	2006	2005	2006
(In millions, except per unit amounts)							
Statement of operations data:							
Total revenues(1)	\$ 12,589.9	\$ 20,975.5	\$ 31,177.3	\$ 13,799.2	\$ 13,527.8	\$ 31,389.0	\$ 13,661.8
Purchases and related costs(1)	(12,232.5)	(20,424.6)	(30,442.5)	(13,457.9)	(13,087.4)	(30,431.3)	(13,073.0)
Field operating costs(2)	(139.9)	(219.5)	(272.5)	(131.6)	(168.9)	(375.5)	(233.1)
General and administrative expenses(2)	(73.1)	(82.7)	(103.2)	(48.3)	(59.2)	(128.6)	(71.8)
Depreciation and amortization	(46.2)	(68.7)	(83.5)	(38.1)	(42.9)	(129.8)	(66.3)
Merger costs							(3.4)
Total costs and expenses	(12,491.7)	(20,795.5)	(30,901.7)	(13,675.9)	(13,358.4)	(31,065.2)	(13,447.6)
Other, net						(0.5)	
Operating income	98.2	180.0	275.6	123.3	169.4	323.3	214.2
Equity earnings (loss) in unconsolidated affiliates			1.0		0.9	2.8	1.8
Interest expense	(35.2)	(46.7)	(59.4)	(28.8)	(33.3)	(127.7)	(72.5)
Interest income and other, net	(3.6)	(0.2)	0.6	0.6	0.4	1.7	1.2
Income tax expense						(1.2)	2.7
Income before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle(7)	\$ 59.4	\$ 133.1	\$ 217.8	\$ 95.1	\$ 137.4	\$ 198.9	\$ 147.4
Basic net income per limited partner unit before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle	\$ 1.01	\$ 1.94	\$ 2.77	\$ 1.27	\$ 1.47	\$ 2.07	\$ 1.32
Diluted net income per limited partner unit before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.94	\$ 2.72	\$ 1.26	\$ 1.45	\$ 2.04	\$ 1.31
Basic weighted average number of limited partner units outstanding	52.7	63.3	69.3	67.7	75.5	91.6	97.8
Diluted weighted average number of limited partner units outstanding	53.4	63.3	70.5	68.7	76.3	92.8	98.6
Balance sheet data (at end of period):							
Total assets	\$ 2,095.6	\$ 3,160.4	\$ 4,120.3	\$ 4,134.5	\$ 6,018.3	\$ 8,677.6	\$ 8,677.6
Total long-term debt	\$ 519.0	\$ 949.0	\$ 951.7	\$ 953.2	\$ 1,255.1	\$ 2,632.5	\$ 2,632.5
Total debt	\$ 646.3	\$ 1,124.5	\$ 1,330.1	\$ 1,773.9	\$ 2,443.6	\$ 3,821.0	\$ 3,821.0
Partners' capital	\$ 746.7	\$ 1,070.2	\$ 1,330.7	\$ 1,000.0	\$ 1,526.1	\$ 2,548.7	\$ 2,548.7
Other Data:							
Maintenance capital expenditures	\$ 7.6	\$ 11.3	\$ 14.0	\$ 8.0	\$ 9.1	\$ 9.1	\$ 9.1
Net cash provided by (used in) operating activities(3)	\$ 115.3	\$ 104.0	\$ 24.1	\$ (453.4)	\$ (642.7)	\$ (642.7)	\$ (642.7)
Net cash provided by (used in) investing activities(3)	\$ (272.1)	\$ (651.2)	\$ (297.2)	\$ (97.4)	\$ (492.7)	\$ (492.7)	\$ (492.7)
Net cash provided by (used in) financing activities	\$ 157.2	\$ 554.5	\$ 270.6	\$ 576.6	\$ 1,141.0	\$ 1,141.0	\$ 1,141.0
Distributions per limited partner unit(4)	\$ 2.2125	\$ 2.3525	\$ 2.6500	\$ 1.2875	\$ 1.4325	\$ 1.4325	\$ 1.4325

**SUMMARY HISTORICAL AND PRO FORMA FINANCIAL
AND OPERATING INFORMATION OF PLAINS (Continued)**

Plains Consolidated Historical

		For the Year Ended December 31,			For the Six Months Ended June 30,	
		2003	2004	2005	2005	2006

(Volumes in thousands of barrels per day)

Operating Data(5):

Pipeline segment:

Tariff activities						
All American	59	54	51	52	48	
Basin	263	265	290	280	322	
Capline	N/A	123	132	152	132	
Cushing to Broome	N/A	N/A	66	54	75	
North Dakota/Trenton	N/A	39	77	67	85	
West Texas/New Mexico Area Systems(6)	189	338	428	418	460	
Canada	203	263	255	258	246	
Other	110	330	426	415	452	
Pipeline margin activities	78	74	74	71	88	
Total	902	1,486	1,799	1,767	1,908	

Gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage segment:

Crude oil lease gathered	437	589	610	625	637	
LPG sales and third party processing	38	48	56	55	66	
Waterborne foreign crude imported		12	58	57	50	
Total	475	649	724	737	753	

- (1) Includes buy/sell transactions. See Note 2 to Plains' Consolidated Financial Statements in Plains' Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2005 incorporated by reference herein.
- (2) Includes compensation expense related to Plains' 1998 Long-Term Incentive Plan and Plains' 2005 Long-Term Incentive Plan. See Item 11, "Executive Compensation Long-Term Incentive Plans" in Plains' Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2005 incorporated by reference herein.
- (3) In conjunction with the change in accounting principle Plains adopted as of January 1, 2004, Plains has reclassified cash flows for 2003 and prior years associated with purchases and sales of linefill on assets that Plains owns as cash flows from investing activities instead of the historical classification as cash flows from operating activities.
- (4) Distributions represent those declared with respect to the period and paid in the following period. Plains' general partner is entitled to receive 2% proportional distributions and also incentive distributions if the amount Plains distributes with respect to any quarter exceeds levels specified in Plains' partnership agreement. See Note 5 to Plains' Consolidated Financial Statements in Plains' Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2005 incorporated by reference herein.
- (5) Volumes associated with acquisitions represent total volumes transported for the number of days Plains actually owned the assets divided by the number of days in the period.
- (6) The aggregate of multiple systems in the West Texas/New Mexico area.
- (7)

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

The Plains pro forma income before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle for the year ended December 31, 2005 includes, as required, the following pro forma adjustments related to the acquisition of the Valero assets that Pacific acquired effective September 30, 2005: (i) depreciation expense for the entire year of approximately \$11 million associated with Plains' estimated purchase price allocated to the Valero assets; and (ii) interest expense of approximately \$11 million for the entire year on the \$175 million of 6 ¹/₄% senior notes issued to fund the asset acquisition. However, since the Valero transaction was an asset acquisition, the Plains pro forma income before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle for the year ended December 31, 2005 does not include revenues and related operating expenses for the period prior to the asset acquisition by Pacific. In addition, the Plains pro forma income before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle for the year ended December 31, 2005 and the six months ended June 30, 2006 does not include any synergies that Plains expects to achieve as a result of the merger with Pacific. For further discussion of potential business combination synergies, see the section captioned "The Merger - Additional Financial Considerations of the Parties."

SUMMARY HISTORICAL FINANCIAL AND OPERATING INFORMATION OF PACIFIC

Certain prior year balances in the accompanying condensed consolidated financial statements have been reclassified to conform to current year presentation.

	Pacific Consolidated Historical				
	Year Ended December 31,			Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2003	2004	2005	2005	2006
	(In millions, except per unit amounts)				
Consolidated Statements of Income:					
Revenue:					
Pipeline transportation(1)	\$ 101.8	\$ 108.4	\$ 116.6	\$ 55.8	\$ 68.7
Storage and terminalling(2)	12.7	37.6	52.0	21.2	42.0
Pipeline buy/sell transportation(3)		18.6	35.7	17.2	21.1
Crude oil sales, net of purchases(4)	21.3	16.8	20.0	7.8	17.5
Total revenue before expenses	135.8	181.4	224.3	102.0	149.3
Expenses:					
Operating	61.0	85.3	104.4	47.1	65.1
General and administrative	13.7	15.4	18.5	8.9	12.6
Merger costs(5)					3.4
Accelerated long-term incentive plan compensation expense(6)			3.1	3.1	
Line 63 oil release costs(7)			2.0	2.0	
Transaction costs(8)			1.8	1.8	
Depreciation and amortization	18.9	24.2	29.4	13.1	20.3
Total expenses	93.6	124.9	159.2	76.0	101.4
Share of net income (loss) of Frontier	(0.2)	1.3	1.8	0.8	0.9
Write-down of idle property(9)		(0.8)	(0.5)		
Operating income	42.0	57.0	66.4	26.8	48.8
Interest and other income	0.5	1.0	1.1	0.9	0.8
Write-off of deferred financing cost and interest rate swap termination expense		(2.9)			
Interest expense	(17.5)	(19.2)	(26.7)	(11.4)	(19.2)
Income before income taxes	25.0	35.9	40.8	16.3	30.4
Income tax (expense) benefit:					
Current		(0.2)	(1.3)	(0.5)	(1.8)
Deferred			0.1	(0.2)	4.5
		(0.2)	(1.2)	(0.7)	2.7
Net income	\$ 25.0	\$ 35.7	\$ 39.6	\$ 15.6	\$ 33.1
Basic net income per limited partner unit	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.23	\$ 1.25	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.83
Diluted net income per limited partner unit	\$ 1.09	\$ 1.23	\$ 1.25	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.83
Weighted average limited partner units outstanding:					

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Pacific Consolidated Historical

Basic	22.3	28.4	32.4	29.7	39.3
Diluted	22.5	28.5	32.4	29.7	39.3

Other Financial Data:

Net cash provided by operating activities	\$ 42.7	\$ 57.2	\$ 76.1	\$ 46.1	\$ 42.1
Net cash used in investing activities	\$ (180.3)	\$ (156.0)	\$ (512.8)	\$ (10.0)	\$ (61.1)
Net cash provided by (used in) financing activities	\$ 123.4	\$ 112.4	\$ 431.3	\$ (27.5)	\$ 23.7
Capital expenditures:					
Sustaining	\$ 2.1	\$ 1.9	\$ 6.1	\$ 0.8	\$ 2.6
Transition	0.4	1.9	11.4	3.2	4.9
Expansion	8.4	12.7	34.2	5.9	35.0
Total capital expenditures	\$ 10.9	\$ 16.5	\$ 51.7	\$ 9.9	\$ 42.5

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Balance Sheet Data (at period end):

Property and equipment, net	\$ 568.0	\$ 718.6	\$ 1,185.5	\$ 713.1	\$ 1,237.8
Total assets	\$ 650.2	\$ 869.9	\$ 1,476.5	\$ 884.3	\$ 1,588.0
Total debt, including current portion	\$ 298.0	\$ 357.2	\$ 565.6	\$ 359.2	\$ 635.4
Net partners' capital	\$ 295.1	\$ 422.5	\$ 698.2	\$ 408.2	\$ 692.0
Limited partner units outstanding	\$ 24.9	\$ 29.6	\$ 39.3	\$ 29.7	\$ 39.3

Operating Data (volumes in thousands of barrels per day):

West Coast Business Unit:					
Pipeline throughput(10)	151.0	141.2	119.6	120.0	108.2
Rocky Mountain Business Unit throughput(10):					
Rangeland system(3):					
Sundre North		21.0	21.0	23.1	21.5
Sundre South		48.1	47.1	39.7	44.2
Western Corridor system	16.7	20.2	24.7	22.2	27.9
Salt Lake City Core system	107.5	115.1	119.6	124.4	125.2
Rocky Mountain Products Pipeline(1)			60.2		60.1
Frontier pipeline(11)	41.7	47.4	47.3	51.3	45.2

- (1) Includes Pacific's ownership of the Rocky Mountain Products Pipeline acquired on September 30, 2005.
- (2) Includes Pacific's ownership of the Pacific Terminals storage and distribution system from July 31, 2003 and its ownership of Pacific Atlantic Terminals from September 30, 2005.
- (3) Includes Pacific's ownership of the Rangeland system, which Pacific acquired on May 11, 2004 and June 30, 2004.
- (4) The above amounts are net of purchases of \$358.5 million, \$402.3 million, and \$623.1 million for the years ended 2003, 2004 and 2005, respectively and \$236.8 million and \$609.9 million for the six months ended June 30, 2005 and 2006, respectively.
- (5) As a result of the proposed merger, Pacific incurred \$3.4 million in costs directly related to the merger for investment banking fees, legal fees, and other transaction costs.
- (6) In March 2005, in connection with the change in control of Pacific's general partner, all restricted units outstanding under Pacific's long-term incentive plan immediately vested. As a result, Pacific recognized \$3.1 million in compensation expense in the first quarter of 2005. Accelerated long-term incentive plan compensation expense includes \$0.6 million of operating expense and \$2.5 million of general and administrative expense.
- (7) As a result of the March 23, 2005 release of crude oil from Pacific's Line 63, Pacific recorded \$2.0 million of net oil release costs in the first quarter of 2005, consisting of what Pacific estimated to be \$25.5 million of accrued costs relating to the release, net of insurance recovery of \$17.7 million and accrued insurance receipts of \$5.8 million as of June 30, 2006.
- (8) Pursuant to an ancillary agreement, Pacific's general partner reimbursed it \$2.4 million for costs incurred in connection with a consent solicitation prepared and delivered to the holders of Pacific's 7¹/₈% senior notes to approve certain amendments to the governing indenture and for severance and other costs incurred in connection with the sale of Pacific's general partner. In accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, Pacific recorded \$0.6 million as capitalized deferred financing costs and \$1.8 million as an expense, both in the first quarter of 2005. The reimbursements were recorded as a general partner's capital contribution.
- (9) These amounts represent write-downs to fair market value of idle Pacific Terminals property that has been or is expected to be sold.
- (10) Throughput is the total number of barrels per day transported on a pipeline system. Pacific recognizes throughput at the time a barrel of crude oil is delivered to its ultimate delivery point. Throughput is presented in thousands of barrels per day.
- (11) Represents 100% of the throughput on the Frontier pipeline.

COMPARATIVE PER UNIT INFORMATION

The following table presents: (1) historical per unit information for Plains; (2) pro forma per unit information of the combined company after giving effect to the merger and the transactions related to the merger; and (3) historical and equivalent pro forma per unit information for Pacific.

The combined company pro forma per unit information was derived by combining information from the historical consolidated financial statements of Plains and Pacific using the purchase method of accounting for the merger. You should read this table together with the historical consolidated financial statements of Plains and Pacific that are filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission and incorporated by reference into this joint proxy statement/prospectus. Please read the "Where You Can Find More Information" section of this document. You should not rely on the pro forma per unit information as being necessarily indicative of actual results had the merger occurred on January 1, 2005 or June 30, 2006.

	Year Ended December 31, 2005			
	Plains		Pacific	
	Historical	Combined Company Pro Forma(1)	Historical	Equivalent Pro Forma(2)
Net income per limited partner unit before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle:				
Basic	\$ 2.77	\$ 2.10	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.62
Diluted	\$ 2.72	\$ 2.07	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.59
Cash distributions per unit(3)	\$ 2.6500	N/A	\$ 2.0925	N/A
Book value per common unit	\$ 17.54	N/A	\$ 20.90	N/A
	Six Months Ended June 30, 2006			
	Plains		Pacific	
	Historical	Combined Company Pro Forma(1)	Historical	Equivalent Pro Forma(2)
Net income per limited partner unit before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle:				
Basic	\$ 1.47	\$ 1.32	\$ 0.83	\$ 1.02
Diluted	\$ 1.45	\$ 1.31	\$ 0.83	\$ 1.01
Cash distributions per unit(3)	\$ 1.4325	N/A	\$ 1.1350	N/A
Book value per common unit	\$ 19.22	\$ 24.98	\$ 20.74	\$ 19.23

- (1) The combined company's pro forma information includes the effect of the merger on the basis described in the notes to the Unaudited Pro Forma Condensed Combined Financial Statements included elsewhere in this joint proxy statement/prospectus.
- (2) Pacific's equivalent pro forma earnings and book value amounts have been calculated by multiplying the combined company's related pro forma per unit amounts by the 0.77 exchange ratio.
- (3) Represents cash distributions per common unit declared with respect to the period and paid in the following period.

MARKET PRICES AND DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION

Plains common units are traded on the NYSE under the symbol "PAA," and Pacific common units are traded on the NYSE under the symbol "PPX." The following table sets forth, for the periods indicated, the range of high and low sales prices per unit for Plains common units and Pacific common units, on the NYSE composite tape, as well as information concerning quarterly cash distributions paid on those units. The sales prices are as reported in published financial sources.

	Plains Common Units			Pacific Common Units		
	High	Low	Distributions(1)	High	Low	Distributions(1)
2004						
First Quarter	\$ 35.23	\$ 31.18	\$ 0.5625	\$ 30.39	\$ 27.10	\$ 0.4875
Second Quarter	\$ 36.13	\$ 27.25	\$ 0.5775	\$ 28.55	\$ 21.96	\$ 0.4875
Third Quarter	\$ 35.98	\$ 31.63	\$ 0.6000	\$ 28.64	\$ 25.89	\$ 0.4875
Fourth Quarter	\$ 37.99	\$ 34.51	\$ 0.6125	\$ 29.47	\$ 26.48	\$ 0.5000
2005						
First Quarter	\$ 40.98	\$ 36.50	\$ 0.6375	\$ 33.65	\$ 28.00	\$ 0.5125
Second Quarter	\$ 45.08	\$ 38.00	\$ 0.6500	\$ 32.40	\$ 29.10	\$ 0.5125
Third Quarter	\$ 48.20	\$ 42.01	\$ 0.6750	\$ 35.69	\$ 31.07	\$ 0.5125
Fourth Quarter	\$ 42.82	\$ 38.51	\$ 0.6875	\$ 32.00	\$ 28.10	\$ 0.5550
2006						
First Quarter	\$ 47.00	\$ 39.81	\$ 0.7075	\$ 32.10	\$ 29.50	\$ 0.5675
Second Quarter	\$ 48.92	\$ 42.81	\$ 0.7250	\$ 35.06	\$ 29.80	\$ 0.5675
Third Quarter (through August 15, 2006)	\$ 47.35	\$ 43.21	\$ (2)	\$ 35.36	\$ 32.46	\$ (2)

(1) Represents cash distributions per common unit declared with respect to the quarter and paid in the following quarter.

(2) Cash distributions in respect of quarters subsequent to the first half of 2006 have not been declared or paid.

As of the record date for the special meeting, Plains had outstanding common units, beneficially held by approximately holders. Plains' partnership agreement requires it to distribute all of its "available cash," as defined in its partnership agreement, within 45 days after the end of each quarter. The payment of quarterly cash distributions by Plains in the future, therefore, will depend on the amount of "available cash" on hand at the end of each quarter.

As of the record date for the special meeting, Pacific had outstanding common units, beneficially held by approximately holders, and subordinated units, all held by LB Pacific. Pacific's partnership agreement requires it to distribute all of its "available cash," as defined in its partnership agreement, within 45 days after the end of each quarter, less reserves established by its general partner. If the merger is not completed, the payment of quarterly cash distributions by Pacific in the future will depend on the amount of "available cash" on hand at the end of each quarter.

Plains' management intends to recommend that the Plains board increase Plains' quarterly distribution from the current \$0.725 per unit to \$0.80 per unit following the closing of the merger. Plains' general partner, in support of the transaction, has agreed to reduce the incentive distributions otherwise payable to it by \$65 million in the aggregate over five four-quarter periods following the merger, beginning on the earlier to occur of (i) the first quarterly distribution declared and paid after the closing of the merger that equals or exceeds \$0.80 per unit or (ii) the second quarterly distribution declared and paid after the closing of the merger. The reduction will be equal to \$20 million in the aggregate for the first four quarters after and including the initial date, \$15 million in the aggregate for the second four quarters, \$15 million in the aggregate for the third four quarters, \$10 million in the aggregate for the fourth four quarters, and \$5 million in the aggregate for the fifth four quarters. For a description of the distribution provisions of Plains' partnership agreement, please read "Comparison of the Rights of Plains and Pacific Common Unitholders."

RISK FACTORS

You should consider carefully the following risk factors, together with all of the other information included in, or incorporated by reference into, this joint proxy statement/prospectus before deciding how to vote. This document also contains forward-looking statements that involve risks and uncertainties. Please read "Information Regarding Forward-Looking Statements."

Risks Related to the Merger and the Related Transactions

Plains may not be able to timely and successfully integrate Pacific's operations with its operations, and thus may fail to realize all of the anticipated benefits of the transaction.

Integration of the two previously independent companies will be a complex, time consuming and costly process. Failure to timely and successfully integrate these companies may have a material adverse effect on the combined company's business, financial condition and results of operations. The difficulties of combining the companies will present challenges to the combined company's management, including:

combining companies with diverse backgrounds and organizational cultures;

experiencing operational interruptions or the loss of key employees, customers or suppliers;

operating a significantly larger combined company with operations in geographic areas and business lines in which Plains has not previously operated; and

consolidating corporate and administrative functions.

The combined company will also be exposed to other risks that are commonly associated with transactions similar to the merger, such as unanticipated liabilities and costs, some of which may be material, and diversion of management's attention. As a result, the anticipated benefits of the merger, including anticipated synergies, may not be fully realized, if at all.

At the effective time of the merger, the market value of the consideration to Pacific unitholders will be determined by the price of Plains common units, which market value will decrease if the market value of Plains common units decreases, and Pacific unitholders cannot be sure of the market value of Plains common units that will be issued.

At the effective time of the merger, the market value of the consideration that Pacific unitholders will receive in the merger will depend on the trading price of Plains common units. The 0.77 exchange ratio that determines the number of Plains common units that Pacific unitholders will receive in the merger is fixed. This means that there is no "price protection" mechanism contained in the merger agreement that would adjust the number of Plains common units that Pacific unitholders will receive based on any decreases in the trading price of Plains common units. Because the parties will be required to obtain certain federal and state regulatory approvals in order to consummate the merger, the period of time between the date of the Pacific special meeting and the closing date could be substantial, thereby increasing the risk that the value of Plains common units could decrease. If Plains' common unit price decreases, the market value of the consideration received by Pacific common unitholders will also decrease. Consider the following example:

Example: Based on the closing trading price of Plains common units on August 15, 2006 of \$46.50 per unit, and based on the fixed 0.77 exchange ratio, the market value of the consideration to be received by Pacific's common unitholders would be \$35.81 per unit, or \$46.50 multiplied by 0.77. If the trading price for Plains' common units decreased 10% from \$46.50 to \$41.85 per unit, then, based on the 0.77 fixed exchange ratio, the market value of the consideration to be received by Pacific's common unitholders would decrease from \$35.81 to \$32.22 per unit, or \$41.85 multiplied by 0.77.

For historical and current market prices of Plains common units and Pacific common units, please read the "Market Prices and Distribution Information" section of this joint proxy statement/prospectus.

The transactions contemplated by the merger agreement may not be consummated even if unitholder approvals for the merger are obtained.

The merger agreement contains conditions that, if not satisfied or waived, would result in the merger not occurring, even though Plains' unitholders and Pacific's unitholders may have voted in favor of the merger agreement and related matters. In addition, Pacific and Plains can agree not to consummate the merger even if all unitholder approvals have been received. The closing conditions to the merger may not be satisfied, and any unsatisfied conditions may not be waived, which may cause the merger not to occur.

While the merger agreement is in effect, Pacific may lose opportunities to enter into different business combination transactions with other parties on more favorable terms, and both Plains and Pacific may be limited in their ability to pursue other attractive business opportunities.

While the merger agreement is in effect, Pacific is prohibited from entering into or soliciting, initiating or encouraging any inquiries or proposals that may lead to a proposal to acquire Pacific, or offer to enter into certain transactions such as a merger, sale of assets or other business combination, with any other person, subject to fiduciary obligations under applicable law. As a result of these provisions in the merger agreement, Pacific may lose opportunities to enter into more favorable transactions.

Moreover, the merger agreement provides for the payment of up to \$40 million in termination fees under specified circumstances, which fees are intended to provide a financial incentive for each of Plains and Pacific to seek to complete the proposed merger rather than to explore alternative transactions that potentially could be more favorable to its unitholders. For a detailed discussion of these termination fees, please read "The Merger Agreement Termination Fees and Expenses."

Both Plains and Pacific have also agreed to refrain from taking certain actions with respect to their businesses and financial affairs pending completion of the merger or termination of the merger agreement. These restrictions and the no-solicitation provisions (described in more detail in "The Merger Agreement") could be in effect for an extended period of time if completion of the merger is delayed.

In addition to the economic costs associated with pursuing a merger, each of Plains' and Pacific's management is devoting substantial time and other human resources to the proposed transaction and related matters, which could limit Plains' and Pacific's ability to pursue other attractive business opportunities, including potential joint ventures, stand-alone projects and other transactions. If either Plains or Pacific is unable to pursue such other attractive business opportunities, then its growth prospects and the long-term strategic position of its business and the combined business could be adversely affected.

Regulatory agencies may delay approval of the merger, which may diminish the anticipated benefits of the merger.

Completion of the merger is conditioned upon the receipt of required governmental consents, approvals, orders and authorizations. Although Plains and Pacific intend to pursue vigorously all required governmental approvals, the requirement to receive these approvals before the merger could delay the completion of the merger, possibly for a significant period of time after Plains' and Pacific's unitholders have approved the merger. Any delay in the completion of the merger could diminish anticipated benefits of the merger or result in additional transaction costs, loss of revenue or other effects associated with uncertainty about the transaction. Any uncertainty over the ability of the partnerships to complete the merger could make it more difficult for them to retain key employees or

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

to pursue business strategies. In addition, until the merger is completed, the attention of management may be diverted from ongoing business concerns and regular business responsibilities to the extent management is focused on matters relating to the transaction, such as obtaining regulatory approvals.

The completion of the merger will effectively require the amendment or refinancing of Pacific's credit facility.

The completion of the merger will result in an event of default under Pacific's credit facility. To avoid a default, the credit facility must be amended or refinanced at or before the completion of the merger. Plains currently intends to refinance this credit facility in connection with the completion of the merger. If Pacific's credit facility is not amended or refinanced prior to the completion of the merger, the resulting default could have a material adverse effect on the combined company.

The closing of the merger may trigger a repurchase obligation with respect to Pacific's outstanding senior notes.

The closing of the merger will constitute a "change of control" under Pacific's indentures for its senior notes. If the change of control results in a ratings downgrade of the Pacific senior notes by either Moody's Investors Service or Standard & Poor's within 90 days after the change of control has occurred, the combined company will be obligated to offer to repurchase each holder's senior notes at 101% of their aggregate principal amount, plus accrued interest. Pacific has \$425 million aggregate principal amount of senior notes outstanding.

If the combined company makes an offer to repurchase the notes, it is possible that holders of a large amount of Pacific's notes may exercise their repurchase right, in which case the combined company would be required to raise significant capital in the short term to fulfill the repurchase obligations. If the combined company were for any reason unable to satisfy the repurchase obligations, it would result in an event of default under Pacific's indentures, which could have a material adverse effect on the combined company.

Some of the directors and executive officers of Plains' and Pacific's general partners have interests that differ in several respects from Plains' and Pacific's unitholders.

In considering the recommendation of the board of directors of each of Plains' and Pacific's general partner to approve the merger agreement and the merger, you should consider that some of the directors and executive officers of Plains' and Pacific's general partners have interests that differ from, or are in addition to, their interests as Plains and Pacific unitholders generally. These interests include:

severance amounts that accrue to certain of Pacific's executive officers in the event of termination of employment or those officers' resignations as a result of certain changes in the terms of their employment;

accelerated vesting of Pacific's equity incentive awards;

ownership by Pacific's executive officers of equity interests in LB Pacific, which will vest on consummation of the merger;

ownership by certain of Plains' executive officers and directors of Pacific's common units;

certain members of the Pacific board being officers and members of the board of directors of LB Pacific's general partner;
and

indirect ownership by certain of Plains' executive officers and directors of Plains' general partner.

In addition, the owners of Pacific's general partner have interests that differ from owners of Pacific's limited partner interests and the owners of Plains' general partner have interests that differ

from the owners of Plains' limited partner interests. The owners of Pacific's general partner will receive cash in the transaction, a portion of which will be distributed to certain members of the Pacific board. For a detailed discussion of the interests of the directors and executive officers of Plains' and Pacific's general partners, please read "The Merger Interests of Certain Persons in the Merger."

Risks Related to the Combined Company's Business

The combined company's future financial and operating flexibility may be adversely affected by restrictions in its debt agreements and by its leverage.

Following the completion of the merger, the combined company will have a substantially increased level of consolidated debt. On a pro forma basis and excluding any debt incurred in connection with acquisitions after June 30, 2006, the combined company's consolidated long-term debt as of June 30, 2006 is estimated to be approximately \$2.6 billion immediately following the completion of the merger. Among other things, this increased leverage may be viewed negatively by credit rating agencies. Pacific's indentures for its senior notes contain non-investment grade, or high-yield, financial covenants and other restrictions. These indentures restrict, among other things, Pacific's ability to pay distributions, incur debt, sell assets, enter into affiliate transactions or create liens on its assets. In the event that the combined company maintains Plains' current investment grade credit ratings, the high-yield covenants contained in Pacific's senior note indentures will fall away, effectively resulting in indentures with investment grade covenants. In the event that the combined company does not maintain Plains' investment grade credit ratings following the merger, the combined company will be subject to the high-yield covenants currently contained in Pacific's senior note indentures. Accordingly, the combined company would be required to comply with these restrictive covenants on an enterprise-wide basis and could be subject to increased capital costs.

Debt service obligations, restrictive covenants in its revolving credit facility and the indentures governing its outstanding senior notes and maturities resulting from this leverage may adversely affect the combined company's ability to finance future operations, pursue acquisitions and fund other capital needs and the combined company's ability to pay cash distributions to unitholders, and may make the combined company's results of operations more susceptible to adverse economic or operating conditions. During an event of default under any of its debt agreements, the combined company would be prohibited from making cash distributions to its unitholders.

The combined company's trading policies cannot eliminate all price risks. In addition, any non-compliance with the combined company's trading policies could result in significant financial losses.

Generally, it will be the combined company's policy that it establish a margin for crude oil purchased by selling crude oil for physical delivery to third party users, such as independent refiners or major oil companies, or by entering into a future delivery obligation under futures contracts on the NYMEX, the Intercontinental Exchange and over-the-counter. Through these transactions, the combined company will seek to maintain a position that is substantially balanced between purchases, on the one hand, and sales or future delivery obligations, on the other hand. Plains expects that the combined company's policy generally will be not to acquire and hold crude oil, futures contracts or derivative products for the purpose of speculating on price changes. These policies and practices cannot, however, eliminate all price risks. For example, any event that disrupts the combined company's anticipated physical supply of crude oil could expose it to risk of loss resulting from price changes. The combined company will also be exposed to basis risk when crude oil is purchased against one pricing index and sold against a different index. Moreover, the combined company will be exposed to some risks that are not hedged, including price risks on certain of its inventory, such as pipeline linefill, which must be maintained in order to transport crude oil on its pipelines. In addition, the combined company will engage in a controlled trading program for up to an aggregate of 500,000 barrels of crude oil. Although this activity will be monitored independently by the combined company's risk

management function, it exposes the combined company to price risks within predefined limits and authorizations.

In addition, the combined company's trading operations may involve the risk of non-compliance with its trading policies. For example, Plains discovered in November 1999 that its trading policy was violated by one of its former employees, which resulted in aggregate losses of approximately \$181.0 million. Plains has taken steps within its organization to enhance its processes and procedures to detect unauthorized trading. There is no assurance, however, that these steps will detect and prevent all violations of the combined company's trading policies and procedures, particularly if deception or other intentional misconduct is involved.

The nature of the combined company's business and assets will expose it to significant compliance costs and liabilities.

The combined company's operations involving the storage, treatment, processing, and transportation of liquid hydrocarbons will be subject to stringent federal, state, and local laws and regulations governing the discharge of materials into the environment. The combined company's segment operations also will be subject to laws and regulations relating to protection of the environment, operational safety and related matters. Compliance with all of these laws and regulations will increase the combined company's overall cost of doing business, including its capital costs to construct, maintain and upgrade equipment and facilities. Failure to comply with these laws and regulations may result in the assessment of administrative, civil, and criminal penalties, the imposition of investigatory and remedial liabilities, the issuance of injunctions that may restrict, inhibit or prohibit the combined company's operations, or claims of damages to property or persons.

Pro forma for the merger, the combined company would own more than three times the miles of pipeline Plains owned three years ago. As Plains has expanded its pipeline assets, it has experienced a corresponding increase in the number of releases of crude oil to the environment. The combined company will be exposed to potentially substantial expense, including clean-up and remediation costs, fines and penalties, and third party claims for personal injury or property damage related to past or future releases. Some of these expenses could increase by amounts disproportionately higher than the relative increase in pipeline mileage and the increase in revenues associated therewith. The incurrence of such expenses not covered by insurance, indemnity or reserves could materially adversely affect the combined company's results of operations.

Plains and Pacific each currently spend substantial amounts to comply with DOT-mandated pipeline integrity rules. The U.S. Department of Transportation ("DOT") is currently in the process of expanding the scope of its pipeline regulation to include the establishment of additional pipeline integrity management programs for certain gathering pipeline systems that are not currently subject to regulation. Neither Plains nor Pacific currently knows what, if any, impact this will have on the combined company's operating expenses.

During 2006, Plains is expanding an internal review process started in 2004 in which it is reviewing various aspects of its pipeline and gathering systems that are not subject to the DOT pipeline integrity management rules. The purpose of this process is to review the surrounding environment, condition and operating history of these pipeline and gathering assets to determine if such assets warrant additional investment or replacement. Accordingly, the combined company could be required (as a result of additional DOT regulation), or it may elect (as a result of its own internal initiatives), to spend substantial sums to ensure the integrity of and upgrade its pipeline systems to maintain environmental compliance, and in some cases, the combined company may take pipelines out of service if it believes the cost of upgrades will exceed the value of the pipelines. Neither Plains nor Pacific can provide any assurance as to the ultimate amount or timing of future pipeline integrity expenditures for environmental compliance.

Loss of credit rating or the ability to receive open credit could negatively affect the combined company's ability to capitalize on a volatile market.

Plains and Pacific believe that, because of the combined company's strategic asset base and complementary business models, the combined company will continue to benefit from swings in market prices and shifts in market structure during periods of volatility in the crude oil market. The combined company's ability to capture that benefit, however, will be subject to numerous risks and uncertainties, including its maintaining an attractive credit rating and continuing to receive open credit from its suppliers and trade counter-parties.

A significant portion of the combined company's segment profit will be dependent upon an adequate supply of crude oil from fields located offshore and onshore in California. Production from these fields has experienced substantial production declines.

A significant portion of the combined company's segment profit will be derived from pipeline transportation margins associated with the Santa Ynez and Point Arguello fields located offshore California and the onshore fields in the San Joaquin Valley. Plains expects that there will continue to be natural production declines from each of these fields as the underlying reservoirs are depleted. Plains estimates that a 5,000 barrel per day decline in volumes shipped from the outer continental shelf fields would result in a decrease in annual pipeline segment profit of the combined company of approximately \$6.1 million (\$3.6 million from Plains' operations and \$2.5 million from Pacific's operations). A similar decline in volumes shipped from the San Joaquin Valley would result in an estimated \$3.2 million decrease in annual pipeline segment profit of the combined company, the majority of which would be related to the Pacific business. In addition to natural production declines, any significant production disruption from the outer continental shelf fields and the San Joaquin Valley due to production problems, transportation problems or other reasons could also have a similar effect on the combined company's business.

The profitability of the combined company's pipeline transportation and gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage operations will depend on the volume of crude oil shipped, purchased and gathered.

Third party shippers generally do not have long-term contractual commitments to ship crude oil on Plains' or Pacific's pipelines. A decision by a shipper to substantially reduce or cease to ship volumes of crude oil on the combined company's pipelines could cause a significant decline in its revenues. For example, Plains estimates that an average 20,000 barrel per day variance in the Basin Pipeline System within the current operating window, equivalent to an approximate 6% volume variance on that system, would change annualized segment profit by approximately \$1.4 million. In addition, Plains estimates that an average 10,000 barrel per day variance on the Capline Pipeline System, equivalent to an approximate 6% volume variance on that system, would change annualized segment profit by approximately \$1.3 million.

To maintain the volumes of crude oil the combined company purchases in connection with its gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage operations, the combined company will need to continue to contract for new supplies of domestic crude oil or increase its foreign activities in order to offset volumes lost because of natural declines in domestic crude oil production from depleting wells or volumes lost to competitors. Replacement of lost volumes of crude oil is particularly difficult in an environment where production is low and competition to gather available production is intense. Generally, because producers experience inconveniences in switching crude oil purchasers, such as delays in receipt of proceeds while awaiting the preparation of new division orders, producers typically do not change purchasers on the basis of minor variations in price. Thus, the combined company may experience difficulty acquiring crude oil at the wellhead in areas where relationships already exist between producers and other gatherers and purchasers of crude oil. Plains estimates that a 15,000 barrel per day decrease in barrels gathered by the combined company would have an approximate

\$5.0 million per year negative impact on segment profit. This impact assumes a reasonable margin throughout various market conditions. Actual margins vary based on the location of the crude oil, the strength or weakness of the market and the grade or quality of crude oil. Plains estimates that a \$0.01 variance in the average segment profit per barrel would have an approximate \$2.9 million annual effect on segment profit of the combined company.

Fluctuations in demand could negatively affect the combined company's operating results.

Demand for crude oil is dependent upon the impact of future economic conditions, fuel conservation measures, alternative fuel requirements, governmental regulation or technological advances in fuel economy and energy generation devices, all of which could reduce demand. Demand also depends on the ability and willingness of shippers having access to the combined company's transportation assets to satisfy their demand by deliveries through those assets.

Fluctuations in demand for crude oil, such as those caused by refinery downtime or shutdown, could have a negative effect on the combined company's operating results. Specifically, reduced demand in an area serviced by the combined company's transmission systems will negatively affect the throughput on such systems. Although the negative impact may be mitigated or overcome by the combined company's ability to capture differentials created by demand fluctuations, this ability is dependent on location and grade of crude oil, and thus is unpredictable.

The combined company's pipeline systems will be dependent upon its interconnections with other crude oil pipelines to reach end markets.

In many cases, the crude oil carried on the combined company's pipeline system will need to be routed onto third party pipelines to reach the refinery or other end market. Reduced throughput on these interconnecting pipelines as a result of testing, line repair, reduced operating pressures or other causes could result in reduced throughput on the combined company's pipeline systems that would adversely affect its profitability.

The combined company will face competition in its pipeline and gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage activities.

The combined company's competitors will include other crude oil pipelines, the major integrated oil companies, their marketing affiliates, and independent gatherers, brokers and marketers and local distribution companies of widely varying sizes, financial resources and experience. Some of these competitors have capital resources many times greater than those of the combined company and control greater supplies of crude oil.

The combined company may not be able to fully capitalize upon planned growth projects.

The combined company will have a number of significant organic growth projects that require the expenditure of significant amounts of capital, including Pacific's Pier 400 project, Salt Lake City expansion and Cheyenne pipeline projects, and Plains' Pine Prairie joint venture and St. James terminal projects. Many of these projects involve numerous regulatory, environmental, weather-related, political and legal uncertainties that will be beyond the control of the combined company. As these projects are undertaken, required approvals may not be obtained, may be delayed or may be obtained with conditions that materially alter the expected return associated with the underlying projects. These projects may require significant outlays of capital. Moreover, revenues associated with these organic growth projects will not increase immediately upon the expenditures of funds with respect to a particular project and these projects may be completed behind schedule or over budgeted cost. Because of continuing increased demand for materials, equipment and services, there could be shortages and cost increases associated with construction projects. The combined company may construct pipelines, facilities or other assets in anticipation of market demand that dissipates or market growth that never

materializes. As a result of these uncertainties, the anticipated benefits associated with the combined company's capital projects may not be achieved.

Plains has limited history in developing or operating natural gas storage facilities, and there are other risks associated with developing this business.

Plains entered into the natural gas storage business in September 2005 in connection with PAA/Vulcan's acquisition of Energy Center Investments LLC. Although many aspects of the natural gas storage industry are similar in many respects to Plains' crude oil gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage operations, Plains' current management has little experience in developing and operating natural gas storage facilities. There are significant risks and costs inherent in Plains' efforts to engage in natural gas storage operations, including the risk that the new line of business may not be profitable and that the combined company might not be able to operate the natural gas storage business or implement its operating policies and strategies successfully.

Plains' natural gas storage operations are conducted through PAA/Vulcan, a 50% joint venture. The board of directors of PAA/Vulcan, which includes an equal number of representatives from Plains and Vulcan Gas Storage, is responsible for providing strategic direction and policy making, and Plains is responsible for the day-to-day operations. As with any such joint venture arrangements, differences in views among the joint venture participants may result in delayed decisions or in failures to agree on major matters, potentially adversely affecting the business and operations of the joint ventures and in turn Plains' business and operations.

The devotion of capital, management time and other resources to natural gas storage operations could adversely affect the combined company's existing business. Entering into the natural gas storage industry may require substantial changes, including acquisition costs, capital development expenditures, and adding management and employees who possess the skills needed to operate a natural gas storage business. For example, Pine Prairie is currently under development and there is no guarantee that it will be fully developed in the expected time frame or at the expected cost or generate the expected returns. Participation in the natural gas storage industry will require an investment in personnel and assets and the assumption of risks that may be greater than Plains previously assumed.

If the combined company does not make acquisitions on economically acceptable terms its future growth may be limited.

The combined company's ability to grow will depend in part on its ability to make acquisitions that result in an increase in available cash per unit. If the combined company is unable to complete such accretive acquisitions either because it is (i) unable to identify attractive acquisition candidates or negotiate acceptable purchase contracts, (ii) unable to raise financing for such acquisitions on economically acceptable terms, or (iii) outbid by competitors, its future growth will be limited. In particular, competition for midstream assets and businesses has intensified substantially and as a consequence such assets and businesses have become more costly. As a result, the combined company may not be able to complete the number or size of acquisitions that it targets internally or to continue to grow as quickly as Plains has historically.

The combined company's acquisition strategy will require access to new capital. Tightened capital markets or other factors that increase the combined company's cost of capital could impair its ability to grow.

The combined company will continuously consider and enter into discussions regarding potential acquisitions. These transactions can be effected quickly, may occur at any time and may be significant in size relative to the combined company's existing assets and operations. Any material acquisition will require access to capital. Any limitations on the combined company's access to capital or increase in the cost of that capital could significantly impair its ability to execute its acquisition strategy. Assuming all other factors affecting the cost of equity capital are equal, the combined company's cost of equity

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

capital will be higher than that of Pacific on a stand-alone basis as a result of Plains' current payment of incentive distributions to its general partner at a 50% level compared to Pacific's current payment of incentive distributions to its general partner at a 15% level. In addition, the combined company's inability to maintain its targeted credit profile, including maintaining Plains' investment grade credit ratings, could negatively affect its cost of capital as well as its ability to execute its acquisition strategy.

The combined company's acquisition strategy will involve risks that may adversely affect its business.

Any acquisition involves potential risks, including:

performance from the acquired assets and businesses that is below the forecasts used in evaluating the acquisition;

a significant increase in indebtedness and working capital requirements;

the inability to timely and effectively integrate the operations of recently acquired businesses or assets;

the incurrence of substantial unforeseen environmental and other liabilities arising out of the acquired businesses or assets, including liabilities arising from the operation of the acquired businesses or assets prior to the acquisition;

risks associated with operating in lines of business that are distinct and separate from historical operations;

customer or key employee loss from the acquired businesses; and

the diversion of management's attention from other business concerns.

Any of these factors could adversely affect the combined company's ability to achieve anticipated levels of cash flows from its acquisitions, to realize other anticipated benefits and to pay distributions or meet its debt service requirements.

The combined company's assets will be subject to federal, state and provincial regulation.

The combined company's domestic interstate common carrier pipelines will be subject to regulation by the FERC under the Interstate Commerce Act. The Interstate Commerce Act requires that tariff rates for petroleum pipelines be just and reasonable and non-discriminatory. The combined company's natural gas storage operations are subject to regulations by the FERC or the Michigan Public Service Commission. In addition, failure to comply with applicable regulations under the Natural Gas Act, and certain other state laws could result in the imposition of administrative, civil and criminal remedies. The combined company also will be subject to the Pipeline Safety Regulations of the DOT. The combined company's intrastate pipeline transportation activities will be subject to various state laws and regulations as well as orders of regulatory bodies.

The combined company's Canadian pipelines will be subject to regulation by the National Energy Board ("NEB") or by provincial agencies. Under the National Energy Board Act, the NEB could investigate the tariff rates or the combined company's terms and conditions of service relating to a jurisdictional pipeline on its own initiative or at the urging of a shipper or other interested party and, if it found its rates or terms of service relating to such pipeline unjust or unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, require the combined company to reduce its rates, provide access to other shippers, or change its terms of service. A provincial agency could, on the application of a shipper or other interested party, investigate the tariff rates or the combined company's terms and conditions of service relating to its provincially regulated proprietary pipelines and, if it found its rates or terms of service unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, declare the pipelines to be common carrier pipelines and require it to reduce its rates, provide access to other shippers, or otherwise alter its terms of service.

Any reduction in the combined company's tariff rates would most likely result in lower revenue and cash flows.

The laws and regulations governing pipeline operations are subject to change and interpretation by the relevant governmental agency. Any such change or interpretation adverse to the combined company could have a material adverse effect on its operations, revenues and profitability.

The combined company's operations will be subject to cross-border regulation.

The combined company's cross-border activities with its Canadian subsidiaries will subject it to regulatory matters, including export licenses, tariffs, Canadian and U.S. customs and tax issues and toxic substance certifications. Regulations include the Short Supply Controls of the Export Administration Act, the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Toxic Substances Control Act. Violations of these license, tariffs and tax reporting requirements could result in the imposition of significant administrative, civil and criminal penalties.

Rate regulation or a successful challenge to the rates the combined company charges on its pipeline systems may reduce the amount of cash the combined company generates.

The Energy Policy Act of 1992 (the "EPAct"), among other things, deems "just and reasonable" within the meaning of the Interstate Commerce Act any oil pipeline rate in effect for the 365-day period ending on the date of the enactment of EPAct if the rate in effect was not subject to protest, investigation, or complaint during such 365-day period (that is, the EPAct "grandfathers" any such rates). The EPAct further protects any rate meeting this requirement from complaint unless the complainant can show that a substantial change occurred after the enactment of EPAct in the economic circumstances of the oil pipeline that were the basis for the rate or in the nature of the services provided which were a basis for the rate. This grandfathering protection does not apply, under certain specified circumstances, when the person filing the complaint was under a contractual prohibition against the filing of a complaint.

For the combined company's domestic interstate common carrier pipelines subject to FERC regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act, shippers may protest the combined company's pipeline tariff filings, and the FERC may investigate new or changed tariff rates. Further, other than for rates set under market-based rate authority and for rates that remain grandfathered under EPAct, the FERC may order refunds of amounts collected under rates that were in excess of a just and reasonable level when taking into consideration the pipeline system's cost of service. In addition, shippers may challenge the lawfulness of tariff rates that have become final and effective. The FERC may also investigate such rates absent shipper complaint. The FERC's ratemaking methodologies may limit the combined company's ability to set rates based on its true costs or may delay the use of rates that reflect increased costs.

The potential for a challenge to the status of the combined company's grandfathered rates under EPA (by showing a substantial change in circumstances) or a challenge to its indexed rates creates the risk that the FERC might find some of the combined company's rates to be in excess of a just and reasonable level that is, a level justified by its cost of service. In such an event, the FERC could order the combined company to reduce any such rates and could require the payment of reparations to complaining shippers for up to two years prior to the complaint.

The combined company will be exposed to the credit risk of its customers in the ordinary course of its gathering and marketing activities.

There can be no assurance that the combined company will adequately assess the creditworthiness of its existing or future counterparties or that there will not be an unanticipated deterioration in their creditworthiness, which could have an adverse impact on the combined company.

In those cases in which the combined company provides division order services for crude oil purchased at the wellhead, it may be responsible for distribution of proceeds to all parties. In other cases, it may pay all of or a portion of the production proceeds to an operator who distributes these proceeds to the various interest owners. These arrangements will expose the combined company to operator credit risk, and there can be no assurance that it will not experience losses in dealings with other parties.

The combined company may encounter increased costs and lack of availability of insurance.

Over the last several years, as the scale and scope of Plains' and Pacific's respective businesses activities have expanded, the breadth and depth of available insurance markets have contracted. Some of this may be attributable to the events of September 11, 2001, which adversely impacted the availability and costs of certain types of coverage. Plains and Pacific anticipate that the effects of hurricanes along the Gulf Coast during 2005 may also have an adverse effect on the availability and cost of coverage. You cannot be assured that the combined company will be able to maintain adequate insurance in the future at rates it considers reasonable. The occurrence of a significant event not fully insured could materially and adversely affect the combined company's operations and financial condition.

Marine transportation of crude oil has inherent operating risks.

The combined company's gathering and marketing operations will include purchasing crude oil that is carried on third party tankers and barges. The combined company's water borne cargoes of crude oil will be at risk of being damaged or lost because of events such as marine disaster, bad weather, mechanical failures, grounding or collision, fire, explosion, environmental accidents, piracy, terrorism and political instability. Such occurrences could result in death or injury to persons, loss of property or environmental damage, delays in the delivery of cargo, loss of revenues from or termination of charter contracts, governmental fines, penalties or restrictions on conducting business, higher insurance rates and damage to the combined company's reputation and customer relationships generally. While certain of these risks may be covered under its insurance program, any of these circumstances or events could increase the combined company's costs or lower its revenues.

In instances in which cargoes are purchased FOB (title transfers when the oil is loaded onto a vessel chartered by the purchaser) the contract to purchase is typically made prior to the vessel being chartered. In such circumstances the combined company will take the risk of higher than anticipated charter costs. The combined company will also be exposed to increased transit time and unanticipated demurrage charges, which involve extra payment to the owner of a vessel for delays in offloading, circumstances that the combined company may not control.

Maritime claimants could arrest the vessels carrying the combined company's cargoes.

Crew members, suppliers of goods and services to a vessel, other shippers of cargo and other parties may be entitled to a maritime lien against that vessel for unsatisfied debts, claims or damages. In many jurisdictions, a maritime lienholder may enforce its lien by arresting a vessel through foreclosure proceedings. The arrest or attachment of a vessel carrying a cargo of the combined company's oil could substantially delay its shipment.

In addition, in some jurisdictions, under the "sister ship" theory of liability, a claimant may arrest both the vessel that is subject to the claimant's maritime lien and any "associated" vessel, which is any vessel owned or controlled by the same owner. Claimants could try to assert "sister ship" liability against one vessel carrying the combined company's cargo for claims relating to a vessel with which the combined company has no relation.

The combined company will be dependent on use of a third-party marine dock for delivery of waterborne crude oil into its storage and distribution facilities in the Los Angeles basin.

A portion of the combined company's storage and distribution business conducted in the Los Angeles basin will be dependent on its ability to receive waterborne crude oil and other dark products, a major portion of which are presently being received through dock facilities operated by Shell Oil Products in the Port of Long Beach. The agreement that will allow the combined company to utilize these dock facilities expires in October 2006, and there is no guarantee that it will be renewed. If this agreement is not renewed and if other alternative dock access cannot be arranged, the volumes of crude oil and other dark products that Pacific presently receives from its customers in the Los Angeles basin may be reduced, which could result in a reduction of storage and distribution revenue and cash flow.

Changes in currency exchange rates could adversely affect the combined company's operating results.

Because the combined company will conduct operations in Canada, it will be exposed to currency fluctuations and exchange rate risks that may adversely affect its results of operations.

Terrorist attacks aimed at the combined company's facilities could adversely affect its business.

Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the U.S. government has issued warnings that energy assets, specifically the nation's pipeline infrastructure, may be future targets of terrorist organizations. These developments will subject the combined company's operations to increased risks. Any future terrorist attack that may target the combined company's facilities, those of its customers and, in some cases, those of other pipelines, could have a material adverse effect on its business.

An impairment of goodwill could reduce the combined company's earnings.

Plains had approximately \$180 million of goodwill on its consolidated balance sheet as of June 30, 2006. Plains currently expects to record approximately \$784 million of goodwill upon completion of the merger with Pacific, but that estimate is subject to change pending the completion of an independent appraisal. Consequently, pro forma for the merger, Plains expects that approximately \$964 million, representing approximately 11% of the combined company's consolidated assets at June 30, 2006 on a pro forma basis, may be recorded as goodwill. These estimates are preliminary and may be adjusted pending the completion of independent appraisals. Goodwill is recorded when the purchase price of a business exceeds the fair market value of the acquired tangible and separately measurable intangible net assets. U.S. generally accepted accounting principles, or GAAP, will require the combined company to test goodwill for impairment on an annual basis or when events or circumstances occur indicating that goodwill might be impaired. If the combined company were to determine that any of its remaining balance of goodwill was impaired, it would be required to take an immediate charge to earnings with a corresponding reduction of partners' equity and increase in balance sheet leverage as measured by debt to total capitalization.

Risks Related to Plains' Common Units and Risks Resulting from Its Partnership Structure

Cost reimbursements due to Plains' general partner may be substantial and will reduce Plains' cash available for distribution to unitholders.

Prior to making any distribution on the common units, Plains will reimburse its general partner and its affiliates, including officers and directors of its general partner, for all expenses incurred on Plains' behalf. The reimbursement of expenses and the payment of fees could adversely affect Plains' ability to make distributions. The general partner has sole discretion to determine the amount of these expenses. In addition, Plains' general partner and its affiliates may provide Plains services for which Plains will be charged reasonable fees as determined by the general partner.

Cash distributions are not guaranteed and may fluctuate with Plains' performance and the establishment of financial reserves.

Because distributions on the common units are dependent on the amount of cash Plains generates, distributions may fluctuate based on Plains' performance. The actual amount of cash that is available to be distributed each quarter will depend on numerous factors, some of which are beyond Plains' control and the control of its general partner. Cash distributions are dependent primarily on cash flow, including cash flow from financial reserves and working capital borrowings, and not solely on profitability, which is affected by non-cash items. Therefore, cash distributions might be made during periods when Plains records losses and might not be made during periods when Plains records profits.

Unitholders may not be able to remove Plains' general partner even if they wish to do so.

Plains' general partner manages and operates Plains. Unlike the holders of common stock in a corporation, unitholders have only limited voting rights on matters affecting Plains' business. Unitholders have no rights to elect the general partner or the directors of the general partner on an annual or other continuing basis.

Furthermore, if unitholders are dissatisfied with the performance of Plains' general partner, they currently have little practical ability to remove Plains' general partner or otherwise change its management. Plains' general partner may not be removed except upon the vote of the holders of at least 66²/₃% of its outstanding units (including units held by Plains' general partner or its affiliates). Because affiliates of Plains' general partner owned more than % of Plains' outstanding common units pro forma for the completion of the merger as of the record date, the removal of Plains' general partner is not readily practicable without the consent of both Plains' general partner and its affiliates.

In addition, the following provisions of Plains' partnership agreement may discourage a person or group from attempting to remove Plains' general partner or otherwise change Plains' management:

generally, if a person acquires 20% or more of any class of units then outstanding other than from Plains' general partner or its affiliates, the units owned by such person cannot be voted on any matter; and

limitations upon the ability of unitholders to call meetings or to acquire information about Plains' operations, as well as other limitations upon the unitholders' ability to influence the manner or direction of management.

As a result of these provisions, the price at which Plains' common units will trade may be lower because of the absence or reduction of a takeover premium in the trading price.

Plains may issue additional common units without unitholder approval, which would dilute a unitholder's existing ownership interests.

Plains' general partner may cause Plains to issue an unlimited number of common units without unitholder approval (subject to applicable NYSE rules). Plains may also issue at any time an unlimited number of equity securities ranking junior or senior to the common units without unitholder approval (subject to applicable NYSE rules). The issuance of additional common units or other equity securities of equal or senior rank will have the following effects:

an existing unitholder's proportionate ownership interest in Plains will decrease;

the amount of cash available for distribution on each unit may decrease;

the relative voting strength of each previously outstanding unit may be diminished; and

the market price of the common units may decline.

Plains' general partner has a limited call right that may require unitholders to sell their units at an undesirable time or price.

If at any time Plains' general partner and its affiliates own 80% or more of the common units, the general partner will have the right, but not the obligation, which it may assign to any of its affiliates, to acquire all, but not less than all, of the remaining common units held by unaffiliated persons at a price generally equal to the then current market price of the common units. As a result, unitholders may be required to sell their common units at a time when they may not desire to sell them or at a price that is less than the price they would like to receive. They may also incur a tax liability upon a sale of their common units.

Unitholders may not have limited liability if a court finds that unitholder actions constitute control of Plains' business.

Under Delaware law, a unitholder could be held liable for Plains' obligations to the same extent as a general partner if a court determined that the right of unitholders to remove Plains' general partner or to take other action under Plains' partnership agreement constituted participation in the "control" of Plains' business.

Plains' general partner generally has unlimited liability for Plains' obligations, such as Plains' debts and environmental liabilities, except for those contractual obligations that are expressly made without recourse to Plains' general partner.

In addition, Section 17-607 of the Delaware Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act provides that under some circumstances, a unitholder may be liable to Plains for the amount of a distribution for a period of three years from the date of the distribution.

Conflicts of interest could arise among Plains' general partner and Plains or its unitholders.

These conflicts may include the following:

Plains does not have any employees and Plains relies solely on employees of the general partner or, in the case of Plains Marketing Canada, employees of PMC (Nova Scotia) Company;

under Plains' partnership agreement, Plains reimburses the general partner for the costs of managing and for operating the partnership;

the amount of cash expenditures, borrowings and reserves in any quarter may affect available cash to pay quarterly distributions to unitholders;

the general partner tries to avoid being liable for partnership obligations. The general partner is permitted to protect its assets in this manner by Plains' partnership agreement. Under Plains' partnership agreement the general partner would not breach its fiduciary duty by avoiding liability for partnership obligations even if Plains can obtain more favorable terms without limiting the general partner's liability; under Plains' partnership agreement, the general partner may pay its affiliates for any services rendered on terms fair and reasonable to Plains. The general partner may also enter into additional contracts with any of its affiliates on behalf of Plains. Agreements or contracts between Plains and Plains' general partner (and its affiliates) are not necessarily the result of arms length negotiations; and

the general partner would not breach Plains' partnership agreement by exercising its call rights to purchase limited partnership interests or by assigning its call rights to one of its affiliates or to Plains.

Tax Risks Related to the Merger and to Owning Plains Common Units

You are urged to read the "Material Federal Income Tax Consequences" section of this joint proxy statement/prospectus for a more complete discussion of the following federal income tax risks related to the merger and owning and disposing of common units received in the merger.

No ruling has been obtained with respect to the tax consequences of the merger.

Although it is anticipated that no gain or loss will be recognized by a Plains unitholder or a Pacific unitholder as a result of the merger (except with respect to cash received in lieu of fractional Plains common units and a net decrease in a unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities discussed below), no ruling has been or will be requested from the Internal Revenue Service, or IRS, with respect to the tax consequences of the merger. Instead, Plains and Pacific are relying on the opinions of their respective counsel as to the tax consequences of the merger, and counsel's conclusions may not be sustained if challenged by the IRS.

The merger may result in income recognition by Pacific and Plains unitholders.

As a result of the merger, each Plains and Pacific unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities will be recalculated. Each Plains unitholder and Pacific unitholder will be treated as receiving a deemed cash distribution equal to the excess, if any, of such unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities immediately before the merger over such unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities immediately following the merger. If the amount of the deemed cash distribution received by a Pacific unitholder or a Plains unitholder exceeds the unitholder's basis in his partnership interest, such unitholder will recognize gain in an amount equal to such excess. The application of the rules governing the allocation of nonrecourse liabilities in the context of the merger is complex and subject to uncertainty. There can be no assurance that there will not be a net decrease in the amount of nonrecourse liabilities allocable to a Pacific unitholder or a Plains common unitholder as a result of the merger.

The merger may further limit the ability of a Pacific common unitholder to utilize suspended passive activity losses.

Passive loss limitations generally provide that specific taxpayers may only deduct losses from passive activities to the extent of the taxpayer's income from passive activities. The passive loss limitations are applied separately with respect to each publicly traded partnership. There is no guidance as to whether suspended passive losses related to Pacific common units will be available to offset future passive income from Plains following the merger. Accordingly, a Pacific common unitholder's ability to utilize suspended Pacific passive losses to offset Plains taxable income following the merger may be limited.

The intended tax consequences of the merger are dependent upon each of Plains and Pacific being treated as a partnership for tax purposes.

The treatment of the exchange of Pacific common units for Plains common units in the merger as a tax-free exchange is dependent upon each of Plains and Pacific being treated as a partnership for federal income tax purposes. If either Plains or Pacific were treated as a corporation for federal income tax purposes, the exchange would likely be a fully taxable transaction for a Pacific unitholder.

Plains' tax treatment depends on Plains' status as a partnership for federal income tax purposes, as well as Plains not being subject to a material amount of entity-level taxation by individual states. If the IRS were to treat Plains as a corporation or if it becomes subject to a material amount of entity-level taxation

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

for state tax purposes, that would reduce the amount of cash available for distribution to Plains' unitholders.

The anticipated after-tax economic benefit of an investment in the common units depends largely on Plains being treated as a partnership for federal income tax purposes. Plains has not requested, and does not plan to request, a ruling from the IRS on this or any other matter affecting Plains.

If Plains were treated as a corporation for federal income tax purposes, Plains would pay federal income tax on Plains' income at the corporate tax rate, which is currently a maximum of 35%, and would likely pay state income tax at varying rates. Distributions to Plains' unitholders would generally be taxed again to them as corporate distributions, and no income, gains, losses, deductions or credits would flow through to them. Treatment of Plains as a corporation would result in a material reduction in the anticipated cash flow and after-tax return to the unitholders, likely causing a substantial reduction in the value of the common units. Moreover, treatment of Plains as a corporation could materially and adversely affect Plains' ability to make cash distributions to Plains' unitholders or to make payments on Plains' debt securities.

Current law may change so as to cause Plains to be treated as a corporation for federal income tax purposes or otherwise subject Plains to entity-level taxation. In addition, because of widespread state budget deficits, several states are evaluating ways to subject partnerships to entity-level taxation through the imposition of state income, franchise or other forms of taxation. If any state were to impose a tax upon Plains as an entity, the cash available for distribution to Plains' unitholders would be reduced. Plains' partnership agreement provides that, if a law is enacted or existing law is modified or interpreted in a manner that subjects Plains to taxation as a corporation or otherwise subjects Plains to entity-level taxation for federal, state or local income tax purposes, then the minimum quarterly distribution and the target distribution levels will be adjusted to reflect the impact of that law on Plains.

If the IRS contests the federal income tax positions Plains takes, the market for Plains' common units may be adversely impacted and the cost of any IRS contest will reduce Plains' cash available for distribution or debt service.

Plains has not requested a ruling from the IRS with respect to any matter affecting Plains. The IRS may adopt positions that differ from the conclusions of Plains' counsel or from the positions Plains takes. It may be necessary to resort to administrative or court proceedings to sustain some or all of Plains' counsel's conclusions or the positions Plains takes. A court may not concur with Plains' counsel's conclusions or the positions Plains takes. Any contest with the IRS may materially and adversely impact the market for common units and the price at which they trade. In addition, the costs of any contest with the IRS, principally legal, accounting and related fees, will be borne by Plains and directly or indirectly by the unitholders and the general partner because the costs will reduce Plains' cash available for distribution or debt service.

Unitholders of the combined company may be required to pay taxes even if they do not receive any cash distributions from Plains.

Because unitholders of the combined company will be treated as partners to whom Plains will allocate taxable income which could be different in amount than the cash Plains distributes, they will be required to pay any federal income taxes and, in some cases, state and local income taxes on their share of Plains' taxable income even if they do not receive any cash distributions from Plains. Unitholders may not receive cash distributions from Plains equal to their share of Plains' taxable income or even equal to the actual tax liability that results from their share of Plains' taxable income.

Tax gain or loss on disposition of common units could be different than expected.

If Plains' unitholders sell their common units, they will recognize gain or loss equal to the difference between the amount realized and their tax basis in those common units. Prior distributions in excess of the total net taxable income allocated to a unitholder for a common unit, which decreased the unitholder's tax basis in that common unit, will, in effect, become taxable income to the unitholder if the common unit is sold at a price greater than the unitholder's tax basis in that common unit, even if the price the unitholder receives is less than the unitholder's original cost. A substantial portion of the amount realized, whether or not representing gain, may be ordinary income to the unitholder. Should the IRS successfully contest some positions Plains takes, the unitholder could recognize more gain on the sale of units than would be the case under those positions, without the benefit of decreased income in prior years. Also, if a unitholder sells units, the unitholder may incur a tax liability in excess of the amount of cash received from the sale.

Tax-exempt entities and foreign persons face unique tax issues from owning Plains' common units that may result in adverse tax consequences to them.

Investment in common units by tax-exempt entities, such as individual retirement accounts (IRAs), and non-U.S. persons raises issues unique to them. For example, virtually all of Plains' income allocated to organizations that are exempt from federal income tax, including IRAs and other retirement plans, will be unrelated business taxable income and will be taxable to them. Distributions to non-U.S. persons will be reduced by withholding taxes at the highest applicable effective tax rate, and non-U.S. persons will be required to file U.S. federal tax returns and pay tax on their share of Plains' taxable income.

Plains treats each purchaser of common units as having the same tax benefits without regard to the actual units purchased. The IRS may challenge this treatment, which could adversely affect the value of the units.

Because Plains and Pacific cannot match transferors and transferees of common units and because of other reasons, Plains and Pacific have adopted depreciation and amortization positions that do not conform with all aspects of the Treasury regulations. A successful IRS challenge to those positions could adversely affect the amount of tax benefits available to Plains' unitholders. It also could affect the timing of these tax benefits or the amount of gain from a unitholder's sale of common units and could have a negative impact on the value of the common units or result in audit adjustments to a unitholder's tax return.

Unitholders of the combined company will be subject to foreign, state and local taxes and return filing requirements in jurisdictions where they do not live as a result of an investment in Plains' units.

In addition to federal income taxes, unitholders of the combined company will be subject to other taxes, such as Canadian federal and provincial taxes, state and local taxes, unincorporated business taxes and estate, inheritance or intangible taxes that are imposed by the various jurisdictions in which Plains does business or owns property but in which such unitholders may not reside. Plains owns property and conducts business in Canada and in most states in the United States. Unitholders may be required to file tax returns and pay taxes in many or all of the jurisdictions in which Plains does business or owns property. Further, unitholders of the combined company may be subject to penalties for failure to comply with those requirements. It will be the combined company's unitholders' responsibility to file all U.S. federal, foreign, state and local tax returns. Plains' counsel has not rendered an opinion on the foreign, U.S. state or local tax consequences of an investment in Plains common units.

THE SPECIAL UNITHOLDER MEETINGS

	Plains	Pacific
Time, Place and Date	<p style="text-align: center;">, 2006 10:00 a.m., local time</p> <p>Houston, Texas</p> <p>The meeting may be adjourned or postponed to another date or place for proper purposes, including for the purpose of soliciting additional proxies.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">, 2006 8:00 a.m., local time 5900 Cherry Avenue Long Beach, California</p> <p>The meeting may be adjourned or postponed to another date or place for proper purposes, including for the purpose of soliciting additional proxies.</p>
Purposes	<p>To consider and vote on the approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger;</p> <p>To consider and vote on the approval of the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement, which Plains currently estimates to be approximately 22.3 million common units; and</p> <p>To transact other business as may properly be presented at the meeting or any adjournments of the meeting.</p> <p>At the present time, Plains knows of no other matters that will be presented for consideration at the meeting.</p>	<p>To consider and vote on the approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger; and</p> <p>To transact other business as may properly be presented at the meeting or any adjournments of the meeting.</p> <p>At the present time, Pacific knows of no other matters that will be presented for consideration at the meeting.</p>
Quorum	<p>Presence, in person or by proxy, of holders of a majority of the outstanding Plains common units.</p>	<p>Presence, in person or by proxy, of holders of a majority of the outstanding Pacific common units (excluding common units held by LB Pacific) and a majority of the outstanding Pacific subordinated units.</p>
Record Date	<p>Close of business on , 2006.</p>	<p>Close of business on , 2006.</p>
Units Entitled to Vote	<p>You may vote at the Plains meeting if you owned Plains common units as of the record date.</p>	<p>You may vote at the Pacific meeting if you owned Pacific common units or Pacific subordinated units as of the record date.</p>

You may cast one vote for each Plains common unit that you owned on the record date.

You may cast one vote for each Pacific common unit and one vote for each Pacific subordinated unit that you owned on the record date.

Recommendations of the Boards of Directors and Pacific's Conflicts Committee

The Plains board has considered the benefits of the merger as well as the associated risks and has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement, has determined that it is advisable and in the best interest of Plains and Plains' common unitholders, and has approved the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement. Accordingly, the Plains board recommends that Plains' common unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger and vote to approve the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement.

The Pacific conflicts committee, comprised of directors who are deemed to be independent of the interests of Pacific's general partner, has considered the benefits of the merger as well as the associated risks and has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's common unitholders (other than LB Pacific). Accordingly, the Pacific conflicts committee recommends that Pacific unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

The Pacific board has considered the benefits of the merger as well as the associated risks and has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's equityholders. Accordingly, the Pacific board recommends that Pacific unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

Votes Required

The affirmative vote of at least a majority of Plains' outstanding common units is required to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger and to approve the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement.

The affirmative vote of at least a majority of Pacific's outstanding common units (other than units held by LB Pacific) and at least a majority of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units, voting as separate classes, is required to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

The failure of a unitholder to vote in person or by proxy will have the effect of a vote against approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger and against the approval of the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement.

As of the record date of the Plains special meeting, directors and executive officers of Plains and their affiliates had the right to vote Plains common units, or approximately % of Plains' outstanding common units. Plains currently expects that all of the directors and executive officers of Plains and their affiliates will vote their common units in favor of the merger, although none of them has entered into any agreement obligating them to do so.

The failure of a unitholder to vote in person or by proxy will have the effect of a vote against approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger.

As of the record date of the Pacific special meeting, directors and executive officers of Pacific and their affiliates had the right to vote Pacific common units, or approximately % of Pacific's outstanding common units, excluding common units held by LB Pacific. Pacific currently expects that all of the directors and executive officers of Pacific will vote their common units in favor of the merger, although none of them has entered into any agreement obligating them to do so. In addition, LB Pacific owns all of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units. Pacific currently expects that LB Pacific will vote its subordinated units in favor of the merger. Pursuant to the purchase agreement, LB Pacific has agreed to use its commercially reasonable efforts to take all appropriate action necessary or advisable to consummate and make effective the transactions contemplated by, and to satisfy the closing conditions of, the purchase agreement and the merger agreement as promptly as practicable.

Units Outstanding

As of the record date, there were common units outstanding.

Plains

As of the record date, there were Pacific common units outstanding.

Voting Procedures

Voting by Plains Common Unitholders

Voting by Pacific Unitholders

Plains common unitholders may vote using any of the following methods:

Pacific unitholders may vote using any of the following methods:

phone the toll-free number listed on your proxy card and follow the recorded instructions;

phone the toll-free number listed on your proxy card and follow the recorded instructions;

go to the Internet website listed on your proxy card and follow the instructions provided;

go to the Internet website listed on your proxy card and follow the instructions provided;

complete, sign and mail your proxy card in the postage-paid envelope; or

complete, sign and mail your proxy card in the postage-paid envelope; or

attend the meeting and vote in person.

attend the meeting and vote in person.

If you have timely and properly submitted your proxy, clearly indicated your vote and have not revoked your proxy, your units will be voted as indicated. If you have timely and properly submitted your proxy but have not clearly indicated your vote, your units will be voted FOR approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger and FOR approval of the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement.

If you have timely and properly submitted your proxy, clearly indicated your vote and have not revoked your proxy, your units will be voted as indicated. If you have timely and properly submitted your proxy but have not clearly indicated your vote, your units will be voted FOR approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger.

If any other matters are properly presented at the meeting for consideration, the persons named in your proxy will have the discretion to vote on these matters in accordance with their best judgment. Proxies voted against adoption of the merger agreement, the merger and the issuance of Plains common units in connection with the merger will not be voted in favor of any adjournment of the meeting for the purpose of soliciting additional proxies.

If any other matters are properly presented at the meeting for consideration, the persons named in your proxy will have the discretion to vote on these matters in accordance with their best judgment. Proxies voted against adoption of the merger agreement and the merger will not be voted in favor of any adjournment of the meeting for the purpose of soliciting additional proxies.

Revocation

You may revoke your proxy at any time prior to its exercise by:

giving written notice of revocation to the Secretary of Plains' general partner;

appearing and voting in person at the Plains meeting; or

properly completing and executing a later dated proxy and delivering it to the Secretary of Plains' general partner at or before the Plains meeting.

Your presence without voting at the meeting will not automatically revoke your proxy, and any revocation during the meeting will not affect votes previously taken.

Validity

The inspectors of election will determine all questions as to the validity, form, eligibility (including time of receipt) and acceptance of proxies. Their determination will be final and binding. The board of directors of Plains' general partner has the right to waive any irregularities or conditions as to the manner of voting. Plains may accept your proxy by any form of communication permitted by Delaware law so long as Plains is reasonably assured that the communication is authorized by you.

The accompanying proxy is being solicited on behalf of the Plains board. The expenses of preparing, printing and mailing the proxy and materials used in the solicitation will be borne by Plains.

Morrow & Co., Inc. has been retained by Plains to aid in the solicitation of proxies for a fee of \$7,500 plus expenses and the reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses. Proxies may be solicited from Plains unitholders by personal interview, telephone and telegram by directors, officers and employees of Plains' general partner, who will not receive additional compensation for performing that service. Arrangements also will be made with brokerage houses and other custodians, nominees and fiduciaries for the forwarding of proxy materials to the beneficial owners of Plains units held by those persons, and Plains will reimburse them for any reasonable expenses that they incur.

Revocation

You may revoke your proxy at any time prior to its exercise by:

giving written notice of revocation to the Secretary of Pacific's general partner;

appearing and voting in person at the Pacific meeting; or

properly completing and executing a later dated proxy and delivering it to the Secretary of Pacific's general partner at or before the Pacific meeting.

Your presence without voting at the meeting will not automatically revoke your proxy, and any revocation during the meeting will not affect votes previously taken.

Validity

The inspectors of election will determine all questions as to the validity, form, eligibility (including time of receipt) and acceptance of proxies. Their determination will be final and binding. The board of directors of Pacific's general partner has the right to waive any irregularities or conditions as to the manner of voting. Pacific may accept your proxy by any form of communication permitted by Delaware law so long as Pacific is reasonably assured that the communication is authorized by you.

The accompanying proxy is being solicited on behalf of the Pacific board. The expenses of preparing, printing and mailing the proxy and materials used in the solicitation will be borne by Pacific.

D.F. King & Co., Inc. has been retained by Pacific to aid in the solicitation of proxies for a fee of \$7,500 plus expenses and the reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses. Proxies may also be solicited from Pacific unitholders by personal interview, telephone and telegram by directors, officers and employees of Pacific's general partner, who will not receive additional compensation for performing that service. Arrangements also will be made with brokerage houses and other custodians, nominees and fiduciaries for the forwarding of proxy materials to the beneficial owners of Pacific units held by those persons, and Pacific will reimburse them for any reasonable expenses that they incur.

Solicitation of Proxies

Units Held in Street Name

If you hold your units in the name of a bank, broker or other nominee, you should follow the instructions provided by your bank, broker or nominee when voting your units or when granting or revoking a proxy.

Absent specific instructions from you, your broker is not empowered to vote your units with respect to the approval and adoption of the merger agreement and the merger or, if you are a Plains unitholder, the approval of the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement. The units not voted because brokers lack power to vote them without instructions are also known as "broker non-votes."

Abstentions and broker non-votes will have the same effect as a vote against the proposals.

THE MERGER

Background of the Merger

In December 2005, representatives of Lehman Brothers Inc. met with Mr. Christopher Manning, the Chairman of the Board of Pacific's general partner and a principal of Lehman Brothers Merchant Banking, to discuss strategic alternatives for Pacific, including a possible initial public offering of Pacific's general partner or a sale of Pacific. After this meeting, Mr. Manning authorized Lehman Brothers Inc. to engage in discussions to determine the level of interest in a possible sale of Pacific. Over approximately the next three months, Lehman Brothers Inc. evaluated the field of potential buyers to acquire Pacific and contacted all twelve of those it identified as logical buyers (including Plains).

On January 10, 2006, Mr. Manning met in Houston, Texas with Mr. Greg Armstrong, the Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Plains' general partner, and Mr. Harry Pefanis, the President and Chief Operating Officer of Plains' general partner, at which time the possibility of a business combination involving Pacific and Plains was informally discussed. In addition, Plains had, since 1999, engaged in informal discussions with the former owner of Pacific's general partner regarding a potential business combination involving Plains and Pacific, which discussions were unrelated to the discussions in 2006 that led to the proposed merger.

Between March 22, 2006 and April 4, 2006, four potential buyers, referred to herein as Parties A, B, C and D, signed confidentiality agreements and began their respective due diligence reviews by meeting with members of Pacific's management in Long Beach, California. At these meetings, held separately for each of the four potential buyers, Pacific's management gave a presentation and provided information about Pacific and its prospects to the potential buyer's representatives, and answered questions relating to various aspects of Pacific's business and a possible transaction with such party.

On March 24, 2006, the full board of directors of Pacific's general partner was advised by Mr. Manning that Pacific and its management team had begun meeting with potential buyers of Pacific.

On April 4, 2006, Parties A, B, C and D were sent letters requesting proposals to acquire LB Pacific or, alternatively, both LB Pacific and Pacific together. In the letter, Lehman Brothers Inc. requested that the bidders provide detail on valuation, the form of consideration, any approvals required to consummate a transaction, financing arrangements and due diligence requirements.

On April 13, 2006, a representative of Lehman Brothers Inc. contacted a representative of Simmons & Company International, financial advisor to Plains, to invite Plains to participate in the process. On April 17, 2006, Plains signed a confidentiality agreement and members of Pacific's management provided an initial operational and financial presentation to representatives of Plains. Between April 17, 2006 and May 16, 2006, representatives of Plains conducted a due diligence review of certain financial, operational and legal matters related to Pacific.

On April 18, 2006, Party A and Party B submitted proposals. Party C and Party D did not submit proposals to Lehman Brothers Inc., and no further discussions occurred with these parties. Party A's proposal contemplated a purchase of all of the equity interests in Pacific, including those owned by LB Pacific and the public, by paying cash to LB Pacific for its ownership interests in the Pacific general partner entities as well as its common and subordinated units of Pacific, and issuing equity securities of Party A to Pacific's common unitholders (other than LB Pacific). Party A's proposal was subject to financing conditions and completion of confirmatory due diligence. Party B's proposal contemplated a purchase of LB Pacific for cash. Party B also expressed an interest in exploring alternative transactions, including an acquisition of only the general partner interest in Pacific or a combination of an investment in Pacific's general partner and a contribution of assets by Party B. Party B's proposal did not include a financing condition, but was subject to further operational and environmental due diligence.

On April 19, 2006, Mr. Armstrong notified the Plains board of management's discussions with representatives of Pacific regarding a potential business combination between Pacific and Plains and indicated that Plains' management intended to submit a non-binding proposal to acquire all of the general partner and limited partner interests of Pacific. Also on April 19, 2006, Messrs. Armstrong and Pefanis and representatives of Simmons & Company and Lehman Brothers Inc. met to discuss Plains' questions regarding the bid process.

On April 20, 2006, Plains submitted an initial, non-binding proposal contemplating a purchase of all of the equity interests in Pacific, including those owned by LB Pacific and the public, by paying cash to LB Pacific for its ownership interests in the Pacific general partner entities as well as its common and subordinated units of Pacific, and issuing Plains common units to Pacific's common unitholders (other than LB Pacific). Plains' proposal was not subject to a financing condition, but was subject to limited confirmatory due diligence.

On April 21, 2006, a representative of Lehman Brothers Inc. informed a representative of Simmons & Company that Plains' initial proposal merited further discussions between Plains and Pacific. Lehman Brothers Inc. likewise informed a representative of Party A that its initial proposal merited further discussions. Despite several requests by Lehman Brothers Inc. and a request by Mr. Manning for Party B to clarify certain aspects of its proposal, Party B did not respond. No further contacts with Party B occurred. Also on April 21, 2006, Plains' management provided a copy of Plains' initial proposal to the Plains board along with summary operational and financial information related to Pacific. Also on April 21, 2006, a representative of Simmons & Company submitted on behalf of Plains an initial due diligence request list to LB Pacific and Pacific.

On April 24, 2006, Pacific provided Plains with access to an online data room to respond to Plains' various document requests and inquiries. Between late April 2006 and May 16, 2006, Plains and Party A conducted due diligence on Pacific both in person and through the online dataroom. Pacific made available to Plains and Party A data regarding the revenues, expenses, capital expenditures, general and administrative expenses, financial performance, facilities, assets and liabilities of Pacific. During this time Pacific made certain of its employees available to Plains and Party A for detailed due diligence discussions. Plains' due diligence review continued through June 11, 2006 and Plains' management was assisted in its due diligence efforts by Simmons & Company, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, transaction services advisors to Plains, and Vinson & Elkins L.L.P., primary outside counsel to Plains.

On April 25, 2006, Plains' management provided the Plains board with a summary overview of Pacific and the merits and risks associated with a potential combination. The management summary addressed, among other things, Pacific's strategic fit with Plains, potential synergies, a brief summary of Pacific's major assets and estimated cash flow contribution and the potential risks and challenges associated with the acquisition of Pacific.

On April 28, 2006, members of Plains' and Pacific's management teams met in Long Beach, California to discuss certain due diligence matters with respect to Pacific.

At the end of April 2006, the Pacific conflicts committee was advised by Pacific's management that it was becoming increasingly likely that the conflicts committee would be required to review a possible transaction involving a sale of Pacific or its general partner. The conflicts committee consisted of the four independent directors on the board, Messrs. John C. Linehan (Chairman), David L. Lemmon, Jim E. Shamas and William L. Thacker. Following this notice, the conflicts committee engaged Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A. to act as its legal counsel, and Petrie Parkman & Co. to act as its financial advisor.

On May 1, 2006, initial drafts of a purchase agreement and merger agreement prepared by Baker Botts L.L.P., counsel to LB Pacific, and Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell LLP, special Delaware counsel to LB Pacific, were delivered to Plains' management and to Party A.

On May 2, 2006, the Pacific conflicts committee met at the Lafayette Park Hotel in Lafayette, California. The committee's advisors, Petrie Parkman and Richards, Layton & Finger, participated in the meeting via telephone. In addition, Mr. Manning and Mr. Irvin Toole, Pacific's President and Chief Executive Officer, were asked to participate in the meeting. Mr. Manning described the background and status of the consideration by LB Pacific of a potential business combination involving Pacific. Following Mr. Manning's presentation, there was a discussion regarding the potential transactions and alternatives. After excusing Messrs. Manning and Toole from the meeting, Richards, Layton & Finger advised the conflicts committee regarding certain legal matters. The conflicts committee also discussed the anticipated next steps in evaluating a potential business combination involving Pacific.

On May 3, 2006, at a regularly-scheduled meeting of the Pacific board, Mr. Manning updated the Pacific directors as to the status of the proposals that had been received from Plains, Party A and Party B, and informed the directors that final proposals would be requested from Plains and Party A. He also stated that calls to the representatives of Party B to discuss its initial proposal and to assess its interest in submitting a final proposal were not being returned, so it did not appear likely that a final proposal would be received from Party B.

Also on May 3, 2006, representatives of management of Party A gave a presentation to Pacific's management covering Party A's business, properties, assets, strategies and stand-alone financial and operational projections. Also on May 3, 2006, Plains' management advised the Plains board as to the status of its discussions with Pacific and that final proposals from bidders would be requested to be delivered on May 16, 2006. Also on that date, Plains' management informed the Plains board that it anticipated holding a board meeting on May 15, 2006 to discuss its final proposal prior to submittal.

On May 8, 2006, representatives of Plains' management gave a presentation to Pacific's management and representatives covering Plains' business, properties, assets, strategies and stand-alone financial and operational projections.

On May 10, 2006, through its online data room, Pacific provided Plains with unrisksed projections, which are referred to as the "upside case" and "Case 2" in the financial analyses of Lehman Brothers Inc. and Petrie Parkman & Co., respectively, summaries of which are included elsewhere in this joint proxy statement/prospectus.

Between May 10 and May 15, 2006, Plains' management delivered to the Plains board a compilation of materials related to the potential acquisition of Pacific. The information delivered provided an operational and financial overview of Pacific, including an accretion/dilution analysis of the combination and other transaction-related information.

On May 11, 2006, letters were sent to Plains and Party A requesting that final proposals be submitted by May 16th, together with any proposed revisions to the draft transaction agreements previously provided. The letters requested that bidders provide final proposals as to the form and amount of consideration, required approvals and conditions to closing, financing arrangements and further due diligence requirements.

Also on May 11, 2006, Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Gary Petersen, a member of the Plains board, participated in a charity golf tournament with a representative of Lehman Brothers Inc. during which the proposed transaction was informally discussed. Mr. Armstrong and the Lehman Brothers Inc. representative were later joined by a representative of Simmons & Company.

On May 15, 2006, the Plains board convened a special meeting to consider the potential acquisition of Pacific. Following significant discussion and deliberation, the Plains board unanimously approved the submission by Plains' management of a final proposal to acquire LB Pacific's ownership interests in the Pacific general partner entities as well as its common and subordinated units and the common units of Pacific held by persons other than LB Pacific, subject to certain specified financial and exchange ratio limitations.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

On various dates prior to Plains' submittal of a proposal on May 16, 2006, Mr. Armstrong had individual discussions with Messrs. David N. Capobianco, Gary R. Petersen and Robert V. Sinnott, each of whom serve on the Plains board as a designee of one of the owners of the Plains general partner. The discussions involved the possibility that the general partner would reduce the incentive distributions otherwise payable to the general partner for some period of time. The purpose of the potential reduction would be to facilitate the proposed transaction. It was noted in these discussions that a reduction in the incentive distributions would require an amendment to the Plains partnership agreement, which in turn would require approval of at least 66²/₃% of the ownership interest in Plains' general partner. Collectively, affiliates of these three directors and Plains' management own approximately 90% of the ownership interests in Plains' general partner.

On May 16, 2006, Mr. Armstrong met with representatives of Simmons & Company and Lehman Brothers Inc. to discuss clarification of the bid process and proposal parameters.

Also on May 16, 2006, Plains and Party A submitted final written proposals. Relative to its initial proposal, Party A's proposal provided for reduced consideration to both LB Pacific and Pacific's public unitholders. The proposal was subject to board approval and resolution of remaining due diligence items. Party A's revisions to the merger agreement included substantial revisions to the nonsolicitation provisions of the document, and proposed a \$45 million termination fee. Shortly after submitting its final proposal, Party A was informed that its offer was inferior to other offers received, both in terms of consideration to LB Pacific and consideration to the public unitholders. Party A indicated it was willing to increase the purchase price payable to LB Pacific to a level consistent with its initial proposal. Party A did not indicate that it was willing to increase the consideration to Pacific common unitholders. The parties did not pursue additional discussions with Party A after the May 16th discussion.

In its final written proposal, Plains offered to pay \$725 million in cash to LB Pacific (for its ownership interests in Pacific's general partner entities, as well as its common and subordinated units of Pacific), and 0.75 Plains common units for each Pacific common unit held by the public (other than LB Pacific). In its proposal, Plains also stated that management intended to recommend that the Plains board increase the Plains quarterly distribution rate to \$0.80 per unit following the proposed combination from the then current \$0.7075 per unit, and that its general partner had indicated a willingness to reduce its incentive distributions by \$10 million in 2007 and \$5 million in 2008. Plains' proposal was not subject to a financing condition or further due diligence, and had been unanimously approved by the Plains board. Plains' proposal was subject to obtaining the requisite approvals from (i) the owners of Plains All American GP LLC for the merger and any reductions in incentive distribution payments and (ii) Plains' unitholders for the merger and the issuance of Plains common units. Plains' proposed changes to the merger agreement contained substantial revisions to the nonsolicitation and termination fee provisions and proposed a \$40 million termination fee (\$15 million of which was payable if Pacific's unitholders did not approve the merger agreement).

On May 17, 2006, Messrs. Armstrong and Pefanis and representatives of Simmons & Company and Lehman Brothers Inc. met in Houston, Texas to discuss and clarify certain aspects of Plains' final written proposal. The conversation was primarily focused on the assumptions that Plains' management had used in its analysis, including synergies, acquisition financing, growth projects and the reduction in Plains' general partner's incentive distributions.

The Pacific board adopted resolutions effective May 18, 2006 formally authorizing and delegating to the Pacific conflicts committee various responsibilities, including: (i) reviewing, evaluating and negotiating (or delegating the ability to negotiate) any proposed business combination involving Pacific or any alternatives thereto; (ii) evaluating whether any proposed business combination or any alternatives thereto are fair and reasonable to, and in the best interests of, the common unitholders of Pacific, other than LB Pacific; and (iii) making a recommendation to the board as to what action, if any, should be taken by the Pacific board with respect to the proposed business combination or any

alternatives thereto. The resolutions further provided that the Pacific board would not recommend a proposed business combination or alternatives thereto for approval by the holders of Pacific units without the prior approval of the Pacific conflicts committee. In addition, the resolutions provided that the chairman of the conflicts committee be paid \$50,000 and each of the three other members of the conflicts committee be paid \$40,000 for their services.

On May 18, 2006, the Plains board convened a regularly scheduled meeting. At this meeting, Plains' management updated members of the Plains board as to the ongoing discussions among Plains, Pacific and their respective representatives. Mr. Armstrong also described the potential temporary adjustment to the general partner's incentive distributions to Messrs. Everardo Goyanes, J. Taft Symonds and Arthur L. Smith, members of the Plains board who are not affiliated with the owners of the general partner.

On May 19, 2006, the Pacific conflicts committee met telephonically with its legal and financial advisors. During this meeting, Petrie Parkman provided a status report on the ongoing negotiations with respect to a potential business combination involving Pacific. Also on May 19, 2006, Baker Botts sent drafts of the transaction agreements, revised to incorporate certain of the comments contained in Plains' May 16th proposal, to Pacific's management, Andrews Kurth LLP, which had been retained by Pacific as its primary outside legal counsel in connection with the potential transaction, and Richards, Layton & Finger. Over the course of the following four days, representatives of LB Pacific, Pacific management, Baker Botts, Richards, Layton & Finger and Andrews Kurth, met telephonically to discuss various issues with respect to the draft transaction agreements, including:

the amount of the termination fee and the application of the termination fee if Pacific's unitholders did not approve the merger;

Plains' proposed ability to require the conflicts committee and the board of directors of Pacific to reaffirm their recommendations of the transaction upon request;

the proposed requirement that Pacific's full board concur with any decision by the conflicts committee to terminate the merger agreement in order to accept a superior proposal; and

certain employee issues, including Plains' assumption of Pacific's obligations under existing employee plans and agreements.

On May 23, 2006, Baker Botts sent revised drafts of the transaction agreements to Vinson & Elkins, as well as to Pacific's management, LB Pacific, Lehman Brothers Inc., Richards, Layton & Finger and Andrews Kurth.

On May 24, 2006, the Pacific conflicts committee, along with its advisors, Petrie Parkman and Richards, Layton & Finger, conducted a series of meetings in Houston, Texas with representatives of Lehman Brothers Inc., Plains' management and Pacific's management. Also present at the meetings were representatives of Andrews Kurth and representatives of Deloitte & Touche LLP, which had been retained by Pacific to conduct accounting due diligence on Plains. Lehman Brothers Inc. provided an overview of the process to date and a preliminary analysis of the proposed offers from Party A and Plains. Plains made a management presentation that discussed its strategy, five-year financial plan and potential benefits of the proposed transaction. Pacific management made a presentation on the status of their business and financial forecasts, including their management case and upside case.

Between May 25, 2006 and June 9, 2006, Pacific's management and representatives of Lehman Brothers Inc., Petrie Parkman, Andrews Kurth and Deloitte & Touche conducted a due diligence review of certain financial, accounting, operational, corporate and legal materials of Plains. Materials provided included general corporate materials, management reports, litigation summaries, material contracts, title materials, benefits arrangements and summaries and environmental and regulatory information. Pacific's management and its advisors also had a number of due diligence meetings with representatives

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

of Plains' management to discuss various aspects of Plains' business and its prospects, including, specifically, meetings to discuss accounting and finance, tax matters, litigation and legal matters, environmental issues, operations, corporate affairs and property and rights-of way.

On May 25, 2006, representatives of Baker Botts, Richards Layton & Finger, Vinson & Elkins, and Prickett, Jones & Elliott, P.A., special Delaware counsel to Plains, met telephonically to discuss various issues pertaining to the transaction agreements. The parties discussed, without resolution, Pacific's proposed changes to the definition of what constituted a "material adverse effect" and to the nonsolicitation and termination fee provisions. On May 26, 2006, Vinson & Elkins distributed revised drafts of the transaction agreements to Baker Botts. Over the course of the next five days, representatives of LB Pacific, Pacific management, Baker Botts, Andrews Kurth and Richards, Layton & Finger met telephonically and/or in person to discuss the revised transaction agreements.

On May 30, 2006, the Pacific conflicts committee met telephonically with its advisors. The conflicts committee and its advisors discussed the status of Pacific's transactional due diligence with respect to Plains. It was decided that one or more members of the conflicts committee and the committee's advisors would meet with Plains' management to discuss certain due diligence information as requested by the conflicts committee. As a result of this meeting, Pacific's representatives were provided access to certain sensitive business information of Plains that Pacific deemed necessary to its due diligence review of Plains.

On May 31, 2006, representatives of Plains, Pacific, Simmons & Company, Lehman Brothers Inc., Vinson & Elkins and Baker Botts met in Baker Botts's offices in Houston, Texas (with some persons participating telephonically). The parties discussed the outstanding issues on the transaction agreements, including the following:

Plains' desire to require that a portion of the termination fee be payable if Pacific's unitholders did not approve the merger, regardless of whether a competing transaction had been proposed;

Plains' proposal to require that Pacific's full board concur with any decision by the conflicts committee to terminate the merger agreement in order to accept a superior proposal;

Plains' proposals for various thresholds in the covenants governing the parties' conduct of business between the signing of the merger agreement and the closing of the merger; and

certain employee issues, including Pacific's proposal for the payment of retention benefits and Pacific's desire for Plains to expressly assume the obligations of Pacific's general partner under existing employee plans and agreements.

After multiple break-out sessions and resumed discussions, the parties reached mutually agreeable resolutions of most of the outstanding issues, including the following:

Plains agreed to reduce from \$15 million to \$10 million the amount of the termination fee payable if Pacific's unitholders did not approve the merger;

Plains agreed that Pacific's full board would not be required to concur with the conflicts committee's decision to terminate the agreement in order to accept a superior proposal;

Plains and Pacific reached compromises on the various thresholds in the operating covenants; and

Plains agreed in principle to Pacific's proposed retention benefit amounts, and agreed to guarantee all obligations of the obligors under Pacific's existing employee plans and agreements.

That evening, Baker Botts distributed revised drafts of the transaction agreements reflecting the parties' discussions earlier that day. Throughout the course of the following day, Baker Botts and Vinson & Elkins met several times telephonically to make further progress toward resolving the

remaining documentation issues. On June 1, 2006, Vinson & Elkins distributed revised drafts of the transaction agreements.

Also on June 1, 2006, Messrs. John Linehan and William Thacker, two members of the Pacific conflicts committee, and representatives of Petrie Parkman and Richards, Layton & Finger, met in Houston, Texas to review sensitive business information of Plains that had been made available to the Pacific conflicts committee and to meet with members of Plains' senior management. During the meeting with Plains' senior management, there was extensive discussion regarding Plains' business condition and prospects, synergies from the potential business combination, potential additional acquisitions, risks of a reduction in its credit ratings and related issues, integration issues, risk management issues and various other financial issues.

On June 2, 2006, the Pacific conflicts committee met telephonically with its legal and financial advisors. Members of Pacific's management and Andrews Kurth also participated in this meeting. Messrs. Linehan and Thacker, along with the conflicts committee's advisors, presented a report on the information reviewed and discussions held with Plains' senior management the day before in Houston, Texas. There was discussion regarding due diligence results to date, the status of the due diligence review and any remaining open items, and the engagement of Lehman Brothers Inc. as financial advisor to Pacific and the terms of the engagement. After all persons other than the conflicts committee members and the committee's advisors were dismissed from the meeting, Petrie Parkman made a preliminary presentation analyzing the potential business combination between Pacific and Plains, and the conflicts committee discussed the merits of such a business combination from the perspective of the common unitholders of Pacific, other than LB Pacific. Also on June 2, 2006, Baker Botts distributed revised drafts of the transaction agreements to the working group, including the conflicts committee and its advisors for consideration at their next meeting.

Also on June 2, 2006, Plains' management updated members of the Plains board as to the status of ongoing discussions among Plains, Pacific and their respective representatives.

On June 7, 2006, the Pacific conflicts committee met in Houston, Texas, with its financial and legal advisors. One committee member participated by telephone. Also present at the invitation of the conflicts committee were members of Pacific management, Andrews Kurth, Deloitte & Touche and Lehman Brothers Inc. The Pacific management team made a presentation of management's views and assessment of the proposed transaction with Plains. Lehman Brothers Inc. made a presentation regarding the terms and structure of the potential transaction with Plains and an analysis of the potential transaction from a financial point of view to Pacific and all of its equityholders as a whole. There also was discussion regarding the results of due diligence on Plains and the status of the due diligence process. After excusing Lehman Brothers Inc. from the meeting, the conflicts committee and its advisors and Pacific management discussed various aspects of the potential transaction with Plains. Following this discussion, the conflicts committee excused from the meeting all persons other than the committee's advisors. Petrie Parkman made a detailed presentation regarding the potential transaction with Plains, including an analysis of the potential transaction from a financial point of view from the perspective of Pacific's common unitholders other than LB Pacific, and there was extensive discussion regarding the merits of the potential transaction. Richards, Layton & Finger made a presentation regarding various legal matters relating to the potential transaction and the conflicts committee's consideration of the potential transaction. At this point in the meeting, the conflicts committee invited Mr. Manning and Mr. Josh Collins, a member of the Pacific board and a principal of Lehman Brothers Merchant Banking, to join the meeting to discuss the process by which LB Pacific had explored potential business combinations, and the views of Lehman Brothers Merchant Banking as to the prospects of Pacific and the terms of the potential transaction with Plains. After excusing Messrs. Manning and Collins from the meeting, the conflicts committee and its advisors further discussed the merits and risks of the proposed transaction with Plains and the prospects for Pacific as a stand-alone entity. Following this discussion, the conflicts committee determined that a counteroffer

should be made and agreed upon the terms of such counteroffer. The conflicts committee then invited representatives of Lehman Brothers Merchant Banking and Pacific senior management to join the meeting, and Mr. Linehan then informed them that the committee would be willing to approve the proposed transaction with Plains if the exchange ratio were increased from 0.75 to 0.82 Plains common units for each Pacific common unit (other than common units owned by LB Pacific). That evening, Andrews Kurth and Richards, Layton & Finger provided Vinson & Elkins and Baker Botts with comments to the merger agreement based on the conflicts committee's discussions earlier that day. The comments reflected the proposed increase to the exchange ratio, as well as revisions to the nonsolicitation provisions and the employee-related covenants, among other things.

On June 8 and 9, 2006, various discussions took place between and among representatives of Plains, LB Pacific, Lehman Brothers Inc. and Simmons & Company. Such discussions resulted in the revised proposal that representatives of Lehman Brothers Inc. presented to the Pacific conflicts committee on June 10th.

On June 9, 2006, Vinson & Elkins distributed revised drafts of the transaction agreements, which contained changes responsive to the comments proposed by Andrews Kurth and Richards, Layton & Finger on June 7th. The revised drafts incorporated in large part the proposed changes to the nonsolicitation provisions of the merger agreement, but did not address some of the employee-related comments in the June 7th mark-up.

On June 10, 2006, the Pacific conflicts committee met telephonically. Representatives of Richards, Layton & Finger, Petrie Parkman, Pacific management, Lehman Brothers Inc., Lehman Brothers Merchant Banking and Baker Botts also attended portions of the meeting. During the meeting, representatives of Lehman Brothers Inc. presented to the conflicts committee a revised proposal to which both Plains and LB Pacific were willing to agree, which decreased the cash consideration to LB Pacific by \$25 million, to \$700 million, increased the exchange ratio in the merger from 0.75 to 0.77 Plains common units per Pacific common unit (other than common units owned by LB Pacific), and increased the amount by which Plains' general partner would agree to reduce its incentive distributions from \$15 million over two years to \$65 million over five years. A representative of Lehman Brothers Inc. told the conflicts committee members that he had been advised by Plains and LB Pacific that the proposal represented the best and final offer from both Plains and LB Pacific. After excusing all participants except the conflicts committee members and the committee's advisors, there was discussion regarding whether the revised offer truly represented the best and final offer from Plains and LB Pacific. Mr. Linehan reported that he had received separate calls the day before from Mr. Manning and Mr. Toole, respectively, informing him that this revised offer would be the best and final offer from LB Pacific and Plains. After further discussion, the committee determined that Mr. Linehan should contact Mr. Armstrong to determine whether there was any further room for an increase in the consideration from Plains. The conflicts committee agreed to consider the revised proposal from Plains and LB Pacific further after Petrie Parkman had the opportunity to review the revised proposal in detail, the parties had resolved all remaining documentation issues and Mr. Linehan had his anticipated conversation with Mr. Armstrong. Later that day, Baker Botts sent revised drafts of the transaction agreements to Vinson & Elkins, which drafts reflected the changes to the economic terms and Pacific's response on the remaining outstanding employee-related issues.

On June 11, 2006, the Plains board met telephonically with its advisors to review the proposed transaction. Plains' senior management advised the members of the board as to the status of the parties' discussions and anticipated timing for executing definitive transaction agreements. Plains' senior management also discussed the projected operating and financial performance of Plains, Pacific and the combined company. Plains' senior management discussed its plan to permanently finance the acquisition as well as liquidity and rating agency matters. Simmons & Company made a detailed presentation analyzing the proposed acquisition. Following the presentation and discussion, Simmons & Company delivered its oral opinion (subsequently confirmed in writing) that, as of June 11, 2006, based

upon and subject to the factors and assumptions set forth in its opinion, the aggregate consideration to be paid by Plains as set forth in the transaction agreements was fair, from a financial point of view, to Plains and Plains' common unitholders (other than those unitholders holding a direct or indirect interest in Plains' general partner). Next, Vinson & Elkins reviewed the terms of the transaction as reflected in the forms of the transaction agreements. Vinson & Elkins also advised the board regarding certain legal matters and the board's consideration of the potential transaction. Following extensive discussion regarding the proposed acquisition, the members of the Plains board unanimously approved the purchase agreement, the merger agreement and the merger and related transactions (including the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement). The Plains board also determined to recommend that Plains' unitholders approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger and approve the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement.

Following the Plains board's meeting, members of senior management of Plains and Pacific, as well as representatives of Petrie Parkman, Baker Botts, Vinson & Elkins, Richards, Layton & Finger and Andrews Kurth, met telephonically to discuss the remaining issues on the transaction agreements. The parties reached agreement on all issues other than the timing of the reductions to Plains' general partner's incentive distributions, which the parties planned to resolve later that day.

Later in the day on June 11th, the Pacific conflicts committee met telephonically with its advisors to review the proposed transaction. Mr. Linehan reported that he had spoken with Mr. Armstrong, and during the discussion Mr. Armstrong had stated that the revised proposal was Plains' best and final offer. Petrie Parkman and Richards, Layton & Finger then apprised the conflicts committee members of the status of discussions and reviewed the terms of the transaction as reflected in the forms of the transaction agreements. Next, Petrie Parkman made a detailed presentation analyzing the revised proposal. Following the presentation and discussion, Petrie Parkman stated that it expected to be in a position to provide, at the request of the committee, an oral opinion that the exchange ratio of 0.77 Plains common units for each Pacific common unit was fair from a financial point of view to Pacific's common unitholders other than LB Pacific. Richards, Layton & Finger advised the conflicts committee members regarding certain corporate law matters. Following extensive discussion, the conflicts committee agreed to approve the merger agreement and the merger, subject to satisfactory resolution as to the timing of the reductions to Plains' general partner's incentive distributions. The conflicts committee agreed to meet again later that day after receipt of Plains' proposal on the incentive distribution reductions.

Also on June 11, representatives of Plains obtained a member's consent of Plains All American GP LLC approving (i) a prospective amendment to Plains' partnership agreement, to become effective upon consummation of the merger, that would reduce the incentive distribution payments as reflected in the merger agreement and (ii) the merger.

Shortly after receipt of Plains' proposal on the incentive distribution reductions, the Pacific conflicts committee met again telephonically with its advisors. After discussion, the conflicts committee concluded that the terms of Plains' proposal on the incentive distribution reductions was satisfactory. The conflicts committee then requested Petrie Parkman's oral opinion as to the fairness of the financial consideration offered in the proposed merger. Petrie Parkman delivered its oral opinion (subsequently confirmed in writing) to the conflicts committee that, as of June 11, 2006, based upon and subject to the factors and assumptions set forth in its opinion, the exchange ratio of 0.77 Plains common units for each Pacific common unit (other than common units owned by LB Pacific) was fair from a financial point of view to Pacific's common unitholders other than LB Pacific. After further discussion regarding the proposed transaction, the committee members unanimously determined that the terms of the merger agreement and the merger, including the relative consideration to be received by LB Pacific on the one hand, and the common unitholders other than LB Pacific on the other hand, were fair to Pacific's common unitholders (other than LB Pacific). The committee members unanimously approved the merger agreement and the merger. The committee members also determined that the committee's

approval of the merger agreement and related transactions constituted "special approval" pursuant to Pacific's partnership agreement. The Pacific conflicts committee also determined to recommend that Pacific's unitholders approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

Later that evening, the board of directors of Pacific's general partner met telephonically to review the transaction. At the meeting, Pacific's management, together with representatives of Lehman Brothers Inc., Andrews Kurth and Baker Botts, apprised the board of the status of discussions and reviewed the terms of the transaction as reflected in the forms of the transaction agreements. Lehman Brothers Inc. delivered its oral opinion (subsequently confirmed in writing) to the board that, as of June 11, 2006, based upon and subject to the factors and assumptions set forth in its opinion, the aggregate consideration to be offered to all holders of the partnership interests of Pacific was fair, from a financial point of view, to such holders. Andrews Kurth advised the board regarding certain legal matters and the board's consideration of the potential transaction. At the request of Mr. Manning, Mr. Linehan and Richards, Layton & Finger provided a brief report regarding the work of the Pacific conflicts committee and its recommendations to the Pacific board. Following extensive discussion, the Pacific board unanimously approved the merger agreement and the merger. The Pacific board also determined to recommend that Pacific's unitholders approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

After the meetings, the merger agreement, purchase agreement, disclosure schedules and ancillary documents were finalized, and the transaction agreements were executed by the parties thereto. On June 12, 2006, Plains and Pacific issued a joint press release announcing the execution of the transaction agreements.

On June 15, 2006, a lawsuit was filed in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, entitled *Kosseff v. Pacific Energy, et al.*, case no. BC 3544016. The plaintiff alleges that he is a unitholder of Pacific, and he seeks to represent a class comprising all of Pacific's unitholders. The complaint names as defendants Pacific and certain of the officers and directors of Pacific's general partner, and asserts claims of self-dealing and breach of fiduciary duty in connection with the merger and related transactions. The plaintiff seeks injunctive relief against completing the merger or, if the merger is completed, rescission of the merger, other equitable relief, and recovery of the plaintiff's costs and attorneys' fees. On July 12, 2006, the court entered a stay of the proceeding pending an initial status conference, which has been scheduled for September 6, 2006.

Recommendation of the Board of Directors and Conflicts Committee of Pacific's General Partner and Reasons for the Merger

The Pacific board has considered the benefits of the merger as well as the associated risks and has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's equityholders. Accordingly, the Pacific board recommends that Pacific unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

In addition, the Pacific conflicts committee, comprised of directors who are deemed to be independent of the interests of Pacific's general partner, has considered the benefits of the merger as well as the associated risks and has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement and determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of Pacific and Pacific's common unitholders. Accordingly, the Pacific conflicts committee recommends that Pacific unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger.

In considering the recommendation of the Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee with respect to the merger, you should be aware that some executive officers and directors have interests in the merger that are different from, or in addition to, the interests of Pacific's common unitholders

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

generally. The Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee were aware of these interests in approving the merger agreement and the merger.

In reaching their respective decisions on the merger, the Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee consulted with management and legal and financial advisors and considered a number of factors, including the following potential benefits and other factors:

that the holders of Pacific's common units (other than LB Pacific) will be entitled to receive 0.77 Plains common units for each Pacific common unit, an exchange ratio that the Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board viewed as attractive in light of Pacific's historic and current trading price, and which represented an implied premium of 14.3% over the average closing unit price during the 20 trading days prior to and including June 9, 2006 (the last day of trading prior to the committee's and the board's respective determinations) and 10.6% over the closing unit price on June 9, 2006;

that the merger is expected to be accretive on the basis of distributable cash flow per common unit of Pacific;

that Plains' management intends to recommend that the Plains board increase Plains' quarterly per unit distribution and that Pacific unitholders would receive such increased distribution following the merger, and that the increase in per unit distribution may ultimately result in the appreciation of Plains' unit price in the market, making the exchange ratio even more favorable to Pacific's unitholders;

that the incentive distributions that would otherwise have been payable to Plains' general partner will be reduced by \$65.0 million in the aggregate over five four-quarter periods following the merger, making additional cash available for general partnership purposes, which may include, as deemed appropriate by Plains' general partner, future distributions, capital investment or reduction of debt;

that the merger will result in potential cost savings, including savings arising due to the complementary assets and businesses of the companies, meaningful operating and general and administrative cost savings, and reduced cost of debt;

that Pacific's unitholders will benefit from the application of Plains' commercial expertise to Pacific's current assets;

that the combined business of Plains and Pacific following the merger will have complementary growth opportunities, including Plains' near-term projects that are a good match with Pacific's longer term growth projects;

that the combined company will represent a substantially larger business than Pacific on a stand-alone basis, mitigating execution risk associated with Pacific's Pier 400 project and other projects;

that the merger will result in significant business and geographic diversification, and that the combined company will have an expanded geographic footprint providing a strong presence in the major U.S. crude oil markets of the Gulf Coast, Rocky Mountains and California;

that the combined company is expected to have investment grade credit ratings that will better enable capitalization on growth initiatives beyond what is currently available to Pacific;

that, as unitholders of Plains following the merger, Pacific unitholders will have greater liquidity for their units;

that the merger will provide an opportunity to enhance a proven management team that is well regarded by the investment community;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

the judgment, advice and analysis of Pacific's senior management, including its favorable recommendation of the merger;

information obtained through due diligence regarding the businesses, assets, liabilities, results of operations and financial performance of Pacific, Plains and the combined company;

in the case of the Pacific board, presentations by and discussions with Lehman Brothers Inc., financial advisor to Pacific, regarding the financial terms of the merger, and its opinion described below to the Pacific board on June 11, 2006 to the effect that, as of the date of its opinion and based on and subject to various assumptions made, matters considered and limitations described in the opinion, from a financial point of view, the aggregate consideration to be offered to all of the holders of the partnership interests in Pacific in the proposed transaction is fair to such holders;

in the case of the Pacific conflicts committee, presentations by and discussions with Petrie Parkman & Co., financial advisor to the conflicts committee, regarding the financial terms of the merger, and its opinion described below to the conflicts committee on June 11, 2006 to the effect that, as of the date of its opinion and based on and subject to various assumptions made, matters considered and limitations described in the opinion, the exchange ratio of 0.77 Plains common units for each Pacific common unit (other than common units owned by LB Pacific) in the merger is fair, from a financial point of view, to Pacific's common unitholders, other than LB Pacific and its affiliates;

the ability of the parties to complete the merger, including the antitrust requirements applicable to the transaction;

presentations by and discussions with Pacific's senior management and representatives of Andrews Kurth, Pacific's outside legal counsel, Richards, Layton & Finger, the Pacific conflicts committee's outside legal counsel, and Baker Botts, LB Pacific's outside legal counsel, regarding the terms of the merger agreement; and

the long-term interests of Pacific and its common unitholders, as well as the effects of the merger on Pacific's customers, creditors and suppliers to the extent those effects relate to the long-term value of Pacific's common units.

The Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee also considered a number of risks associated with the merger, including the following:

that Plains is currently at the 50% incentive distribution level for its general partner, as compared to Pacific, which is at the 15% incentive distribution level for its general partner, which means that Pacific's unitholders will be receiving a lower percentage of the combined company's cash distributions than they would have as unitholders of Pacific and that this higher incentive distribution percentage for the general partner effectively increases the cost of equity for the combined company going forward;

that Plains' investment grade credit rating might be reduced as a result of the transaction, thereby adversely affecting Plains' business;

the possibility that Plains' unit price could diminish prior to closing, reducing the premium available to Pacific's common unitholders (other than LB Pacific);

that regulatory approvals must be obtained to complete the merger, including approvals under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act, approvals from the California Public Utilities Commission and other state regulatory bodies, and Canadian approvals; and

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

that the merger might not be completed in a timely manner, or at all, including the diversion of management and employee attention and the potential employee attrition, all at significant cost and disruption to Pacific's normal business.

In the view of the Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee, these risks did not outweigh the advantages of the merger.

Finally, the Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee considered a number of procedural factors associated with the merger, including the following:

that because of the possible conflicts of interest between LB Pacific and Pacific's public unitholders (other than LB Pacific), which created possible conflicts for management and certain members of the Pacific board, the Pacific conflicts committee was delegated the power and authority to review, evaluate and make a recommendation to the Pacific board, on behalf of Pacific and the interests of the public unitholders (other than LB Pacific), with respect to the merger and any alternative transaction;

that the delegation of power to the Pacific conflicts committee included the authority to recommend against any transaction, including the proposed transaction with Plains;

that the Pacific conflicts committee consists of directors who are not affiliated with Plains or LB Pacific or their respective affiliates, and who are not executive officers of Pacific;

that the terms and conditions of the proposed merger were determined through negotiations among Pacific, its general partner, the Pacific conflicts committee, and Plains and their respective representatives and advisors;

that in response to a demand by the conflicts committee, Plains and LB Pacific revised the terms of the merger so that the exchange ratio for the merger was increased, the consideration to be paid to LB Pacific was decreased and the amount of incentive distributions to be given up by Plains' general partner following the merger was increased;

that LB Pacific stated that it would not agree to any further decrease in the amount of consideration it was to receive in the transactions;

that Plains stated that the exchange ratio and other financial terms set forth in the merger agreement represented its best and final offer;

that the merger must be approved by a majority of Pacific's common unitholders, excluding LB Pacific;

that after engaging in discussions to gauge interest in a possible sale of Pacific, Lehman Brothers Inc. contacted 12 potential buyers in the process of exploring a possible sale transaction;

that the merger agreement allows Pacific an opportunity to respond to a takeover proposal and to accept a superior proposal, subject to certain limitations including the payment of a termination fee;

that the Pacific conflicts committee was given complete authority to select and compensate legal, financial and other independent advisors as it deemed appropriate;

that the Pacific conflicts committee retained and was advised by independent legal counsel experienced in advising on similar transactions;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

that the Pacific conflicts committee retained and was advised by Petrie Parkman, an independent investment banker experienced with publicly traded midstream partnerships, to assist in evaluating the fairness of the transaction;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

that there was a financial, accounting, operational and legal due diligence investigation of Plains conducted by Pacific's management and its financial, accounting and legal advisors;

that the projected financial cases described below under the caption " Additional Financial Considerations of the Parties Pacific" were provided to the Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board as described in that section; and

that the Pacific conflicts committee received the opinion of Petrie Parkman to the effect that, as of the date of its opinion and based on and subject to various assumptions made, matters considered and limitations described in the opinion, the exchange ratio of 0.77 Plains common units for each Pacific common unit in the merger (other than common units owned by LB Pacific) is fair from a financial point of view to Pacific's common unitholders other than LB Pacific.

The foregoing discussion of the factors considered by the Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee is not intended to be exhaustive, but it does set forth the principal factors considered by the board and the conflicts committee. The Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee reached their respective unanimous conclusions to recommend the merger agreement and the merger in light of various factors described above and other factors that each member of the board and the conflicts committee believed were appropriate. In view of the wide variety of factors considered by the Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee in connection with their evaluations of the merger and the complexity of these matters, the board and the conflicts committee did not consider it practical, and did not attempt, to quantify, rank or otherwise assign relative weights to the specific factors they considered in reaching their decisions and did not undertake to make any specific determination as to whether any particular factor, or any aspect of any particular factor, was favorable or unfavorable to the ultimate determinations. Rather, the Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee made their recommendations based on the totality of information presented to them and the investigations conducted by them. In considering the factors discussed above, individual directors may have given different weights to different factors.

Recommendation of the Board of Directors of Plains' General Partner and Reasons for the Merger

The Plains board has considered the benefits of the merger as well as the associated risks and has unanimously approved and adopted the merger agreement, has determined that it is advisable and in the best interest of Plains and Plains' common unitholders, and has approved the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement. Accordingly, the Plains board recommends that Plains' common unitholders vote to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger and vote to approve the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement. The potential benefits considered by the Plains board included the following:

the significant potential cost savings and operating synergies derived by combining two public entities and eliminating duplicative costs;

the complementary asset bases of Plains and Pacific in California, the Rocky Mountains and Canada, with minimal asset overlap but attractive potential vertical integration opportunities;

the opportunity to generate incremental value by applying Plains' commercial business model to Pacific's assets and organic growth opportunities;

the combination of Plains' in-progress organic growth projects, for which substantial equity capital has been raised and/or debt capital arranged, with Pacific's longer lead-time organic growth projects, which are anticipated to extend growth visibility for several years regardless of future acquisitions;

the opportunity to augment Plains' existing organization with talent from Pacific and expand the breadth and depth of its organization;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

the expanded inventory of internal growth projects helping to mitigate the adverse impacts of potential delays associated with any one project, such as those caused by permitting, weather, availability of materials or other factors;

the positive impact that Pacific's tariff and fee-based activities should have on Plains' credit rating;

the acceleration of Plains' expansion into the refined products infrastructure business afforded by Pacific's products terminals on the West Coast and in the Northeast and its products pipeline in the Rockies;

the ability to capitalize on increasing domestic demand for refined products provided by Pacific's refined products assets; and

the combination of Plains' tariff-based pipeline business and commercial and fee-based gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage business with Pacific's predominately tariff- and fee-based pipeline and terminalling businesses, resulting in a stronger, more diversified and more resilient business profile for the combined company.

In addition to considering the foregoing, the Plains board consulted with its management and Plains' legal and financial advisors, and considered a variety of other factors, including:

information regarding the business, operations, financial condition, liabilities, earnings, prospects and potential strategic opportunities of Plains and Pacific, including the information described below under the caption " Additional Financial Considerations of the Parties Plains;"

near-term dilution, offset by anticipated long-term accretion, relative to distributable cash flow per unit;

the judgment and recommendations of Plains' senior management;

presentations by and discussions with Simmons & Company International, Plains' financial advisor regarding, among other things, the financial terms of the purchase agreement and the merger agreement;

the opinion letter delivered by Simmons & Company International to the effect that, as of the date of its opinion and subject to various assumptions made, matters considered and limitations described in the opinion, the aggregate consideration to be paid by Plains in the merger and related transactions is fair, from a financial point of view, to Plains and the Plains common unitholders (excluding the Plains common unitholders who hold a direct or indirect interest in Plains' general partner);

presentations by and discussions with senior management and Vinson & Elkins L.L.P., Plains' outside legal counsel, regarding, among other things, the terms of the purchase agreement and the merger agreement;

the visibility of future distribution increases and long-term value of Plains' common units;

the abilities of the parties to complete the merger and other transactions contemplated by the purchase agreement and the merger agreement;

the risks associated with integrating Pacific's assets, operations and business activities into Plains' assets, operations and business activities mitigated by the familiarity of Plains' management with Pacific's assets through their participation in historical sales processes involving such assets;

the risks associated with financing certain components of the purchase price as well as the ongoing capital requirements of the combined company;

the risks associated with delay in development, or non-development, of key internal growth projects; and

the risks associated with the merger, including those described under "Risk Factors Risks Related to the Merger and the Related Transactions."

The foregoing discussion of the factors considered by the Plains board is not intended to be exhaustive, but it does set forth the principal factors considered by the board. The board reached its unanimous conclusion to recommend the merger agreement and the merger, and the issuance of Plains units in the merger, in light of various factors described above and other factors that each member of the board believed were appropriate. In view of the wide variety of factors considered by the Plains board in connection with its evaluation of the merger and the complexity of these matters, the board did not consider it practical, and did not attempt, to quantify, rank or otherwise assign relative weights to the specific factors it considered in reaching its decision and did not undertake to make any specific determination as to whether any particular factor, or any aspect of any particular factor, was favorable or unfavorable to the ultimate determinations. Rather, the board made its recommendation based on the totality of information presented to it and the investigations conducted by it. Individual directors may have given different weights to different factors.

In considering the recommendation of the Plains board with respect to the merger, you should be aware that some executive officers and directors have interests in the merger that are different from, or in addition to, the interests of Plains' common unitholders generally. The Plains board was aware of these interests in approving the merger agreement and the merger.

Additional Financial Considerations of the Parties

Pacific

In considering the merits of the proposed merger, the Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board reviewed a number of cases for Plains' and Pacific's future financial and operating performance through 2010. Projections were reviewed for Plains and Pacific on a stand-alone basis and on a combined basis giving effect to the proposed merger and estimated synergies associated with the merger. The Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board reviewed the projections as a tool to evaluate the relative merits and risks associated with Pacific continuing as a stand-alone entity versus Pacific and Plains as a combined enterprise, recognizing that relatively small variances in the assumptions underlying the projected cases would cause material differences in the results projected as a result of the extended projection period. Given the sensitivity to small variances, the projections were regarded primarily as directional indicators of potential accretion and were just one of several factors considered by the Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board in making their respective determinations with respect to the merger and the merger agreement. For additional discussion regarding the factors considered by the Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board, please read "The Merger Recommendation of the Board of Directors and Conflicts Committee of Pacific's General Partner and Reasons for the Merger."

In developing the projected cases, Pacific made numerous material assumptions with respect to Pacific and Plains, including:

organic growth opportunities and the amounts and timing of related costs and potential economic returns;

the availability and cost of capital;

the cash flow from existing assets and business activities;

the size, timing and achievability of commercial and operating synergies;

current and future supply and demand for crude oil and other products with respect to selected assets; and

other general business, market and financial assumptions.

All of these assumptions involve variables making them difficult to predict, and most are beyond the control of Pacific. Although Pacific believes that there was a reasonable basis for its projections and underlying assumptions, any assumptions for near-term projected cases remain uncertain, and the risk of inaccuracy increases with the length of the forecasted period.

Although combined company 2006 results were reviewed, the merger was not expected to close before the fourth quarter of 2006. As a result, 2007 and near-term combined company projections were the primary point of focus, and later-year projections were used to gauge the long-term strategic benefits of the merger. The Pacific conflicts committee and the Pacific board placed less importance on the later-year projections given the inherent uncertainties in forecasting results that far into the future.

Conflicts Committee of the Pacific Board of Directors. The Pacific conflicts committee primarily relied on two sets of projections for Pacific: Average Research Analyst Estimates and a Management Case. The Average Research Analyst Estimates were derived from average published Wall Street research analyst estimates for 2006 and 2007 earnings before interest, tax, depreciation and amortization ("EBITDA") and distributable cash flow per limited partner unit. The Management Case, which was provided by Pacific management, projected financial results for fiscal years 2006 through 2010. The Management Case represented management's view of the most likely projected results using then-current information. The Pacific conflicts committee also was provided with a projected case assuming full and rapid exploitation of commercial opportunities available to Pacific without any risk adjustments for such things as the size, timing or results of future investments in internal growth projects, or for the timing of permitting and construction. The committee did not give significant weight to this case due to the lack of risk adjustments. In addition to the foregoing, the committee also was provided with and reviewed the projections described below under " Pacific Board of Directors."

The Pacific conflicts committee also reviewed three sets of projections for Plains: Average Research Analyst Estimates and two cases, Case 1 and Case 2, based on information provided by, and discussions with, the management of Plains and its advisors, and on public guidance disclosed by Plains in its Current Report on Form 8-K furnished on May 3, 2006 and in a press release issued on May 25, 2006. Average Research Analyst Estimates were derived from average published Wall Street research estimates for 2006 and 2007 EBITDA and distributable cash flow per unit. The information provided by and discussed with Plains management and its advisors included estimates for certain financial metrics such as Adjusted EBITDA, interest expense and maintenance capital expenditures and assumptions (including capital expenditures on growth projects, financing assumptions and expected cash flow impact of those projects) that were used to calculate the remaining projections. The principal difference between Case 1 and Case 2 was the amount of capital expenditures spent on growth projects and/or acquisitions.

To develop the combined company projections, the Pacific conflicts committee, after review, relied on several assumptions from Plains' management and its advisors, including the financing assumptions for the merger, estimated synergies and future distribution policy. To achieve comparable estimates, projected cases (for both Pacific and Plains on a stand-alone basis and on a combined company basis) were prepared assuming no acquisitions would be completed by either party in the forecast period. Two combined company scenarios were reviewed using: (i) the Pacific Average Research Analyst Estimates and the Plains Average Research Analyst Estimates ("Scenario 1"), and (ii) the Pacific Management Case and Plains Case 1 ("Scenario 2"). Among other assumptions, the Pacific conflicts committee considered the estimated percentage change in the distributable cash flow per Pacific limited partner unit and the distributions per Pacific limited partner unit under both scenarios. Under the two scenarios, the percentage increases in distributions on limited partner units from the distributions

estimated each year in the relevant Pacific stand-alone cases are listed below. A positive change represents an improvement to the Pacific stand-alone case. The committee noted the increase in distribution coverage in the projections, which enhances the visibility for future distribution growth.

	Scenario 1		Scenario 2	
	2006E	2007E	2006E	2007E
Distributable Cash Flow per Limited Partner Unit	8.3%	6.2%	7.6%	11.6%
Distributions per Limited Partner Unit	1.4%	1.1%	2.4%	5.1%

Pacific Board of Directors. The Pacific board primarily relied on two sets of projections for Pacific on a stand-alone basis: a Street Case, and the Management Case described above under "Conflicts Committee of the Pacific Board of Directors." The Street Case was derived from median published Wall Street research analyst estimates for 2006 and 2007 EBITDA, maintenance capital expenditures and growth capital expenditures, which were assumed to be financed 50% with debt and 50% with equity and to occur at mid-year. The Pacific board was also provided a projected case assuming full and rapid exploitation of commercial opportunities available to Pacific without any risk adjustments. The board did not give significant weight to this case due to the lack of risk adjustments.

The Pacific board utilized two sets of projections for Plains on a stand-alone basis: a Street Case and a Management Case. The Street Case was derived from median published Wall Street research estimates for 2006 and 2007 EBITDA, maintenance capital expenditures and growth capital expenditures, which were assumed to be financed 50% with debt and 50% with equity and to occur at mid-year. The Management Case was derived from information provided by Plains management and its advisors. This information included estimates for certain financial metrics through 2010 such as Adjusted EBITDA, interest expense and maintenance capital expenditures and assumptions (including capital expenditures on growth projects, financing assumptions and expected cash flow impact of those projects) which were used to calculate the remaining projections.

To develop the combined company projections, Pacific's management and Pacific's board, after review, relied on several assumptions from Plains' management and its advisors, including the financing assumptions for the merger, estimated synergies and future distribution policy. To achieve comparable estimates, projected cases (for both Pacific and Plains on a stand-alone basis and on a combined company basis) were prepared assuming no acquisitions would be completed by either party in the forecast period. Using the above mentioned merger assumptions, two combined company scenarios were reviewed: (i) Pacific Street Case and Plains Street Case ("Scenario 3"), and (ii) Pacific Management Case and Plains Management Case ("Scenario 4"). An additional scenario was prepared using the non-risk-adjusted Pacific case assuming full and rapid exploitation of commercial opportunities, but this scenario was not given significant weight due to the lack of risk adjustments. Among other assumptions, the Pacific board considered the percentage change in the distributable cash flow per Pacific limited partner unit and the distributions per Pacific limited partner unit under both scenarios. Under the two scenarios, the percentage increases in distributions on limited partner units from the distributions estimated each year in the relevant Pacific stand-alone cases are listed below. A positive change represents an improvement to the Pacific stand-alone case. The board noted the

increase in distribution coverage in the projections, which enhances the visibility for future distribution growth.

	Scenario 3		Scenario 4				
	2006E	2007E	2006E	2007E	2008E	2009E	2010E
Distributable Cash Flow per Limited Partner Unit	8.5%	11.0%	7.3%	17.2%	10.2%	12.7%	8.3%
Distributions per Limited Partner Unit	2.7%	6.4%	2.8%	3.9%	9.6%	9.2%	8.0%

Plains

In considering the merits of the proposed merger, the Plains board reviewed a number of projected cases for Plains' future financial and operating performance through 2012 that were prepared by Plains' management with assistance from its financial advisor. Certain assumptions included in these projected cases prepared by Plains' management and its financial advisor, but not the entirety of the projected cases, were provided to the Pacific board and the Pacific conflicts committee and their advisors during presentations made by Plains' management, which are referred to above and below. Projections were reviewed for Plains on a stand-alone basis and on a combined basis giving effect to the proposed merger and anticipated synergies associated with the merger. Projected cases (both stand-alone and combined) were prepared assuming (i) no acquisitions would be completed in the forecast period, which are referred to below as the "non-acquisition cases" and (ii) the completion of acquisitions during the forecast period, which are referred to below as the "acquisition cases." The Plains board reviewed the projections as a tool to evaluate the relative merits and risks associated with Plains continuing as a stand-alone entity versus Plains and Pacific as a combined enterprise, recognizing that relatively small variances in the assumptions underlying the projected cases would cause material differences in the results projected as a result of the extended projection period. Given the sensitivity to small variances, the projections were regarded primarily as directional indicators of potential accretion and were just one of several factors considered by the Plains board in making its determinations with respect to the merger and the merger agreement. For additional discussion regarding the factors considered by the Plains board, please read "The Merger Recommendation of the Board of Directors of Plains' General Partner and Reasons for the Merger."

The projected cases were developed in a manner generally consistent with Plains' historical development of financial and operating guidance. The projected cases were developed without changes to Plains' existing accounting policies, with the exception of Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 133 "Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities", Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 123(R) "Share-Based Payment", and potential gains and losses on foreign currency revaluations as there is no reasonably accurate way to forecast the potential gains and losses on these items as they are dependent upon market conditions that are outside of Plains' control.

In developing the projected cases, Plains' management made numerous material assumptions with respect to Plains and Pacific, including:

organic growth opportunities and the amounts and timing of related costs and potential economic returns;

the availability and cost of capital;

the cash flow from existing assets and business activities;

the size, timing and achievability of commercial and operating synergies;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

current and future supply and demand for crude oil and other products with respect to selected assets; and

other general business, market and financial assumptions.

With respect to future investments in internal growth projects, Plains' management assumed that it would invest \$150 million in 2007 and \$100 million per year thereafter on a stand-alone basis, such investments being in addition to its projects that are already in progress. In the combined case, Plains' management assumed an additional \$100 million per year of investments in internal growth projects above the stand-alone case. The projected cases also assume that Plains begins receiving distributions from its investment in PAA/Vulcan Gas Storage LLC in 2009.

For the acquisition cases, additional assumptions were made with respect to the size, availability, timing and anticipated results of, and cash flows from, acquired assets. All of these assumptions involve variables making them difficult to predict, and most are beyond the control of Plains. Although Plains believes that there was a reasonable basis for its projections and underlying assumptions, any assumptions for near-term projected cases remain uncertain, and the risk of inaccuracy increases with the length of the forecasted period.

The projection of future acquisitions is particularly difficult as Plains has no control over the availability or price of future acquisition opportunities. On a stand-alone basis, Plains' management has historically targeted the completion of acquisitions for average aggregate consideration of approximately \$200 million to \$300 million per year. Since 2002, excluding the proposed merger with Pacific, Plains has averaged over \$340 million of completed acquisitions per year. In developing certain of the stand-alone and combined company cases, Plains' management incorporated incremental acquisitions of \$200 million and \$300 million per year, respectively, in order to evaluate their indicative impact on Plains or the combined company's growth profile.

Plains' management assumed that the Adjusted EBITDA and economic returns generated from potential future investments in internal growth projects and potential acquisitions would be generally consistent with the economic returns that it has realized on historical internal growth investments and acquisitions of similar size and asset type, with some judgmental adjustments to reflect recent changes in market trends and increased competition for acquisitions.

The primary metric of each projected case was Adjusted EBITDA, which in turn was used to determine projected economic returns as well as distributable cash flows. The forecasts did not attempt to project future depreciation, net income or net income per unit. The significant assumptions incorporated into the various Adjusted EBITDA forecasts are discussed above and below. Adjusted EBITDA represents earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization and was adjusted for certain selected items that Plains believed impacted the comparability of financial results between reporting periods.

With respect to Plains' stand-alone case, on June 12, 2006, Plains furnished a Current Report on Form 8-K that updated its financial and operating guidance for the second half of 2006 and provided preliminary Adjusted EBITDA guidance for 2007. The update increased the midpoint for Plains' 2006 Adjusted EBITDA guidance by approximately 7% to \$466 million and established a midpoint for 2007 Adjusted EBITDA of \$500 million. The guidance update, which excluded the impact of the proposed merger, incorporated the full-year benefit of Plains' announced 2006 acquisitions as well as internal growth projects projected to meaningfully contribute to 2007 results, but excluded any additional acquisitions not announced as of the date of such update. The updated guidance for 2006 and 2007 and its impact on subsequent years was incorporated into the projected cases reviewed by the Plains board. Plains' management used the updated stand-alone guidance as the foundation for constructing the projected cases of its future financial and operating performance. As a result of projected contributions from potential future expansion capital expenditures, on a stand-alone basis, Plains' Adjusted EBITDA

was forecasted to increase to \$620 million by 2010 in the non-acquisition case and to \$714 million in the acquisition case. In each case, such Adjusted EBITDA forecasts were viewed only as directional indicators.

In examining the potential contribution from Pacific, the Plains board reviewed financial projections for Pacific prepared by Plains' management team. Plains' management and the Plains board also had access to the upside case projections of Pacific's management, but did not use these projections as they were presented in evaluating the merger because they assume full and rapid exploitation of commercial opportunities without any risk adjustments. Plains' projections for Pacific, which incorporated anticipated synergies associated with the merger and the anticipated implementation of a number of internal growth projects, were significantly higher than Pacific's recent financial results (but less than Pacific's upside case). In order to achieve this projected increase, Plains projected that aggregate incremental capital investments through 2011 will total approximately \$682 million, with approximately 90% to 95% of the capital expected to be invested by the end of 2008. A substantial portion of the projected Adjusted EBITDA from the projects would be supported by existing throughput agreements, lease agreements or similar contracts intended to ensure a reasonable level of utilization.

Assuming the merger is consummated near the end of 2006, total synergies were projected to approximate \$30 million in 2007, increasing to approximately \$55 million on an annualized basis by 2010 and further escalating to \$72 million in 2012. The synergies were expected to derive from cost savings, operating synergies and efficiencies and commercial opportunities. Realization of certain of these synergies would require projected capital spending of approximately \$102 million, which is included in the aforementioned \$682 million of aggregate incremental capital investments.

As a result of anticipated synergies and Plains' projection of Pacific's base level Adjusted EBITDA, the incremental Adjusted EBITDA contribution from the proposed merger was projected to be approximately \$184 million in 2007. As a result of a projected increase in realized synergies and anticipated contributions from expansion capital expenditures, the annual Adjusted EBITDA contribution from the proposed merger was projected to increase to approximately \$314 million in 2010 and \$337 million in 2012.

The Plains board reviewed the expected economic returns associated with the merger and the related impacts on the combined company's distribution growth potential. Plains projected that the invested capital-to-one year forward Adjusted EBITDA multiple for the acquisition of Pacific would improve over time as cash flow from internal growth projects and anticipated synergies were realized. Based on Plains' non-acquisition case projection for invested capital and Pacific's 2007 incremental Adjusted EBITDA contribution of \$184 million, the initial implied acquisition multiple for the transaction was projected to be approximately 13.7x. At the end of 2011 the invested capital-to-one year forward Adjusted EBITDA multiple for the transaction was projected to approximate 9.1x. This multiple was calculated using approximately \$3.1 billion of invested capital, representing the sum of the transaction value at announcement and the projected capital to be spent through year-end 2011, and Plains' non-acquisition case projection for Pacific's 2012 incremental Adjusted EBITDA contribution of \$337 million.

The Plains board also reviewed the projected impact of the proposed merger on distributable cash flow ("DCF") per unit, which is a common metric by which investors measure the distribution capacity of a publicly traded partnership, relative to the Plains stand-alone case. Based on the projected non-acquisition case Adjusted EBITDA of the combined company, an assumption of \$100 million per year in incremental internal growth projects for the combined company, certain capital structure and financing assumptions (including the assumptions that (i) at least 50% of future expansion capital and acquisitions would be funded with cash flow in excess of distributions and equity and (ii) subject to the impact of the incentive distribution rights of Plains' general partner and the effect of the agreement of

Plains' general partner to reduce the incentive distributions that would otherwise be payable to it, the cost of capital for the combined company would be relatively consistent with Plains' cost of capital at the time the projections were prepared), the combined company projections indicated that the proposed merger would be dilutive relative to DCF per unit in Plains' stand-alone case in 2007 by approximately \$0.14 per unit and would be accretive to DCF per unit by approximately \$0.25 and \$0.35 per unit in 2010 and 2012, respectively. With respect to the projected acquisition case, which also assumed \$100 million per year of incremental growth projects for the combined company as well as similar financing assumptions, the combined company projections indicated that, on a DCF per unit basis relative to the stand-alone case, the proposed merger would be dilutive in 2007 by \$0.13 and accretive in 2010 and 2012 by \$0.26 and \$0.34, respectively. The Plains board also reviewed variance sensitivity analyses, which confirmed that relatively small variances in the assumptions underlying the projected cases would cause material differences in the projected results. Because of this sensitivity and the related potential for inaccuracy, particularly in the longer term, the projections were regarded primarily as directional indicators of potential accretion and not as a prediction of results.

The Plains board also took into consideration that a significant portion of Pacific's projected Adjusted EBITDA was derived from tariff and fee-based activities that would provide an enhanced level of stability to the combined company's Adjusted EBITDA, as well as the long-term attractiveness of the combined company's asset base beyond 2012.

These and other relevant factors were considered in projecting that the combined company would be able to increase its cash distribution to \$3.20 per unit on an annualized basis shortly after closing the merger, and continue to target an annual distribution growth rate of 7% to 9% per year relative to the higher distribution level for the next several years, while maintaining an appropriate distribution coverage ratio. This distribution growth outlook assumes no net deterioration of the base businesses and the successful development of internal growth project portfolios of Plains and Pacific, as well as the anticipated synergies of the merger and the effect of Plains' general partner's agreement to reduce its incentive distributions from what it would otherwise have received.

Certain Considerations Regarding Projected Information

Plains and Pacific make public only very limited information as to future financial and operating performance and neither partnership typically provides specific or detailed information over an extended period of time because of the speculative nature of such forward-looking information. The foregoing projected information is included in this joint proxy statement/prospectus only because this information was considered by the Plains board, the Pacific board and/or the Pacific conflicts committee, as applicable, in performing due diligence and evaluating the merger and related transactions. The inclusion of the foregoing projected information in this joint proxy statement/prospectus should not be regarded as an indication that either Plains or Pacific or their respective representatives considered or consider the projected information to be a reliable or accurate prediction of future events, and the projected information should not be relied upon as such.

The projected information described above was not prepared with a view to compliance with the published guidelines of the SEC or the guidelines established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants regarding projections or forecasts. The projected financial information is not presented in accordance with GAAP. The projected financial information included in this joint proxy statement has been prepared by, and is the responsibility of, Plains' and Pacific's management, as applicable. PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP and KPMG LLP have neither examined nor compiled the accompanying projected financial information and, accordingly, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP and KPMG LLP do not express an opinion or any other form of assurance with respect thereto. The PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP and KPMG LLP reports incorporated by reference in this document relate to Plains' and Pacific's historical financial information, respectively. Such reports do not extend to the projected financial information and should not be read to do so.

The internal financial forecasts (upon which the projected information is based) are, in general, prepared solely for internal use to guide various management decisions, including with respect to capital budgeting. Such internal financial forecasts are inherently subjective in nature, susceptible to interpretation and accordingly such forecasts may not be achieved.

The internal financial forecasts also reflect numerous assumptions made by management, including the categories of material assumptions described above, all of which are difficult to predict and many of which are beyond the control of the preparing party. Accordingly, there can be no assurance that the assumptions made in preparing the internal financial forecasts upon which the foregoing projected financial information was based will prove accurate. There will be differences between actual and forecasted results, and the differences may be material.

Each of Plains and Pacific believe that the projected information prepared and/or provided by it was reasonable at the time developed. However, none of Plains, Pacific or their respective representatives has made or makes any representation to any unitholder regarding the ultimate performance of Plains, Pacific or the combined company relative to the information included in the projected information above, and none of them intends to update or otherwise revise the projected information to reflect circumstances existing after the date when made or to reflect the occurrence of future events in the event that any or all of the assumptions underlying the projected information prove to be in error.

Opinions of Financial Advisors

Opinion of Lehman Brothers Inc. Financial Advisor to the Board of Directors of Pacific's General Partner

Lehman Brothers Inc. ("Lehman Brothers") acted as financial advisor to the Pacific board in connection with the proposed merger and the transactions related to the merger. On June 11, 2006, Lehman Brothers rendered its oral opinion (subsequently confirmed in writing) to Pacific's board that as of such date and, based upon and subject to certain matters stated therein, from a financial point of view, the aggregate consideration to be offered to all of the holders of the partnership interests in Pacific in the proposed transaction is fair to such holders.

THE FULL TEXT OF LEHMAN BROTHERS' WRITTEN OPINION, DATED JUNE 11, 2006 ("LEHMAN BROTHERS' OPINION") IS ATTACHED AS ANNEX B TO THIS JOINT PROXY STATEMENT/PROSPECTUS. PACIFIC UNITHOLDERS MAY READ SUCH OPINION FOR A DISCUSSION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS MADE, PROCEDURES FOLLOWED, FACTORS CONSIDERED AND LIMITATIONS UPON THE REVIEW UNDERTAKEN BY LEHMAN BROTHERS IN RENDERING ITS OPINION. THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF LEHMAN BROTHERS' OPINION AND THE METHODOLOGY THAT LEHMAN BROTHERS USED TO RENDER ITS FAIRNESS OPINION. THIS SUMMARY IS QUALIFIED IN ITS ENTIRETY BY REFERENCE TO THE FULL TEXT OF THE OPINION.

LEHMAN BROTHERS' ADVISORY SERVICES AND OPINION WERE PROVIDED FOR THE INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE OF THE PACIFIC BOARD IN CONNECTION WITH ITS CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION. LEHMAN BROTHERS' OPINION IS NOT INTENDED TO BE AND DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A RECOMMENDATION TO ANY UNITHOLDER OF PACIFIC AS TO HOW SUCH UNITHOLDER SHOULD VOTE WITH RESPECT TO THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION. LEHMAN BROTHERS WAS NOT REQUESTED TO OPINE AS TO, AND LEHMAN BROTHERS' OPINION DOES NOT ADDRESS, (I) LB PACIFIC LP'S OR PACIFIC'S UNDERLYING BUSINESS DECISION TO PROCEED WITH OR EFFECT THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION OR (II) THE ALLOCATION OF THE AGGREGATE CONSIDERATION BETWEEN LB PACIFIC AND THE HOLDERS OF PACIFIC COMMON UNITS NOT HELD BY LB PACIFIC IN THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

In arriving at its opinion, Lehman Brothers reviewed and analyzed:

- (1) the merger agreement and the purchase agreement and the specific terms of the proposed transaction;
- (2) publicly available information concerning Pacific and Plains that Lehman Brothers believed to be relevant to its analysis, including Pacific's and Plains' respective Annual Reports on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2005 and their respective Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q for the three months ended March 31, 2006;
- (3) financial and operating information with respect to the business, operations and prospects of Pacific furnished to Lehman Brothers by Pacific, including the financial projections prepared by management of Pacific (the management case), and separate financial projections based on Pacific management's view of full and rapid exploitation of commercial opportunities available to Pacific without any risk adjustments (the upside case);
- (4) estimates prepared by the management of Plains regarding the amounts and timing of expected operational and interest expense savings, as well as commercial opportunities, expected to be achieved as a result of the proposed transaction (called the expected synergies);
- (5) financial and operating information with respect to the business, operations and prospects of Plains furnished to Lehman Brothers by Plains, including financial projections of Plains prepared by the management of Plains;
- (6) published estimates of independent research analysts with respect to the future financial performance of Pacific and Plains;
- (7) the respective trading histories of Pacific common units and Plains common units from June 9, 2004 to June 9, 2006;
- (8) a comparison of the historical financial results and present financial condition of Pacific and Plains to each other and to other publicly traded companies that Lehman Brothers deemed relevant;
- (9) a comparison of the financial terms of the proposed transaction to the financial terms of other transactions that Lehman Brothers deemed relevant;
- (10) the potential pro forma impact of the proposed transaction on the holders of partnership interests of Pacific and Plains, including the impact of the proposed transaction on per limited partnership unit distributable cash flow and cash distributions;
- (11) the relative contributions of Pacific and Plains to the historical and future financial performance of the combined partnership, including a comparison of their respective earnings per limited partnership unit and distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit; and
- (12) the results of efforts to solicit third parties' interest in a potential transaction with Pacific.

In addition, Lehman Brothers had discussions with the managements of Pacific and Plains concerning their respective businesses, operations, assets, liabilities, financial conditions and prospects, including the expected synergies, and undertook such other studies, analyses and investigations as Lehman Brothers deemed appropriate.

In arriving at its opinion, Lehman Brothers assumed and relied upon the accuracy and completeness of the financial and other information used by Lehman Brothers without assuming any responsibility for independent verification of such information. Lehman Brothers further relied upon the assurances of the managements of Pacific and Plains that they were not aware of any facts or circumstances that would make such

information inaccurate or misleading. With respect to the financial

projections of Pacific, including both management and upside cases, upon advice of Pacific, Lehman Brothers assumed that such projections were reasonably prepared on a basis reflecting the best currently available estimates and judgments of the management of Pacific as to the future financial performance of Pacific, and Lehman Brothers relied on both management and upside cases in performing its analysis. With respect to the financial projections of Plains, upon advice of Pacific, Lehman Brothers assumed that such projections were reasonably prepared on the basis reflecting the best currently available estimates and judgments of the management of Plains as to the future financial performance of Plains and that Plains will perform substantially in accordance with such projections. Additionally, upon advice of Pacific, Lehman Brothers considered and relied upon published estimates of independent research analysts on Pacific and Plains in performing its analysis. Upon advice of Pacific, Lehman Brothers also assumed that the amounts and timing of the expected synergies were reasonable and that the expected synergies will be realized substantially in accordance with such estimates. In arriving at its opinion, Lehman Brothers did not conduct a physical inspection of the properties and facilities of Pacific or Plains and did not make or obtain any evaluations or appraisals of the assets or liabilities of Pacific or Plains. Lehman Brothers' opinion necessarily was based upon market, economic and other conditions as they existed on, and could be evaluated as of, the date of such opinion.

In connection with rendering its opinion, Lehman Brothers performed certain financial, comparative and other analyses as described below. In arriving at its opinion, Lehman Brothers did not ascribe a specific range of value to Pacific or Plains, but rather made its determination as to the fairness, from a financial point of view, to all of the holders of partnership interests in Pacific of the aggregate consideration to be offered to such holders in the proposed transaction on the basis of financial and comparative analyses. The preparation of a fairness opinion involves various determinations as to the most appropriate and relevant methods of financial and comparative analysis, and the application of those methods to the particular circumstances, and therefore, such an opinion is not readily susceptible to summary description. Furthermore, in arriving at its opinion, Lehman Brothers did not attribute any particular weight to any analysis or factor considered by it, but rather made qualitative judgments as to the significance and relevance of each analysis and factor. Accordingly, Lehman Brothers believes that its analyses must be considered as a whole and that considering any portion of such analyses and factors, without considering all analyses and factors as a whole, could create a misleading or incomplete view of the process underlying its opinion. In its analyses, Lehman Brothers made numerous assumptions with respect to industry performance, general business and economic conditions and other matters, many of which are beyond the control of Pacific and Plains. None of Pacific, Plains, Lehman Brothers or any other person assumes responsibility if future results are materially different from those discussed. Any estimates contained in these analyses were not necessarily indicative of actual values or predictive of future results or values, which may be significantly more or less favorable than as set forth therein. In addition, analyses relating to the value of businesses do not purport to be appraisals or to reflect the prices at which businesses actually may be sold.

The following is a summary of the material financial analyses used by Lehman Brothers in connection with providing its opinion to the Pacific board. Certain of the summaries of financial analyses include information presented in tabular format. In order to fully understand the financial analyses used by Lehman Brothers, the tables must be read together with the text of each summary. The tables alone do not constitute a complete description of the financial analyses. Accordingly, the analyses listed in the tables and described below must be considered as a whole. Considering any portion of such analyses and of the factors considered, without considering all analyses and factors, could create a misleading or incomplete view of the process underlying the Lehman Brothers opinion.

Lehman Brothers' Valuation Analysis. Lehman Brothers performed valuation analyses of Pacific as a stand-alone entity using the following methodologies: discounted cash flow analysis, comparable

companies trading analysis, comparable master limited partnership merger analysis and comparable midstream/pipeline transactions analysis. The table below summarizes the indicative valuation ranges for Pacific on both an enterprise and equity basis as derived from these methodologies, and compares these valuation ranges to the aggregate consideration to be offered by Plains in the proposed transaction.

Valuation Summary Results Pacific

Valuation Methodology	Indicative Enterprise Valuation Range	Implied Equity Valuation Range
	(\$ in millions)	(\$ in millions)
Discounted Cash Flow Analysis Management Case	\$ 2,000 - \$2,400	\$ 1,411 - \$1,811
Discounted Cash Flow Analysis Upside Case	\$ 2,100 - \$2,600	\$ 1,511 - \$2,011
Comparable Companies Trading Analysis	\$ 1,900 - \$2,200	\$ 1,311 - \$1,611
Comparable MLP Merger Analysis	\$ 2,000 - \$2,300	\$ 1,411 - \$1,711
Comparable Midstream/Pipeline Transactions Analysis	\$ 1,600 - \$1,800	\$ 1,011 - \$1,211
Aggregate Consideration in the Proposed Transaction	\$ 2,315	\$ 1,726

Discounted Cash Flow Analysis. Lehman Brothers performed a discounted cash flow analysis of Pacific to calculate the estimated present value of the enterprise value of Pacific. A discounted cash flow analysis is a traditional valuation methodology used to derive a valuation of an asset by calculating its "present value" of estimated future cash flows of the asset. "Present value" refers to the current value of future cash flows or amounts and is obtained by discounting those future cash flows or amounts by a discount rate that takes into account macro-economic assumptions and estimates of risk, the opportunity cost of capital, expected returns and other appropriate factors applicable to a particular asset. The estimated present value of the enterprise value of Pacific was calculated by adding the projected unlevered free cash flows of Pacific for the five fiscal years beginning January 1, 2006 and ending December 31, 2010 to the present value of the terminal value of the partnership interests in Pacific.

To estimate the residual value of Pacific at the end of the forecast period, or terminal value, Lehman Brothers used perpetuity of projected unlevered free cash flows and assumed growth rates for projected unlevered free cash flows beyond 2010 of 1.0% to 3.0% per year. Lehman Brothers also assumed discount rates of 9.0% to 12.0%. The range of discount rates was based on an analysis of the weighted average cost of capital for Pacific and other comparable companies. The growth rates for the projected unlevered free cash flows beyond 2010 used were based on Lehman Brothers' view of consumption growth, inflation and embedded decline in crude oil reserves in the domestic United States.

The projections underlying the discounted cash flow analysis were prepared by Pacific management. In performing the discounted cash flow analysis, Lehman Brothers considered both the management case and upside case with respect to the operating and financial projections. In each case, Pacific is assumed to operate as a stand-alone entity and, accordingly, the estimated synergies associated with the proposed transaction were not included in the analysis. Based on the discount rates and terminal values as described above, the management case resulted in an indicative enterprise valuation range of \$2,000 million to \$2,400 million which implied an equity valuation range of \$1,411 million to \$1,811 million, and the upside case resulted in an indicative enterprise valuation range of \$2,100 million to \$2,600 million which implied an equity valuation range of \$1,511 million to \$2,011 million. The equity valuation range was obtained by subtracting short-term and long-term debt and adding cash on the balance sheet as of March 31, 2006 to the enterprise valuation range. Lehman Brothers noted that the aggregate consideration to be offered to all of the holders of Pacific

partnership interests in the proposed transaction was within the range calculated for both management and upside cases.

Comparable Companies Trading Analysis. In order to assess how the public market values units of similar publicly traded companies, Lehman Brothers reviewed and compared specific financial and operating data relating to Pacific with selected companies that Lehman Brothers deemed comparable to Pacific, including:

Boardwalk Pipeline Partners, LP	Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P.
Buckeye Partners, L.P.	ONEOK Partners, L.P.
Enbridge Energy Partners, L.P.	Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.
Energy Transfer Partners, L.P.	Sunoco Logistics Partners L.P.
Enterprise Products Partners L.P.	TEPPCO Partners, L.P.
Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.	Valero L.P.

The comparable companies listed above were chosen because they are publicly traded master limited partnerships with operations that for purposes of this analysis may be considered similar to Pacific. Lehman Brothers calculated various multiples and ratios for the comparable companies and used the multiples and ratios as a reference point to develop an indicative valuation for Pacific. Lehman Brothers reviewed multiples and ratios for the comparable companies based on estimates of earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization (EBITDA); net income; net income per limited partnership unit; distributable cash flow (defined as EBITDA less interest expense and maintenance capital expenditures); and distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit. The projections for the comparable companies and Pacific were based on published estimates of independent research analysts. Because this analysis is meant to estimate the value of Pacific on a stand-alone basis, the expected synergies were not included in the comparable companies analysis. The multiples for the comparable companies were calculated using the closing unit prices for the comparable companies as of June 9, 2006 and balance sheet data as of March 31, 2006. In calculating the limited partnership equity values for each of the comparable companies, Lehman Brothers used the current market price for the specific partnership's common units and applied no discount on the value of subordinated units (where applicable) relative to the price of the common unit. In calculating the general partner equity values for each of the comparable companies, Lehman Brothers multiplied the cash flows being received by the general partner (based on the latest quarterly distribution annualized) by a multiple of 30.0x, which was derived using comparable publicly traded general partnerships. For master limited partnerships with publicly traded general partners, such as Enterprise Products Partners L.P. and Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P., the market value of the general partner was used instead

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

of the multiple of distributions method. With respect to the comparable companies, Lehman Brothers considered the following statistics and multiples:

	<u>Median</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>
L.P. Unit Distribution Yield (latest quarter annualized)	7.05%	6.88%	8.53%	5.31%
Unit Price as a Multiple of:				
Distributable Cash Flow per L.P. Unit				
2006E	13.4x	13.6x	17.0x	10.6x
2007E	13.0x	12.5x	14.1x	9.5x
Net Income per L.P. Unit				
2006E	17.3x	18.2x	23.4x	15.0x
2007E	16.8x	17.0x	23.4x	13.9x
Total Equity Value as a Multiple of:				
Aggregate Distributable Cash Flow				
2006E	14.8x	15.7x	21.5x	11.9x
2007E	13.3x	14.0x	19.0x	9.9x
Aggregate Net Income				
2006E	20.4x	21.5x	33.8x	16.5x
2007E	19.2x	19.9x	34.8x	14.1x
Total Enterprise Value as a Multiple of:				
Aggregate EBITDA				
2006E	13.9x	14.2x	18.6x	11.3x
2007E	12.8x	12.9x	16.8x	10.2x

Given the inherent differences between the business, operations and prospects of Pacific and the businesses, operations and prospects of the comparable companies, Lehman Brothers believed that it was inappropriate to, and therefore did not, rely solely on the quantitative results of the comparable company analysis and accordingly also made qualitative judgments concerning differences between the financial and operating characteristics and prospects of Pacific and the comparable companies that could affect the public trading values of each. These qualitative judgments related primarily to the differing sizes, growth prospects, profitability levels and degree of operational risk between Pacific and the comparable companies.

Based upon these judgments, Lehman Brothers selected a range of multiples for each metric and applied them to the stand-alone financial metrics for Pacific. The resulting indicative enterprise valuation range was \$1,900 million to \$2,200 million which implied an equity valuation range of \$1,311 million to \$1,611 million. Lehman Brothers noted that the aggregate consideration to be offered to all of the holders of partnership interests in Pacific in the proposed transaction was above this valuation range.

Comparable Master Limited Partnership ("MLP") Merger Analysis. Lehman Brothers reviewed and analyzed certain information relating to the following transactions: the acquisition of Kaneb Pipe Line Partners, L.P. by Valero L.P., the acquisition of GulfTerra Energy Partners, L.P. by Enterprise Products Partners L.P., and the acquisition of Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline Partners, L.P. by Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P. These mergers were selected because the operations of these companies may be considered similar to Pacific for purposes of this analysis and these mergers represent the only mergers completed by publicly traded energy industry master limited partnerships. Among other things, Lehman Brothers analyzed the equity purchase price as a multiple of latest twelve months (LTM) net income and LTM distributable cash flow. Additionally, Lehman Brothers analyzed the total purchase price as a multiple of LTM EBITDA and LTM earnings before interest and taxes (EBIT). Lehman Brothers used

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

the multiples as a reference point to derive an indicative valuation range for Pacific. The projections for the comparable MLP merger transactions and Pacific were based on published estimates of independent research analysts. As in the comparable companies analysis, Lehman Brothers excluded the expected synergies from this comparable MLP merger analysis. The following table summarizes the results of this analysis:

	<u>Median</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>
Total Equity Value as a Multiple of:				
LTM Distributable Cash Flow	18.5x	18.4x	19.4x	17.3x
LTM Net Income	21.3x	21.5x	23.2x	19.9x
Total Enterprise Value as a Multiple of:				
LTM EBITDA	13.8x	13.8x	15.0x	12.7x
LTM EBIT	19.5x	18.5x	20.1x	15.7x

The comparable MLP merger analysis resulted in an indicative enterprise valuation range of \$2,000 million to \$2,300 million which implied an equity valuation range of \$1,411 million to \$1,711 million. Lehman Brothers noted that the aggregate consideration to be offered to all of the holders of partnership interests in Pacific in the proposed transaction was above this valuation range.

Comparable Midstream/Pipeline Transactions Analysis. Lehman Brothers reviewed and analyzed certain information relating to selected transactions in the midstream liquids and midstream natural gas industry since 1991, including but not limited to transactions between the following parties:

TEPPCO Partners, L.P. /	Enbridge Income Fund /
Duke Energy Corporation	Enbridge Inc.
KN Energy, Inc. / Kinder	Plains All American Pipeline, L.P. /
Morgan, Inc.	Shell Pipeline Co. LP
Alberta Energy Co. Ltd. /	Enbridge Energy Partners, L.P. /
AEC Pipelines, L.P.	Shell Pipeline Co. LP
Alberta Energy Co. Ltd. /	Pacific Energy Partners, L.P. /
TransCanada Pipelines Ltd.	BP Canada Energy Co.
Plains All American Pipeline, L.P. /	Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. /
Murphy Oil Co. Ltd.	National Cooperative Refinery Association
Pembina Pipeline Income Fund /	Plains All American Pipeline, L.P. /
AEC Pipelines, L.P.	Link Energy LLC
Koch Industries, Inc. /	Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. /
BP America, Inc.	Shell Oil Products US
BC Gas Inc. /	Buckeye Partners, L.P. /
EnCana Corp.	Shell Oil Products US
Kaneb Pipeline Partners, L.P. /	Koch Industries, Inc. /
Tesoro Petroleum Corp.	ONEOK, Inc.
Madison Dearborn Partners, LLC and	Pacific Energy Partners, L.P. /
Carlyle/Riverstone Global Energy and	Valero L.P.
Power Fund II, L.P. / The Williams	
Companies, Inc.	

Lehman Brothers calculated, when available, the LTM and one-year forward EBITDA multiples implied by the aggregate purchase price involved in such midstream/pipeline transactions and used these multiples as a reference point to develop an indicative valuation range for Pacific. The projections for the comparable midstream/pipeline transactions and Pacific were based on published

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

estimates of independent research analysts. As in the comparable MLP merger analysis, Lehman Brothers excluded the expected synergies from this comparable midstream/pipeline transactions analysis. The following table summarizes the results of this analysis:

	Median	Average	High	Low
Total Enterprise Value as a Multiple of:				
LTM EBITDA	9.0x	9.2x	14.9x	4.5x

Lehman Brothers noted that multiples in recent transactions have been higher than the average multiple of comparable midstream/pipeline transactions since 1991 and thus selected a range of multiples that were higher than the average for the whole group in performing this analysis. Using this selected range of multiples, the comparable midstream/pipeline transactions analysis resulted in an indicative enterprise valuation range of \$1,600 million to \$1,800 million which implied an equity valuation range of \$1,011 million to \$1,211 million. Lehman Brothers noted that the aggregate consideration to be offered to all of the holders of partnership interests in Pacific in the proposed transaction was significantly above this valuation range. However, Lehman Brothers believes that the comparable midstream/pipeline transactions analysis is less relevant than the other valuation methodologies for a number of reasons, principally, due to the tax-advantaged nature of MLPs and the significant unit-for-unit exchange component (59.4% of total equity consideration) in the proposed transaction as compared to the all-cash consideration for almost all of the comparable midstream/pipeline transactions.

Historical Exchange Ratio Analysis. To illustrate the implied average exchange ratio of Pacific common units for Plains common units, Lehman Brothers compared the historical per unit prices of Pacific and Plains during different periods for the two-year period prior to June 9, 2006. The following table summarizes the historical implied average exchange ratio calculated for the periods indicated:

	Average Exchange Ratio
June 9, 2006	0.696x
5 day period	0.686x
10 day period	0.668x
20 day period	0.674x
30 day period	0.688x
60 day period	0.694x
90 day period	0.698x
120 day period	0.707x
One year period	0.721x
Two year period	0.757x

Transaction Premium Analysis. To illustrate how the premium implied by the 0.770x exchange ratio in the merger compared to the premiums paid in similar transactions, Lehman Brothers compared the premium implied in the merger to the premiums paid in 25 transactions in the energy sector, between September 27, 2001 and June 9, 2006, with a value greater than \$1 billion and where the consideration was not 100% cash. Lehman Brothers calculated the premium per share paid by the acquiror compared to the share price of the target company prevailing (i) one day, (ii) one week and (iii) one month (four weeks) prior to the announcement of the transaction. The following table summarizes the results of the premiums paid calculated for these transactions, as well as the premiums implied by the 0.770x exchange ratio offered in the merger:

	Premiums Implied by 0.770x Exchange Ratio	Median	Average	High	Low
Time Period					
One Day	10.6%	20.9%	18.4%	37.9%	(4.0)%
One Week	10.6%	18.8%	18.9%	39.2%	(10.2)%
One Month	14.4%	24.6%	23.7%	48.7%	(2.9)%

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Lehman Brothers also noted that the 0.770x exchange ratio represented an implied premium of 14.3% over the average exchange ratio calculated using closing prices during the 20 trading days prior to and including June 9, 2006.

Contribution Analysis. To illustrate the respective contributions of Pacific and Plains to the estimated net income per limited partnership unit and estimated distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit of the combined company, Lehman Brothers calculated such estimated net income and distributable cash flow based on published estimates of independent research analysts and the management and upside cases prepared by the management of Pacific. Based on these estimates, Lehman Brothers derived implied exchange ratios based on the relative contribution by each of Pacific and Plains, as well as the 0.770x exchange ratio offered in the merger. The following table summarizes the results of such review:

	Implied Exchange Ratio Based on:	
	Distributable Cash Flow per L.P. Unit	Net Income per L.P. Unit
Street Case		
2006E	0.687x	0.527x
2007E	0.717x	0.598x
Management Case		
2006E	0.696x	0.499x
2007E	0.661x	0.463x
2008E	0.723x	0.561x
Upside Case		
2006E	0.696x	0.499x
2007E	0.717x	0.538x
2008E	0.884x	0.886x

Pro Forma Analysis. To determine the pro forma impact of the proposed transaction on, among other things, Pacific's and Plains' projected distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit for the years 2006 through 2010, Lehman Brothers compared the distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit of Pacific and Plains, on a stand-alone basis, to the distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit of Pacific and Plains pro forma for the proposed transaction. Three scenarios, each of which included expected synergies and the impact of the reduction in incentive distributions that would have otherwise been payable to Plains' general partner, were analyzed based on: (i) published estimates of independent research analysts for both Pacific and Plains (estimates were only available for 2006 and 2007), (ii) the management case provided by Pacific management and the financial projections provided by Plains management, and (iii) the upside case provided by Pacific management and the financial projections provided by Plains management. Based on this review, Lehman Brothers noted that the proposed transaction would be accretive to distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit for holders of Pacific limited partnership interests in all years under all cases except for 2008, 2009 and 2010 under the upside case.

General. Lehman Brothers is an internationally recognized investment banking firm and, as part of its investment banking activities, is regularly engaged in the valuation of businesses and their securities in connection with mergers and acquisitions, negotiated underwritings, competitive bids, secondary distributions of listed and unlisted securities, private placements and valuations for corporate and other purposes. LB Pacific and the Pacific board selected Lehman Brothers because of its expertise, reputation and familiarity with Pacific and the oil and gas industry generally and because its investment banking professionals have substantial experience in transactions comparable to the merger.

As compensation for its services in connection with the merger, Lehman Brothers was paid \$1.0 million upon the delivery of the Lehman Brothers opinion. Additional compensation of \$11.5 million will be payable to Lehman Brothers upon completion of the proposed transaction, and

Lehman Brothers will be reimbursed for reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with the proposed transaction. The opinion fee, the additional consideration and the reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses will be paid one-third by LB Pacific and two-thirds by Pacific. In addition, Pacific has agreed to indemnify Lehman Brothers for certain liabilities that may arise out of its engagement by Pacific and the rendering of the Lehman Brothers opinion. Lehman Brothers also has performed various investment banking services for Pacific and Plains in the past, and expects to perform such services for Plains in the future, and received and expects to receive customary fees for such services.

In the ordinary course of its business, Lehman Brothers may actively trade in the debt or equity securities of Pacific and Plains for its own account and for the accounts of its customers and, accordingly, may at any time hold a long or short position in such securities. Pacific's general partner is deemed to be an affiliate of Lehman Brothers through a 59% ownership interest in Pacific's general partner held by certain entities controlled by Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., the parent entity of Lehman Brothers.

Opinion of Petrie Parkman & Co. Financial Advisor to the Conflicts Committee of the Board of Directors of Pacific's General Partner

The Pacific conflicts committee engaged Petrie Parkman & Co. ("Petrie Parkman") as its financial advisor as of May 2, 2006 in connection with the possible sale, merger, or similar transactions involving all or a portion of Pacific and, in connection therewith, of LB Pacific and/or certain of its affiliates. On June 11, 2006, Petrie Parkman delivered to the Pacific conflicts committee its oral opinion, and subsequently confirmed in writing that, as of that date and based upon and subject to the matters set forth in the opinion, the exchange ratio was fair, from a financial point of view, to the holders of Pacific common units, other than LB Pacific and its affiliates.

THE FULL TEXT OF THE PETRIE PARKMAN OPINION, DATED JUNE 11, 2006, WHICH SETS FORTH, AMONG OTHER THINGS, THE ASSUMPTIONS MADE, PROCEDURES FOLLOWED, MATTERS CONSIDERED, AND QUALIFICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE REVIEW UNDERTAKEN BY PETRIE PARKMAN IN RENDERING ITS OPINION IS, WITH PETRIE PARKMAN'S CONSENT, ATTACHED AS ANNEX C TO THIS JOINT PROXY STATEMENT/PROSPECTUS AND IS INCORPORATED IN THIS DOCUMENT BY REFERENCE. THE SUMMARY OF THE PETRIE PARKMAN OPINION SET FORTH IN THIS DOCUMENT IS QUALIFIED IN ITS ENTIRETY BY REFERENCE TO THE FULL TEXT OF THE OPINION. THE HOLDERS OF PACIFIC COMMON UNITS ARE URGED TO READ THE PETRIE PARKMAN OPINION CAREFULLY AND IN ITS ENTIRETY.

PETRIE PARKMAN'S OPINION WAS PROVIDED TO THE PACIFIC CONFLICTS COMMITTEE FOR ITS USE AND BENEFIT IN CONNECTION WITH ITS CONSIDERATION OF THE MERGER AND RELATES SOLELY TO THE FAIRNESS, FROM A FINANCIAL POINT OF VIEW, OF THE EXCHANGE RATIO TO THE HOLDERS OF PACIFIC COMMON UNITS, OTHER THAN LB PACIFIC AND ITS AFFILIATES. THE PETRIE PARKMAN OPINION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A RECOMMENDATION TO ANY HOLDER OF PACIFIC COMMON UNITS AS TO HOW SUCH HOLDER SHOULD VOTE ON THE MERGER. PETRIE PARKMAN'S OPINION DOES NOT ADDRESS THE RELATIVE MERITS OF THE MERGER AS COMPARED TO ANY ALTERNATIVE BUSINESS TRANSACTION OR STRATEGIC ALTERNATIVE THAT MIGHT BE AVAILABLE TO PACIFIC NOR DOES IT ADDRESS THE UNDERLYING BUSINESS DECISION OF PACIFIC TO ENGAGE IN THE MERGER. PETRIE PARKMAN WAS NOT ASKED TO AND DID NOT SOLICIT THIRD-PARTY INDICATIONS OF INTEREST IN ACQUIRING ALL OR ANY PART OF PACIFIC. PETRIE PARKMAN'S OPINION AND ITS PRESENTATION TO THE PACIFIC CONFLICTS COMMITTEE WERE AMONG MANY FACTORS TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION BY THE PACIFIC CONFLICTS COMMITTEE IN

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

APPROVING THE MERGER AGREEMENT AND MAKING ITS RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE MERGER.

In arriving at its opinion, Petrie Parkman, among other things:

- (1) reviewed certain publicly available business and financial information relating to Pacific, including (i) its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and related audited financial statements for the fiscal years ended December 31, 2003, December 31, 2004 and December 31, 2005 and (ii) its Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q and related unaudited financial statements for the fiscal quarter ended March 31, 2006;
- (2) reviewed certain publicly available business and financial information relating to Plains, including (i) its Annual Reports on Form 10-K and related audited financial statements for the fiscal years ended December 31, 2003, December 31, 2004 and December 31, 2005, (ii) its Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q and related unaudited financial statements for the fiscal quarter ended March 31, 2006 and (iii) its Current Report on Form 8-K dated May 3, 2006;
- (3) analyzed certain historical and projected financial and operating data of Pacific and Plains prepared by the management and staff of Pacific and Plains, respectively;
- (4) discussed the current and projected operations and prospects of Plains with the managements and staffs of Pacific and Plains, including information relating to certain strategic implications and operational benefits anticipated to result from the merger and purchase transactions, and discussed the current and projected operations and prospects of Pacific with the management and staff of Pacific;
- (5) reviewed the historical market prices and trading history of the Pacific common units and the Plains common units;
- (6) compared recent stock market capitalization indicators for Pacific and Plains with recent stock market capitalization indicators for certain other publicly traded energy companies that Petrie Parkman deemed to be relevant;
- (7) compared the financial terms of the merger with the financial terms of other transactions that Petrie Parkman deemed to be relevant;
- (8) participated in discussions among the representatives of the conflicts committee, Pacific, Plains and their respective legal and financial advisors;
- (9) reviewed a draft dated June 11, 2006 of the merger agreement and a draft dated June 11, 2006 of the purchase agreement;
- (10) reviewed and considered the proceedings and sale process undertaken by LB Pacific that led to the merger and purchase transaction;
- (11) reviewed and considered the allocation of value of the aggregate financial consideration to be received from the merger and purchase transaction between the holders of Pacific common units (other than LB Pacific and its affiliates), on the one hand, and LB Pacific, on the other hand; and
- (12) reviewed such other financial studies and analyses and performed such other investigations and took into account such other matters as Petrie Parkman has deemed necessary or appropriate.

In connection with its opinion, Petrie Parkman assumed and relied upon, without assuming any responsibility for, or independently verifying, the accuracy and completeness of all information supplied or otherwise made available to Petrie Parkman by Pacific and Plains. Petrie

Parkman further relied upon the assurances of representatives of the management of Pacific and Plains that they were unaware

of any facts that would make the information provided to Petrie Parkman incomplete or misleading in any material respect. With respect to projected financial and operating data, Petrie Parkman assumed that it had been reasonably prepared on bases reflecting the best currently available estimates and judgments of the managements and staffs of Pacific and Plains relating to the future financial and operational performance of each partnership and the strategic implications and operational benefits anticipated to result from the merger and purchase transaction. Petrie Parkman did not make an independent evaluation or appraisal of the assets or liabilities of Pacific or Plains, nor was Petrie Parkman furnished with any such evaluations or appraisals. In addition, Petrie Parkman did not assume any obligation to conduct, nor did Petrie Parkman conduct, any physical inspection of the properties or facilities of Pacific or Plains. Petrie Parkman also assumed that the final form of the merger agreement and the purchase agreement would be substantially similar to the last draft reviewed by Petrie Parkman, and that the merger and purchase transaction would be consummated in accordance with the terms of the respective agreements without waiver of any of the conditions precedent to the merger or purchase transaction contained in such agreements.

Petrie Parkman's opinion was rendered on the basis of conditions in the securities markets and the energy markets as they existed and could be evaluated on the date of its opinion and the conditions and prospects, financial and otherwise, of Pacific and Plains as they were represented to Petrie Parkman as of the date of its opinion or as they were reflected in the materials and discussions described in Petrie Parkman's opinion. It should be understood that subsequent developments may affect Petrie Parkman's opinion and that Petrie Parkman does not have any obligation to update, revise or reaffirm its opinion.

The following is a summary of the financial analyses performed by Petrie Parkman in connection with the preparation of its opinion dated June 11, 2006 and presented to the Pacific conflicts committee on that date.

This summary includes information presented in tabular format. In order to fully understand these financial analyses, the tables must be read together with the text accompanying each summary. The tables alone do not constitute a complete description of these financial analyses. Considering the data set forth in the tables without considering the full narrative description of these analyses, including the methodologies and assumptions underlying these analyses, could create a misleading or incomplete view of these financial analyses performed by Petrie Parkman.

Implied Premium Analysis. Petrie Parkman calculated the premiums implied by comparing the \$35.50 per unit of implied merger consideration to Pacific unitholders based on the 0.77 exchange ratio offered by Plains and the Plains June 9, 2006 closing price of \$46.10 per unit to the historical trading prices of Pacific common units for specified periods between January 3, 2005 and June 9, 2006 and calculated the following results:

Period	Market Price	\$35.50 Offer Premium
Last Price (June 9, 2006)	\$ 32.09	10.6%
1 Week Prior	\$ 32.09	10.6%
1 Month (30 Calendar Days) Prior	\$ 31.58	12.4%
6 Months Prior	\$ 30.26	17.3%
1 Year Prior	\$ 31.82	11.6%
High Price	\$ 35.51	0.0%
Low Price	\$ 28.02	26.7%

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Historical Trading Ratio Analysis. Petrie Parkman analyzed the historical ratios of the closing prices of Pacific common units divided by the corresponding closing prices of Plains common units for the period from January 3, 2005 to June 9, 2006 and calculated the following results:

Period	Average Trading Ratio
Current (June 9, 2006)	0.70
1 Week Prior	0.68
1 Month (30 Calendar Days) Prior	0.68
3 Months Prior	0.69
1 Year Prior	0.72
Since January 3, 2005	0.74
High	0.83
Low	0.64

Discounted Cash Flow Analysis. Petrie Parkman projected the potential financial performance of Pacific and Plains, without giving effect to the proposed merger, for the five year period beginning on January 1, 2006. Petrie Parkman prepared these projections using financial and operating projections prepared and/or provided by the managements and staffs of Pacific and Plains and certain assumptions based upon discussions with the managements of Pacific and Plains regarding the potential future operating and financial performance of Pacific and Plains.

For each of Pacific and Plains, Petrie Parkman analyzed two cases of operating projections, in which the principal variables were the growth rate in estimated earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, depletion and amortization ("EBITDA") and associated capital expenditures to support the growth rate. Petrie Parkman calculated the net present value of projected limited partner distributions and terminal values using after-tax discount rates of 10.0% to 12.0% for Pacific and 9.0% to 11.0% for Plains and terminal multiples of 12.0x to 15.0x estimated 2010 limited partner distributions for Pacific and Plains. The discount rates were selected by Petrie Parkman based on an analysis of the weighted average cost of capital for Pacific and Plains. The terminal multiples were selected by Petrie Parkman based on a review of comparable company trading and transaction multiples. From the equity reference values implied by this analysis, Petrie Parkman determined composite per unit equity reference value ranges of \$33.00 to \$39.00 and \$38.00 to \$45.00 for Case 1 and Case 2, respectively, for Pacific and \$46.00 to \$54.00 and \$50.00 to \$58.00 for Case 1 and Case 2, respectively, for Plains.

The per unit equity reference value ranges for Pacific and Plains were then used to derive implied exchange ratios of 0.61 to 0.85 and 0.66 to 0.90 for Case 1 and Case 2, respectively. The low end of the implied exchange ratio range is calculated by dividing the low end of the Pacific equity reference value range by the high end of the Plains equity reference value range. The high end of the implied exchange ratio range is calculated by dividing the high end of the Pacific equity reference value range by the low end of the Plains equity reference value range.

Petrie Parkman noted the proposed exchange ratio of 0.77 was supported by its analysis.

Comparable Transaction Analysis. Petrie Parkman reviewed selected publicly available information on three merger transactions involving publicly traded master limited partnerships announced between October 1997 and June 2006 that Petrie Parkman deemed appropriate for an analysis of Pacific and Plains.

Using publicly available information, Petrie Parkman calculated purchase price of equity multiples of latest twelve months ("LTM"), current year's and next year's estimated distributable cash flow per limited partner unit and total investment, which Petrie Parkman defined for the purposes of this analysis as purchase price of equity plus net obligations assumed, multiples of LTM, current year's and next year's EBITDA. In each case, estimated distributable cash flow and EBITDA were based on the average of research analyst estimates.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Petrie Parkman determined that the following company acquisition transactions were relevant to an evaluation of Pacific and Plains:

Acquirer	Target	Date of Announcement
Valero, L.P.	Kaneb Pipeline Partners, L.P.	November 1, 2004
Enterprise Products Partners, L.P.	GulfTerra Energy Partners, L.P.	December 15, 2003
Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.	Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline Partners, L.P.	October 20, 1997

The maximum, mean, median and minimum implied multiples in these transactions are set forth below. The table below also includes benchmark multiple ranges selected by Petrie Parkman based on a review of the implied multiples in the selected transactions.

	Implied Multiples in Selected Transactions				Selected Benchmark Ranges
	Maximum	Mean	Median	Minimum	
Purchase Price/LTM Distributable Cash Flow	17.2x	14.8x	15.0x	12.1x	15.0 - 17.0x
Purchase Price/Current Year's Estimated Distributable Cash Flow	14.8x	14.8x	14.8x	14.8x	14.0 - 16.0x
Purchase Price/Next Year's Estimated Distributable Cash Flow	14.8x	14.6x	14.6x	14.4x	14.0 - 15.0x
Total Investment/LTM EBITDA	15.3x	13.5x	14.5x	10.8x	14.0 - 15.0x
Total Investment/Current Year's Estimated EBITDA	14.9x	13.9x	13.9x	12.8x	12.5 - 14.5x
Total Investment/Next Year's Estimated EBITDA	14.3x	13.0x	13.0x	11.7x	12.0 - 14.0x

Petrie Parkman applied the benchmark multiples to Pacific's and Plains' LTM, current year's and next year's estimated distributable cash flow and EBITDA and adjusted for long-term debt, net working capital and the estimated value for the partnerships' general partner interests and incentive distribution rights, where appropriate, to determine enterprise reference value ranges for Pacific and Plains.

Petrie Parkman also performed a premium analysis for the same universe of merger transactions, which compared the offer price per target company unit with the target company's unit price measured one day, 30 days and 60 days prior to the public announcement of the transaction. The maximum, mean, median and minimum premiums (which Petrie Parkman defined for the purposes of this analysis as excess of offer price over target company's unit price stated as a percentage above the target company's unit price), together with benchmark premium ranges selected by Petrie Parkman based on a review of the implied premiums for these periods, were as follows:

	Implied Premiums in Selected Transactions				Selected Benchmark Ranges
	Maximum	Mean	Median	Minimum	
One Day Prior	32%	18%	21%	2%	15% - 25%
30 Days Prior	39%	20%	19%	3%	15% - 25%
60 Days Prior	42%	22%	24%	-1%	20% - 30%

Petrie Parkman applied the range of benchmark premiums to the corresponding unit prices of Pacific and Plains for the periods of one day, 30 days and 60 days prior to June 9, 2006 and adjusted for long-term debt and net working capital to determine enterprise reference value ranges for Pacific and Plains.

Petrie Parkman determined from the enterprise reference value ranges implied by these multiples a composite reference value range of \$1,850 million to \$2,100 million for Pacific and \$5,500 million to \$5,900 million for Plains. After deducting long-term debt and net working capital from the enterprise

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

reference value ranges and dividing by the fully-diluted number of units outstanding, the resulting equity reference value ranges were \$32.84 to \$39.19 for Pacific and \$52.53 to \$57.55 for Plains.

These per unit equity reference value ranges were then used to derive the implied exchange ratio range of 0.57 to 0.75. The low end of the implied exchange ratio range is calculated by dividing the low end of the Pacific equity reference value range by the high end of the Plains equity reference value range. The high end of the implied exchange ratio range is calculated by dividing the high end of the Pacific equity reference value range by the low end of the Plains equity reference value range.

Petrie Parkman noted the proposed exchange ratio of 0.77 was supported by its analysis.

Capital Market Comparison. Using publicly available information, Petrie Parkman calculated market capitalization multiples of LTM, 2006 and 2007 estimated distributable cash flow per limited partner unit and enterprise value multiples of LTM, 2006 and 2007 estimated EBITDA for ten publicly traded companies for Pacific and ten publicly traded companies for Plains. In each case, estimated distributable cash flow and EBITDA were based on average research analyst estimates. Petrie Parkman calculated market value for purposes of this analysis by adding the market value of common units as of June 9, 2006, the market value of common units less a 5% discount for outstanding subordinated units as of June 9, 2006 (the discount reflecting the reduced marketability and structural subordination of the subordinated units relative to the common units) and the estimated value for the partnerships' general partner interests and incentive distribution rights. Petrie Parkman obtained the enterprise value of each partnership by adding the equity market value to the sum of its long-term debt and subtracting net working capital.

Petrie Parkman determined that the following companies were relevant to an evaluation of Pacific based on Petrie Parkman's view of the comparability of the operating and financial characteristics of these companies to those of Pacific:

Buckeye Pipeline Partners, L.P.	Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P.
Enbridge Energy Partners, L.P.	Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.
Enterprise Product Partners, L.P.	Sunoco Logistics Partners, L.P.
Holly Energy Partners, L.P.	TEPPCO Partners, L.P.
Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.	Valero, L.P.

The maximum, mean, median and minimum multiples for the ten partnerships are set forth below. The table also includes benchmark multiple ranges selected by Petrie Parkman based on a review of the comparable company multiples.

Measure	Comparable Company Multiples				Selected Benchmark Ranges
	Maximum	Mean	Median	Minimum	
Price/LTM Distributable Cash Flow per Limited Partner Unit	15.7x	13.7x	13.7x	10.0x	14.0 - 15.0x
Price/2006 Estimated Distributable Cash Flow per Limited Partner Unit	15.0x	13.2x	13.2x	11.6x	13.0 - 14.0x
Price/2007 Estimated Distributable Cash Flow per Limited Partner Unit	13.9x	12.4x	12.4x	11.0x	12.0 - 13.5x
Enterprise Value/LTM EBITDA	21.4x	17.6x	17.3x	14.5x	16.0 - 18.0x
Enterprise Value/2006 Estimated EBITDA	19.9x	15.7x	15.4x	12.4x	14.5 - 16.5x
Enterprise Value/2007 Estimated EBITDA	18.4x	14.6x	14.5x	11.3x	13.5 - 15.0x

Petrie Parkman applied the benchmark multiples to Pacific's LTM, 2006 and 2007 estimated distributable cash flow and EBITDA and adjusted for long-term debt, net working capital and the

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

estimated value of the partnership's general partner interest and incentive distribution rights, where appropriate, to determine enterprise reference value ranges for Pacific.

Petrie Parkman determined from the enterprise reference value ranges implied by these multiples a composite enterprise reference value range of \$1,800 million to \$2,000 million. After deducting long-term debt and net working capital from the enterprise reference value range and dividing by the fully-diluted number of units outstanding, the resulting equity reference value range was \$31.57 to \$36.65.

Petrie Parkman determined that the following companies were relevant to an evaluation of Plains based on Petrie Parkman's view of the comparability of the operating and financial characteristics of these companies to those of Plains:

Buckeye Pipeline Partners, L.P.	Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P.
Enbridge Energy Partners, L.P.	Pacific Energy Partners, L.P.
Enterprise Product Partners, L.P.	Sunoco Logistics Partners, L.P.
Holly Energy Partners, L.P.	TEPPCO Partners, L.P.
Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.	Valero, L.P.

The maximum, mean, median and minimum multiples for the ten companies are set forth below. The table also includes benchmark multiple ranges selected by Petrie Parkman based on a review of the comparable company multiples.

Measure	Comparable Company Multiples				Selected Benchmark Ranges
	Maximum	Mean	Median	Minimum	
Price/LTM Distributable Cash Flow per Limited Partner Unit	16.3x	14.3x	14.1x	13.0x	14.0 - 15.0x
Price/2006 Estimated Distributable Cash Flow per Limited Partner Unit	15.0x	13.4x	13.3x	12.3x	13.0 - 14.0x
Price/2007 Estimated Distributable Cash Flow per Limited Partner Unit	13.9x	12.5x	12.6x	11.0x	12.0 - 13.5x
Enterprise Value/LTM EBITDA	21.4x	17.8x	17.4x	14.7x	16.0 - 18.0x
Enterprise Value/2006 Estimated EBITDA	19.9x	15.6x	15.4x	12.4x	14.5 - 16.5x
Enterprise Value/2007 Estimated EBITDA	18.4x	14.4x	14.5x	11.3x	13.5 - 15.0x

Petrie Parkman applied the benchmark multiples to Plains' LTM, 2006 and 2007 estimated distributable cash flow and EBITDA and adjusted for long-term debt, net working capital and the estimated value of the partnership's general partner interest and incentive distribution rights, where appropriate, to determine enterprise reference value ranges for Plains.

Petrie Parkman determined from the enterprise reference value ranges implied by these multiples a composite enterprise reference value range of \$5,000 million to \$5,600 million. After deducting long-term debt and net working capital from the enterprise reference value range and dividing by the fully-diluted number of units outstanding, the resulting equity reference value range was \$46.25 to \$53.78.

The per unit equity reference value ranges were then used to derive the implied exchange ratio range of 0.59 to 0.79. The low end of the implied exchange ratio range is calculated by dividing the low end of the Pacific equity reference value range by the high end of the Plains equity reference value range. The high end of the implied exchange ratio range is calculated by dividing the high end of the Pacific equity reference value range by the low end of the Plains equity reference value range.

Petrie Parkman noted the proposed exchange ratio of 0.77 was supported by its analysis.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Pro Forma Analysis. Petrie Parkman analyzed the pro forma financial effects of the proposed merger and purchase transaction for the fiscal years ended 2006 and 2007 using average research analyst estimates and the Discounted Cash Flow Analysis Case 1 for Pacific and Plains. For purposes of its analysis, Petrie Parkman assumed \$30 million of pre-tax synergies. This analysis indicated that the merger would be accretive to 2006 and 2007 estimated distributable cash flow per Pacific limited partner unit and 2006 and 2007 estimated distributions per Pacific limited partner unit.

The description set forth above constitutes a summary of the analyses employed and factors considered by Petrie Parkman in rendering its opinion to the Pacific conflicts committee. Petrie Parkman believes that its analyses must be considered as a whole and that selecting portions of its analyses, without considering all analyses and factors, could create an incomplete view of the process underlying its opinion. The preparation of a fairness opinion is a complex, analytical process involving various determinations as to the most appropriate and relevant methods of financial analysis and the application of those methods to the particular circumstances and is not necessarily susceptible to partial analysis or summary description. In arriving at its opinion, Petrie Parkman did not attribute any particular weight to any analysis considered by it, but rather made qualitative judgments as to the significance and relevance of each analysis. Any estimates resulting from the analyses are not necessarily indicative of actual values, which may be significantly more or less favorable than as set forth in this document. In addition, analyses based on forecasts of future results are not necessarily indicative of future results, which may be significantly more or less favorable than suggested by these analyses. Estimates of reference values of companies do not purport to be appraisals or necessarily reflect the prices at which companies may actually be sold. Because the estimates are inherently subject to uncertainty and based upon numerous factors or events beyond the control of the parties and Petrie Parkman, Petrie Parkman cannot assure that the estimates will prove to be accurate.

No company used in the analyses of other publicly traded companies or any transaction used in the analyses of comparable transactions is identical to Pacific, Plains or the proposed merger. Accordingly, these analyses must take into account differences in the financial and operating characteristics of the selected publicly traded companies and differences in the structure and timing of the selected transactions and other factors that would affect the public trading values and acquisition values of the companies considered.

Petrie Parkman, as part of its investment banking business, is continually engaged in the evaluation of energy-related businesses and their securities in connection with mergers and acquisitions, negotiated underwritings, secondary distributions of listed and unlisted securities, private placements and evaluations for corporate and other purposes. The Pacific conflicts committee selected Petrie Parkman as its financial advisor because it is an internationally recognized investment banking firm that has substantial experience in transactions similar to the merger.

Pursuant to the terms of an engagement letter agreement dated effective as of May 2, 2006, Pacific paid Petrie Parkman a customary fee upon the delivery of Petrie Parkman's fairness opinion dated June 11, 2006. No portion of Petrie Parkman's fee was contingent upon the consummation of the merger or the conclusions reached by Petrie Parkman in its opinion. In addition, Pacific agreed to reimburse Petrie Parkman for reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with the engagement, including fees and reasonable expenses of legal counsel. Pacific has also agreed to indemnify Petrie Parkman and its affiliates and its and their respective directors, officers, partners, agents, employees and controlling persons to the full extent lawful, from and against certain liabilities related to or arising out of its rendering of services under its engagement, including liabilities under the federal securities laws. In the ordinary course of business, Petrie Parkman or its affiliates may trade in the debt or equity securities of Pacific or Plains for the accounts of its customers and, accordingly, may at any time hold a long or short position in such securities.

Opinion of Simmons & Company International Financial Advisor to the Board of Directors of Plains' General Partner

Simmons & Company International ("Simmons & Company") acted as financial advisor to the Plains board in connection with the proposed merger and the transactions related to the merger. On June 11, 2006, Simmons & Company rendered its written opinion to the Plains board to the effect that as of the date of such opinion, the aggregate consideration to be paid by Plains in the proposed merger and the related transactions is fair, from a financial point of view, to Plains and the Plains common unitholders (excluding the Plains common unitholders who hold a direct or indirect interest in Plains' general partner).

THE FULL TEXT OF THE SIMMONS & COMPANY OPINION DATED JUNE 11, 2006 IS INCLUDED AS ANNEX D TO THIS DOCUMENT. HOLDERS OF PLAINS COMMON UNITS MAY READ THE SIMMONS & COMPANY OPINION FOR A DISCUSSION OF THE FACTORS CONSIDERED, ASSUMPTIONS MADE AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE REVIEW UNDERTAKEN BY SIMMONS & COMPANY IN CONNECTION WITH ITS OPINION.

SIMMONS & COMPANY'S ADVISORY SERVICES AND OPINION WERE PROVIDED FOR THE INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE OF THE PLAINS BOARD IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR CONSIDERATION OF THE MERGER AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS. SIMMONS & COMPANY'S OPINION IS NOT A RECOMMENDATION TO ANY UNITHOLDER OF PLAINS OR PACIFIC AS TO HOW SUCH UNITHOLDER SHOULD VOTE WITH RESPECT TO THE MERGER. SIMMONS & COMPANY WAS NOT REQUESTED TO OPINE AS TO, AND ITS OPINION DOES NOT ADDRESS, PLAINS' UNDERLYING BUSINESS DECISION TO PROCEED WITH OR EFFECT THE MERGER AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS, OR THE FAIRNESS OF THE RESPECTIVE CONSIDERATION TO BE PAID BY PLAINS IN ANY PARTICULAR ASPECT OF THE MERGER AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS.

Simmons & Company, in arriving at its opinion, reviewed and analyzed:

- (1) the agreements and the specific terms of the purchase agreement, merger agreement and related transaction documents;
- (2) publicly-available information concerning Plains and Pacific that Simmons & Company believed to be relevant to the analysis, including Plains' and Pacific's respective Annual Reports on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2005, and their respective Quarterly Reports on Form 10-Q for the three months ended March 31, 2006;
- (3) financial and operating information with respect to the business, operations and prospects of Plains and Pacific furnished to Simmons & Company by the management of Plains, including estimates prepared by the management of Plains regarding the amounts and timing of selling, general and administrative expense and operational expense savings, as well as commercial opportunities expected to be achieved as a result of the merger and the related transactions (collectively, the "Expected Synergies");
- (4) a pro forma discounted cash flow analysis of Pacific;
- (5) the respective trading histories of Plains common units and Pacific common units for the three year period ended June 8, 2006;
- (6) a comparison of historical financial results and present financial condition of Plains and Pacific to each other and to other publicly traded partnerships that Simmons & Company deemed relevant;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

- (7) the relative contributions of Plains and Pacific to the historical and future financial performance of the combined company, including a comparison of each entity's EBITDA and distributable cash flow;
- (8) an analysis of the pro forma financial consequences of the merger and the related transactions to the Plains common unitholders, including the impact of the merger and the related transactions on distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit;
- (9) an analysis of Pacific's pro forma total invested capital to EBITDA and unlevered distributable cash flow as compared to certain other partnerships that Simmons & Company believed to be comparable to Pacific; and
- (10) a comparison of the financial terms of the merger and the related transactions to the financial terms of other business combinations and transactions that Simmons & Company deemed relevant.

In addition, Simmons & Company had multiple discussions with the managements of Plains and Pacific concerning the business, operations, assets, financial condition and prospects of Plains and Pacific and undertook such other studies, analyses and investigations as Simmons & Company deemed appropriate.

Simmons & Company, in arriving at its opinion, assumed and relied upon the accuracy and completeness of the financial and other information used by it without assuming any responsibility for independent verification of such information and further relied upon the assurance of the management of Plains that they were not aware of any facts or circumstances that would make such information inaccurate or misleading. With respect to the financial projections of Plains, Pacific and the combined company, upon advice of the management of Plains, Simmons & Company assumed that such projections were reasonably prepared on a basis reflecting the best currently available estimates and judgments of the management of Plains as to the future financial performance of Plains, Pacific and the combined company and that each will perform substantially in accordance with such projections. In addition, upon advice of the management of Plains, Simmons & Company also assumed that the amounts and timing of the Expected Synergies were reasonable and that the Expected Synergies will be realized substantially in accordance with such estimates. On the advice of management of Plains, Simmons & Company assumed that, as a result of the merger and the related transactions, no income, gain or loss is expected to be recognized for Federal income tax purposes by Plains common unitholders, other than gain resulting from any decrease in partnership liabilities pursuant to Section 752 of the Code. Furthermore, on advice of the management of Plains, any tax consequences to the Plains common unitholders associated with Section 752 of the Code were assumed to be immaterial. In arriving at its opinion, Simmons & Company did not conduct a physical inspection of the properties and facilities of Plains or Pacific and did not make or obtain any evaluations or appraisals of the assets or liabilities of either partnership. Simmons & Company's opinion necessarily was based upon market, economic and other conditions as they existed on, and could be evaluated as of, June 11, 2006.

The analyses performed by Simmons & Company are not necessarily indicative of actual values or actual future results, which may be significantly more or less favorable than suggested by the analyses. The analyses were prepared solely as part of Simmons & Company's analysis of the fairness, from a financial point of view, to Plains and the Plains common unitholders (excluding the Plains common unitholders who hold a direct or indirect interest in Plains' general partner) of the aggregate consideration to be paid by Plains in the proposed merger and related transactions.

Simmons & Company's opinion and financial analyses were only one of the many factors considered by Plains and the Plains board in their evaluation of the merger and the related transactions

and should not be viewed as determinative of the views of Plains' management or the Plains board with respect to the merger and the related transactions and the aggregate consideration.

The following is a summary of certain of the financial analyses used by Simmons & Company in connection with providing its written opinion to the Plains board on June 11, 2006. **Some of the summaries of the financial analyses include information presented in tabular format. To fully understand the financial analyses, the tables should be read together with the text of each summary. Considering the data in the tables without considering the narrative description of the financial analyses, including the methodologies and assumptions underlying the analyses, could create a misleading or incomplete view of the financial analyses.** For purposes of this summary of Simmons & Company's analyses, the term "implied aggregate equity consideration" refers to the estimated value of the aggregate equity consideration of \$1,729 million to be paid by Plains in the merger, consisting of:

the cash consideration of \$700 million to be paid to LB Pacific; and

the estimated implied value of the aggregate consideration to be paid in the merger of \$1,029 million, based on consideration of \$35.65 per Pacific common unit in the form of 0.77 Plains common units issuable for each outstanding Pacific common unit not owned by LB Pacific.

Discounted Cash Flow Analysis. Simmons & Company performed a discounted cash flow analysis of the projected unlevered free cash flows of Pacific for the calendar years 2006 through 2015. Simmons & Company assumed discount rates of 9.0% and 12.5% and calculated terminal values using a range of multiples of projected EBITDA from 8.0x to 12.0x. The discount rates reflect an estimate of the weighted average cost of capital.

The projections underlying the discounted cash flow analysis were provided to Simmons & Company by Plains' management. In performing the discounted cash flow analysis, Simmons & Company considered a range of cases with respect to the operating and financial projections in which, among other things, the Expected Synergies realized and the number of growth projects completed were varied. Simmons & Company did not include any estimated annual acquisitions in performing the discounted cash flow analysis. This analysis indicated the implied aggregate equity reference range for Pacific below, with the implied aggregate equity consideration payable by Plains in the merger and the related transactions within the range.

**Implied Aggregate Equity Reference
Range for Pacific**

**Implied Aggregate Equity Consideration Payable in
the Merger and Related Transactions**

\$1,392 million - \$2,059 million

\$1,729 million

Comparable MLP Analysis. Simmons & Company reviewed and compared certain financial information relating to Pacific to corresponding financial information, ratios and public market multiples for 13 publicly traded energy midstream master limited partnerships (MLPs) including:

Boardwalk Pipeline Partners, L.P.
Buckeye Partners L.P.
Enbridge Energy Partners, L.P.
Energy Transfer Partners, L.P.
Enterprise Products Partners, L.P.
Holly Energy Partners, L.P.
Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.

Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P.
ONEOK Partners, L.P.
Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.
Sunoco Logistics Partners L.P.
TEPPCO Partners, L.P.
Valero L.P.

The partnerships listed above (the "Selected Partnerships"), were chosen because they are publicly traded MLPs with operations that for purposes of analysis may be considered similar to Pacific. Simmons & Company calculated various multiples and ratios for the Selected Partnerships and used the

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

multiples and ratios as reference points to develop an indicative valuation for Pacific. All multiples were based on closing market prices on June 8, 2006 and balance sheets as of March 31, 2006. Estimated financial data for the Selected Partnerships were based on publicly available research analysts' estimates. Simmons & Company reviewed multiples and ratios for the Selected Partnerships based on estimates of EBITDA; distributable cash flow (defined as EBITDA less interest expense and maintenance capital expenditures); unlevered distributable cash flow (defined as EBITDA less maintenance capital expenditures); and distribution yield. In calculating the general partner equity value for each of the Selected Partnerships, Simmons & Company utilized two different approaches. The first approach was to value the cash flows that the general partner was currently receiving based on the distribution yield the limited partner units were currently receiving. The second approach divided the cash flows that the general partner was currently receiving (based on the latest quarterly distribution annualized) by the current yield on the equity of each partnership's corresponding general partner if it is publicly traded. For those Selected Partnerships that do not have publicly traded general partners, Simmons & Company applied the median yield on the equity of those that are publicly traded.

This analysis indicated the implied aggregate equity reference range for Pacific below, with the implied aggregate equity consideration payable by Plains in the merger and the related transactions within the range.

**Implied Aggregate Equity Reference
Range for Pacific**

\$1,324 million - \$1,785 million

**Implied Aggregate Equity Consideration Payable in
the Merger and Related Transactions**

\$1,729 million

Comparable MLP Merger Analysis. Simmons & Company analyzed certain information relating to the following three business combination transactions involving publicly traded MLPs in the energy industry:

Acquiror

Valero L.P.

Enterprise Products Partners, L.P.
Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, L.P.

Target

Kaneb Pipe Line Partners, L.P. and Kaneb Services LLC
GulfTerra Energy Partners, L.P.
Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline Partners, L.P.

Among other things, Simmons & Company analyzed the equity purchase price for the transactions as a multiple of latest twelve months (LTM) net income and LTM distributable cash flow. Additionally, Simmons & Company analyzed the total purchase price in each comparable transaction as a multiple of LTM EBITDA and LTM earnings before interest and taxes, which is referred to as EBIT. Simmons & Company used the range of multiples as reference points to derive an indicative valuation range for Pacific. Simmons & Company examined the comparable MLP mergers both excluding expected synergies and including announced expected synergies. This analysis indicated the implied aggregate equity reference range for Pacific below, with the implied aggregate equity consideration payable by Plains in the merger and the related transactions within the range.

**Implied Aggregate Equity Reference Range
for Pacific**

\$1,564 million - \$1,883 million

**Implied Aggregate Equity Consideration Payable in
the Merger and Related Transactions**

\$1,729 million

Premium Paid Analysis. Simmons & Company analyzed the premium implied by the 0.77 exchange ratio in the merger and compared that to the premiums paid in the comparable MLP mergers. Simmons & Company calculated the following implied aggregate equity reference range for Pacific using the historical premiums paid in the comparable MLP mergers for the limited partners' interests and calculating the value for Pacific's general partner as the cash flows that it is currently

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

receiving (based on the latest quarterly distribution annualized) divided by the median yield on the equity of the publicly traded general partners of MLPs. This analysis indicated the implied aggregate equity reference range for Pacific below, with the implied aggregate equity consideration payable by Plains in the merger and the related transactions within the range.

**Implied Aggregate Equity Reference Range
for Pacific**

\$1,335 million - \$1,782 million

**Implied Aggregate Equity Consideration Payable in
the Merger and Related Transactions**

\$1,729 million

Comparable Transactions Analysis. Simmons & Company analyzed certain information relating to selected transactions in the midstream/downstream transportation logistics industry since 2003 (collectively, "Selected Transactions"). Specifically, Simmons & Company calculated, when available, the LTM and runrate EBITDA multiples implied by the aggregate purchase price of the Selected Transactions and used these multiples as reference points to develop an indicative valuation range for Pacific. Simmons & Company excluded the Expected Synergies from the comparable transactions analysis. This analysis indicated the implied aggregate equity reference range for Pacific below, with the implied aggregate equity consideration payable by Plains in the merger and the related transactions above the range.

**Implied Aggregate Equity Reference Range
for Pacific**

\$1,062 million - \$1,556 million

**Implied Aggregate Equity Consideration Payable in
the Merger and Related Transactions**

\$1,729 million

Contribution Analysis. Simmons & Company reviewed certain historical and estimated future financial information, including, among other things, EBITDA and distributable cash flow for Plains and Pacific based on financial data provided by Plains' management for the estimated calendar years 2007 through 2010. Simmons & Company performed the analysis both including and not including the Expected Synergies. Based on these projections, Simmons & Company compared the relative contribution of each partnership to the whole and the implied equity value based on the percentage contribution of Plains and Pacific. The relative contributions of Plains and Pacific resulted in the implied aggregate equity reference range for Pacific below, with the implied aggregate equity consideration payable by Plains in the merger and the related transactions within the range.

**Implied Aggregate Equity Reference Range for
Pacific**

\$1,534 million - \$1,948 million

**Implied Aggregate Equity Consideration Payable in
the
Merger and Related Transactions**

\$1,729 million

Pro Forma Accretion/Dilution Analysis. Simmons & Company analyzed the pro forma impact of the merger and the related transactions on, among other things, Plains' projected distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit for the calendar years 2007 through 2012. Using financial projections provided by Plains' management, Simmons & Company compared the distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit of Plains, on a stand-alone basis, to the distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit of Plains pro forma for the merger and the related transactions. Simmons & Company considered that the amounts that would otherwise be distributed to Plains' general partner pursuant to the incentive distribution rights of Plains will be reduced by \$65 million over five four-quarter periods pursuant to the merger and related transactions. Simmons & Company performed this analysis using two different sets of projections. The principal, but not only, difference between the two different sets of projections was inclusion of estimated annual acquisitions completed beginning in 2007. The estimated acquisitions were assumed to be consummated at an average EBITDA multiple of 8.2x. In addition, Simmons & Company performed pro forma sensitivity analyses on the acquisition projection case by varying several growth, financing and performance assumptions for the calendar years 2007, 2010 and 2012. Based on such analysis, and such projections provided by the management of Plains, the

merger and the related transactions would be dilutive to distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit for Plains common unitholders for the calendar year 2007 under both the no acquisition projection case and each variation of the acquisition projection case as adjusted for the different assumptions, and would be accretive to distributable cash flow per limited partnership unit for Plains common unitholders for the calendar years 2008 through 2012 under both the no acquisition projection case and the acquisition projection case and for the calendar years 2010 and 2012 for each variation of the acquisition projection case as adjusted for the different assumptions.

Invested Capital/EBITDA and Unlevered Distributable Cash Flow Analysis. Simmons & Company analyzed the projected ratios of total invested capital to Pacific's projected EBITDA and projected unlevered distributable cash flow for the calendar years 2007 through 2012. Simmons & Company defined total invested capital as the aggregate transaction value paid in the merger and the related transactions plus estimated cumulative capital expenditures for each of the analyzed projected years. Simmons & Company also calculated the ratios of total invested capital to projected EBITDA and projected unlevered distributable cash flow for calendar year 2007 for a group of comparable MLPs using publicly available research analysts' estimates. Simmons & Company compared the implied range of ratios from the comparable MLPs to the ratios implied by Pacific's projected results. The implied ratios for total invested capital to both Pacific's projected EBITDA and unlevered distributable cash flow, both including all the Expected Synergies and including only half the Expected Synergies, for the calendar year 2007 and the implied ratios for total invested capital to Pacific's projected EBITDA, including only half of the Expected Synergies, for the calendar years 2008 through 2010 were above the range implied by the comparable MLPs. The implied ratios for total invested capital to both Pacific's projected EBITDA and unlevered distributable cash flow, including all the Expected Synergies, for the calendar years 2008 through 2012, for total invested capital to Pacific's projected unlevered distributable cash flow, including only half the Expected Synergies, for the calendar years 2008 through 2012 and for total invested capital to Pacific's projected EBITDA, including only half the Expected Synergies, for the calendar years 2011 and 2012 were within the range implied by the comparable MLPs.

Exchange Ratio Analysis. Simmons & Company reviewed the daily ratio of the closing price of Pacific common units to the closing price of Plains common units for the three-year period ended June 8, 2006. Simmons & Company calculated the average of this ratio for ten-day, 30-day, 90-day, one-year, two-year and three-year periods, with the average ratio ranging from 0.665 to 0.778. The exchange ratio of 0.77 Plains common units per Pacific common unit offered as consideration in the merger was within this range.

Simmons & Company is a specialized, energy-related investment banking firm and, as part of its investment banking activities, is regularly engaged in the valuation of businesses and their securities in connection with mergers and acquisitions, negotiated underwritings, competitive bids, secondary distributions of listed and unlisted securities, private placements and valuations for corporate and other purposes. The Plains board selected Simmons & Company because of its expertise, reputation and familiarity with Plains and the oil and gas industry in general and because its investment banking professionals have substantial experience in transactions comparable to the merger and the related transactions.

Pursuant to the terms of the engagement letter dated May 10, 2006, Plains has paid Simmons & Company \$900,000 for acting as Plains' financial advisor in connection with the merger, including rendering its fairness opinion on June 11, 2006. Further, Plains has agreed to pay Simmons & Company an additional fee of \$4,100,000 upon consummation of the merger. Whether or not the merger occurs, Plains will also reimburse Simmons & Company's reasonable expenses, including legal fees, incurred in connection with its engagement and indemnify Simmons & Company against liabilities arising out of Simmons & Company's services to Plains or, if indemnification is unavailable, contribute to the liabilities.

Simmons & Company has performed various investment banking services for Plains in the past and has received and expects to continue to receive customary fees for such services. In the ordinary course of business, Simmons & Company may actively trade in the debt and equity securities of Plains and Pacific for its own account and for the accounts of its customers and, accordingly, may at any time hold a long or short position in such securities.

Interests of Certain Persons in the Merger

In considering the recommendations of the Pacific board and the Plains board with respect to the merger, unitholders of both partnerships should be aware that some of the executive officers and directors of the general partners of Pacific and Plains have interests in the transaction that differ from, or are in addition to, the interests of common unitholders generally. The Pacific board, the Pacific conflicts committee and the Plains board were aware of these interests and considered them in approving the merger agreement and the related transactions. All dollar amounts set forth below are gross amounts and are not reduced for applicable tax withholding.

Interests of Directors and Executive Officers of Pacific's General Partner

Ownership of Pacific Common Units. The directors and executive officers of Pacific and their affiliates beneficially owned, as of the record date for the Pacific special meeting, approximately % of the Pacific common units then outstanding (excluding common units held by LB Pacific). They will be entitled to receive the same consideration in the merger as all other Pacific common unitholders (other than LB Pacific).

Severance Arrangements. Messrs. Toole, Wright, Tywoniuk, Wood and Zollinger are parties to employment agreements with Pacific. Under these employment agreements, if the employee is terminated without cause following a change of control, or if he resigns for "good reason," as defined in the agreement, following a change of control, he will, among other things, be entitled to a one-time severance payment as well as continuation of welfare plan benefits for a specified period. The severance amount payable to Messrs. Toole and Wright would be equal to two times their current base salary plus two times their target cash bonus for the year in which termination occurs. The severance amount payable to Messrs. Tywoniuk, Wood and Zollinger would be equal to one times their current base salary plus one times their target cash bonus for the year in which termination occurs. Welfare plan benefits would be continued for up to two years for Messrs. Toole and Wright, and up to one year for Messrs. Tywoniuk, Wood and Zollinger. Messrs. Wright, Tywoniuk, Wood and Zollinger would also be entitled to receive executive outplacement services at Pacific's expense for a specified period (six months for Mr. Wright, three months for Messrs. Tywoniuk, Wood and Zollinger). "Good reason" for any resignation exists if the employee suffers a demotion in rank, title, responsibility or authority; an assignment of duties inconsistent with the employee's prior duties resulting in a diminution in position, authority, duties or responsibilities; the employer's failure to comply with the employment agreement; or the employer's requiring the employee to relocate in order to maintain employment.

Pursuant to severance arrangements agreed with Plains, Messrs. Wylie, Diefenbach and Boarts and Ms. Lobel will be entitled to a one-time severance payment and continuation of welfare plan benefits if they are terminated without cause, or resign for good reason, within twelve months of the consummation of the merger. The severance amount payable to Mr. Wylie would be equal to two times his current base salary plus two times his target cash bonus for the year in which termination occurs. The severance amount payable to Messrs. Diefenbach and Boarts would be equal to one times their current base salary plus one times their target cash bonus for the year in which termination occurs. The severance amount payable to Ms. Lobel would be equal to one-half times her current base salary plus one-half times her target cash bonus for the year in which termination occurs, which amount increases to one times if her termination occurs after her one-year anniversary of employment in February 2007 or later. "Good reason" for any resignation exists if the employee suffers a material adverse change in

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

responsibilities or title, a reduction in salary, or a change of more than 25 miles in primary work location.

The severance amounts that would be payable under these arrangements to each of Pacific's executive officers if the employment of the executive officers is terminated after the consummation of the merger are listed below, including severance, estimated costs of welfare benefits and estimated costs of outplacement services if applicable. Amounts for Ms. Lobel could increase as described above depending on the date of any termination of her employment.

Name	Severance Payment
Irvin Toole, Jr.	\$ 1,114,200
Forrest E. Wylie	947,950
David E. Wright	700,200
Gerald A. Tywoniuk	315,800
Lynn T. Wood	278,100
Arthur G. Diefenbach	223,250
Gary L. Zollinger	233,250
Lyle B. Boarts	185,850
Marilyn A. Lobel	113,550

Pacific's Long Term Incentive Plan. Pacific's general partner has adopted a long-term incentive plan for employees and directors of the general partner and employees of its affiliates who perform services for Pacific. The consummation of the merger will cause an acceleration of the vesting periods of, and lapse of restrictions on, Pacific restricted common unit awards (including those issued to directors and executive officers of Pacific's general partner) under the long-term incentive plan. Information with respect to restricted common units held by directors and executive officers of Pacific's general partner is set forth below.

Name	Number of Restricted Units	Dollar Value(1)
David L. Lemmon	2,000	\$ 69,500
John C. Linehan	2,000	69,500
Douglas L. Polson	2,000	69,500
Jim E. Shamas	2,000	69,500
William L. Thacker	2,000	69,500
Irvin Toole, Jr.	7,757	269,556
Forrest E. Wylie	5,253	182,542
David E. Wright	3,527	122,563
Gerald A. Tywoniuk	2,807	97,543
Lynn T. Wood	2,200	76,450
Arthur G. Diefenbach	2,020	70,195
Gary L. Zollinger	2,010	69,848
Lyle B. Boarts	1,030	35,793
Marilyn A. Lobel	820	28,495

(1)

Based on the closing price of Pacific's common units on August 16, 2006.

LB Pacific's Option Plan. LB Pacific has adopted an option plan for officers, directors, employees, advisors, and consultants of Pacific Energy Management and their affiliates. Under the plan, participants may be granted options to acquire partnership interests in LB Pacific. Pacific is not obligated to pay any amounts to LB Pacific for the benefits granted or paid to executives and key employees under the plan.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

The estimated value on exercise of LB Pacific options held by directors and executive officers of Pacific's general partner are set forth below. The estimated value of options on exercise is based on a number of assumptions, including estimates of fees and expenses that LB Pacific expects to incur prior to and at closing, as well as LB Pacific's balance sheet at closing. Therefore, the actual amounts realized by the named individuals may change.

Name	Estimated Value of Options on Exercise (1)
Irvin Toole, Jr.	\$ 2,614,600
Forrest E. Wylie	8,889,700
David E. Wright	3,137,600
Gerald A. Tywoniuk	2,614,600
Lynn T. Wood	1,045,900
Arthur G. Diefenbach	1,568,800
Gary L. Zollinger	1,568,800
Lyle B. Boarts	1,045,900
Marilyn A. Lobel	653,600

(1) Represents the excess of the estimated liquidation value of LB Pacific for the option holders' interest over the exercise price of the options held by the individual.

LB Pacific Cash Bonus Payments. In addition to bonuses that may otherwise be payable, LB Pacific intends to make cash bonus payments to certain executive officers of Pacific Energy Management at the closing of the merger in recognition of their efforts in connection with the transaction. Pacific is not obligated to pay any amounts to LB Pacific in respect of these payments. The payments are subject to the approval of the board of directors of LB Pacific's general partner.

The amount of the cash bonus payment expected to be made to each executive officer of Pacific's general partner is set forth below.

Name	Cash Bonus Payment
Irvin Toole, Jr.	\$ 243,000
Forrest E. Wylie	466,300
Lynn T. Wood	337,200

Indirect Ownership Interests in LB Pacific. Christopher Manning, the chairman of the Pacific board, and Joshua Collins, a member of the Pacific board, hold ownership interests in Lehman Brothers Merchant Banking Associates III, L.P. ("LBMB"), which is the general partner or manager of each of the entities that beneficially own an aggregate 59% interest in LB Pacific. Additionally, Douglas Polson, a member of the Pacific board, holds an ownership interest in Lehman Sidecar I LLC ("Sidecar"), which beneficially owns an 8.66% interest in LB Pacific. As a result of the merger, LBMB and Sidecar will receive a portion of the net cash proceeds from the merger, which will result in cash payments to Messrs. Manning, Collins and Polson.

Timothy Day, a member of the Pacific board, holds a limited partner interest in First Reserve GP X, LP ("FRGPX"), which is the general partner of the entity that directly owns an approximate 41% interest in LB Pacific. As a result of the merger, FRGPX will receive a portion of the net cash proceeds from the merger, which will result in a cash payment to Mr. Day.

Directors' Membership on Board of Directors of LB Pacific. Christopher Manning, Joshua Collins and Timothy Day, members of the Pacific board, are also members of the board of directors of (and in the case of Messrs. Manning and Collins, are officers of) LB Pacific GP, LLC, the sole general partner of LB Pacific.

Directors' and Officers' Indemnification and Insurance. The merger agreement requires Plains to maintain, for six years after the effective time of merger, directors' and officers' liability insurance for the benefit of persons who are or were covered by Pacific's existing directors' and officers' liability insurance policies at any time before the effective time of the merger, as described more fully under "The Merger Agreement Covenants and Other Agreements Employee Matters."

Affiliation of Lehman Brothers Inc. with Pacific's General Partner

Lehman Brothers Inc. acted as financial advisor to the Pacific board in connection with the proposed merger and the transactions related to the merger. Lehman Brothers Inc. delivered an opinion to the Pacific board on June 11, 2006 to the effect that, as of the date of its opinion and based on and subject to various assumptions made, matters considered and limitations described in the opinion, from a financial point of view, the aggregate consideration to be offered to all of the holders of the partnership interests in Pacific in the proposed transaction is fair to such holders. Pacific's general partner is deemed to be an affiliate of Lehman Brothers Inc. through a 59% ownership interest in Pacific's general partner held by certain entities controlled by Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., the parent entity of Lehman Brothers Inc.

Interests of Plains' General Partner's Executive Officers and Directors

Ownership of Pacific Common Units. Mr. Armstrong, the Chairman of the Plains board and Chief Executive Officer of Plains' general partner, owns 5,000 Pacific common units. Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors, L.P. ("KACALP"), an entity affiliated with Mr. Sinnott, a member of the Plains board, manages or controls various accounts that own a total of 1,880,500 Pacific common units. Mr. Sinnott is the President of Kayne Anderson Investment Management, Inc., which is the general partner of KACALP. In addition, executive officers of Plains' general partner (excluding Mr. Armstrong) own a total of 9,500 Pacific common units.

Ownership of Plains' General Partner; Conflicts of Interest. Certain of Plains' directors and executive officers own an indirect interest in Plains' general partner, which owns both the 2% general partner interest and the incentive distribution rights of Plains.

Pursuant to Plains' partnership agreement, Plains' general partner is entitled to receive quarterly incentive distributions if the amount that Plains distributes with respect to any quarter exceeds certain levels specified in its partnership agreement. Under the quarterly incentive distribution provisions, Plains' general partner is generally entitled, without duplication, to 15% of the amounts distributed by Plains in excess of \$0.450 (\$1.80 annualized) per unit, 25% of the amounts distributed by Plains in excess of \$0.495 (\$1.98 annualized) per unit and 50% of the amounts distributed by Plains in excess of \$0.675 (\$2.70 annualized) per unit.

The following table illustrates the allocation of aggregate distributions at different per-unit distribution levels and based upon the assumptions indicated. Incentive distributions made to Plains'

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

general partner are affected by both the gross amount per unit that Plains distributes with respect to each outstanding unit and the aggregate number of units that are outstanding.

Annual Distribution Per Unit	Distribution to Unitholders	Distribution to GP(1)	Total Distribution	GP Percentage of Total Distribution
(in thousands)				
\$2.90 (current Plains distribution level)(2)	\$ 234,900	\$ 41,189	\$ 276,089	14.9%
\$3.20 (anticipated post-merger distribution level)(3)	\$ 329,600	\$ 83,275	\$ 412,875	20.2%
\$3.60(3)	\$ 370,800	\$ 124,475	\$ 495,275	25.1%
\$4.00(3)	\$ 412,000	\$ 165,675	\$ 577,675	28.7%


- (1) Includes distributions attributable to the 2% general partner interest and the incentive distribution rights. Does not give effect to \$65 million reduction in incentive distribution payments over five four-quarter periods following the merger.
- (2) Assumes 81.0 million units outstanding. Actual number of units outstanding as of August 15, 2006 was 80,994,178.
- (3) Assumes 103 million units outstanding following the merger.

As illustrated above, by operation of Plains' partnership agreement, the owners of Plains' general partner have interests that differ materially from owners of Plains' limited partner interests. In the context of certain transactions, including the merger (which involves the issuance of a significant number of Plains common units), a potential conflict exists between the interests of the owners of Plains' general partner and the interests of Plains' common unitholders. Even giving effect to the reduction in incentive distribution payments otherwise payable to Plains' general partner, the merger is expected to be accretive to Plains' general partner on a distributable cash flow basis beginning in 2007. Based on Plains' projected results, the effect of the merger is not expected to be accretive on a distributable cash flow per unit basis to Plains' existing limited partners until 2008.

The directors and executive officers of Plains also have interests that are aligned with the interests of Plains' common unitholders. As of the record date, Plains' directors and executive officers and their affiliates owned in the aggregate approximately % of Plains' outstanding common units, and following the merger are expected to own approximately % of the combined company's outstanding common units.

The following table sets forth the effective ownership of Plains AAP, L.P. (after giving effect to proportionate ownership of Plains All American GP LLC, its 1% general partner).

Name and Address of Owner	Percentage Ownership of Plains AAP
Paul G. Allen(1) 505 Fifth Avenue S, Suite 900 Seattle, WA 98104	54.3%
Vulcan Energy Corporation(2) c/o Plains All American GP LLC 333 Clay Street, Suite 1600 Houston, TX 77002	54.3%
KAFU Holdings, L.P.(3) 1800 Avenue of the Stars, 2nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067	20.3%

Name and Address of Owner	Percentage Ownership of Plains AAP
	

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

E-Holdings III, L.P.(4)	9.0%
1100 Louisiana, Suite 3150 Houston, TX 77002	
E-Holdings V, L.P.(4)	2.1%
1100 Louisiana, Suite 3150 Houston, TX 77002	
PAA Management, L.P.(5)	4.9%
333 Clay Street, Suite 1600 Houston, TX 77002	
Wachovia Investors, Inc.	4.2%
301 South College Street, 12th Floor Charlotte, NC 28288	
Mark E. Strome	2.6%
100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1500 Santa Monica, CA 90401	
Strome MLP Fund, L.P.	1.3%
100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1500 Santa Monica, CA 90401	
Lynx Holdings I, LLC	1.2%
15209 Westheimer, Suite 110 Houston, TX 77082	

-
- (1) Mr. Allen owns approximately 88.38% of the outstanding shares of common stock of Vulcan Energy Corporation. A subsidiary of Vulcan Energy Corporation owns 54.321% of the equity of our general partner. Mr. Allen disclaims any deemed beneficial ownership, beyond his pecuniary interest therein, in any of Plains' partner interests held by Vulcan Energy Corporation or any of its affiliates.
 - (2) Mr. Capobianco disclaims any deemed beneficial ownership of the interests held by Vulcan Energy Corporation and its affiliates beyond his pecuniary interest therein, if any.
 - (3) Mr. Sinnott disclaims any deemed beneficial ownership of the interests owned by KAFU Holdings, L.P. other than through his 4.5% limited partner interest in KAFU Holdings, L.P.
 - (4) Mr. Petersen disclaims any deemed beneficial ownership of the interests owned by E-Holdings III, L.P. and E-Holdings V, L.P. beyond his pecuniary interest therein.
 - (5) PAA Management, L.P. is owned entirely by certain members of senior management. Other than Mr. Armstrong, no directors of Plains' general partner own any interest in PAA Management, L.P. Directors and executive officers as a group own approximately 95% of PAA Management, L.P. Mr. Armstrong disclaims any beneficial ownership of the general partner interest owned by Plains AAP, L.P., other than through his ownership interest in PAA Management, L.P.

In addition to the ownership interests described above, certain of the owners of Plains' general partner have the right to designate a director to the Plains board. Messrs. Capobianco, Petersen and Sinnott have been so designated. These directors have interests in the merger and related transactions that differ from the interests of Plains common unitholders generally.

No Appraisal Rights

Delaware law does not provide for appraisal rights on a merger involving a Delaware limited partnership. Pursuant to §17-212 of the Delaware Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act, however,

a partnership agreement or an agreement of merger or consolidation may provide that contractual appraisal rights with respect to a partnership interest or another interest in a limited partnership shall be available for any class or group of partners or partnership interests in connection with any amendment of a partnership agreement, any merger or consolidation in which the limited partnership is a constituent party to the merger or consolidation, any conversion of the limited partnership to another business form, any transfer to or domestication in any jurisdiction by the limited partnership, or the sale of all or substantially all of the limited partnership's assets. However, neither Plains unitholders nor Pacific unitholders have contractual appraisal rights under their respective partnership agreements or the merger agreement.

Regulatory Matters

Under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 and the rules promulgated thereunder by the FTC, the merger cannot be completed until notifications have been given and certain information has been furnished to the FTC and the Antitrust Division of the DOJ and specified waiting period requirements have been satisfied. On July 31, 2006, the Hart-Scott-Rodino waiting period expired. Plains and Pacific have made required filings with Canadian regulatory authorities, and with the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California and the Public Service Commission of the State of Wyoming, the approval of which are conditions to the merger (and in the case of Wyoming, any protest periods subsequent to such approval shall have lapsed without protest or, if a protest has been filed, such protest shall have been resolved to the reasonable satisfaction of the parties). Plains or Pacific may receive requests for information concerning the proposed merger and related transactions from the FTC or individual states.

At any time before or after completion of the merger, the DOJ, the FTC, or any state could take such action under the antitrust laws as it deems necessary or desirable in the public interest, including seeking to enjoin the completion of the merger, to rescind the merger or to seek divestiture of particular assets of Plains or Pacific. Private parties also may seek to take legal action under the antitrust laws under certain circumstances. In addition, non-United States governmental and regulatory authorities may seek to take action under applicable antitrust laws. A challenge to the merger on antitrust grounds may be made and, if such a challenge is made, it is possible that Plains and Pacific will not prevail.

Listing of Common Units to be Issued in the Merger

Plains expects to obtain approval to list on the NYSE the common units to be issued pursuant to the merger agreement, which approval is a condition to closing the merger.

Accounting Treatment

Plains will account for the merger using the purchase method of accounting. Under the purchase method of accounting, the aggregate consideration that Plains pays for Pacific will be allocated to Pacific's assets and liabilities based on their fair values, with any excess being treated as goodwill. Plains currently expects to record approximately \$784 million of goodwill upon completion of the merger, but that estimate is subject to change.

Pending Litigation

On June 15, 2006, a lawsuit was filed in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, entitled *Kosseff v. Pacific Energy, et al.*, case no. BC 3544016. The plaintiff alleges that he is a unitholder of Pacific, and he seeks to represent a class comprising all of Pacific's unitholders. The complaint names as defendants Pacific and certain of the officers and directors of Pacific's general partner, and asserts claims of self-dealing and breach of fiduciary duty in connection with the merger and related

transactions. Among other allegations, the plaintiff alleges that (1) the proposed transaction was the product of a flawed process that would result in the sale of Pacific at an unfairly low price, (2) subsequent quarterly financial results for Pacific would have had a material positive impact on Pacific's common unit price had the proposed transaction not been announced, and thus the premium being offered to Pacific's unitholders was manufactured by the defendants based on the timing of the announcement of the proposed transaction, (3) because of various conflicts of interest, the defendants have acted to better their own interests at the expense of Pacific's public unitholders, (4) the defendants favored the proposed transaction in order to secure accelerated vesting of equity compensation under change in control provisions in contracts they have with Pacific, and (5) the defendants were assured that Lehman Brothers Inc. "would rubber-stamp the transaction as fair and, for that reason, Lehman [Brothers Inc.] was hand-picked by the defendants to issue the so-called 'fairness opinion'." The plaintiff seeks injunctive relief against completing the merger or, if the merger is completed, rescission of the merger, other equitable relief, and recovery of the plaintiff's costs and attorneys' fees. On July 12, 2006, the court entered a stay of the proceeding pending an initial status conference, which has been scheduled for September 6, 2006. Pacific believes that the lawsuit is without merit and intends to defend against it vigorously. There can be no assurance that additional claims will not be made or additional lawsuits filed, the substance of which may be similar to the allegations described above or that otherwise might arise from, or in connection with, the merger agreement and the transactions it contemplates.

THE MERGER AGREEMENT

The following is a summary of the material terms of the merger agreement and the related transactions. This summary is qualified in its entirety by reference to the merger agreement, as amended, a copy of which is attached to this joint proxy statement/prospectus as Annex A and is incorporated into this document by reference. You should read the merger agreement because it, and not this document, is the legal document that governs the terms of the merger. The merger agreement contains representations and warranties Pacific and Plains made to each other. The assertions embodied in those representations and warranties are qualified by information in confidential disclosure schedules that both Pacific and Plains have exchanged in connection with signing the merger agreement. The disclosure schedules contain information that modifies, qualifies and creates exceptions to the representations and warranties set forth in the attached merger agreement. Accordingly, you should keep in mind that the representations and warranties are modified in important part by the underlying disclosure schedules. The disclosure schedules contain information that has been included in Pacific's and Plains' general prior public disclosures, as well as additional information, some of which is non-public. Pacific and Plains do not believe the disclosure schedules contain information that the securities laws require to be publicly disclosed except as discussed in this joint proxy statement/prospectus. Moreover, information concerning the subject matter of the representations and warranties may have changed since the date of the merger agreement, and this information may or may not be fully reflected in the companies' public disclosures.

Transactions Related to the Merger

On June 11, 2006, in connection with the execution of the merger agreement, Plains entered into a purchase agreement with LB Pacific, pursuant to which Plains has agreed, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the purchase agreement, to purchase from LB Pacific (i) all of the issued and outstanding limited partner interest in Pacific Energy GP, LP, a Delaware limited partnership and the general partner of Pacific, (ii) the sole member interest in Pacific Energy Management LLC, a Delaware limited liability company and the general partner of Pacific Energy GP, LP, (iii) 2,616,250 Pacific common units and (iv) 7,848,750 Pacific subordinated units for an aggregate purchase price of \$700 million in cash. This purchase and sale will occur immediately prior to the consummation of the merger.

Each of Plains and LB Pacific made customary representations and warranties in the purchase agreement. The purchase agreement may be terminated by LB Pacific or Plains upon or after termination of the merger agreement, and is subject to customary closing conditions, including satisfaction of all conditions specified in the merger agreement.

A copy of the purchase agreement is filed as Exhibit 2.2 to the registration statement of which this joint proxy statement/prospectus is a part.

Structure of the Merger

At the effective time of the merger, Pacific will merge with and into Plains, and each of the outstanding common units of Pacific, other than those common units purchased by Plains prior to the merger, will be converted into the right to receive 0.77 Plains common units. Plains will be the surviving limited partnership of the merger.

Plains' certificate of limited partnership will be the surviving entity's certificate of limited partnership until further amended. Plains' partnership agreement will be the surviving entity's partnership agreement until further amended. Plains' management team and board of directors will continue in their current roles and manage the combined company following the merger.

When the Merger Becomes Effective

Pacific and Plains will execute and file a certificate of merger with the Delaware Secretary of State on the third business day after the day on which the last condition to completing the merger is satisfied or waived or at such other time as Plains and Pacific may agree. The merger will become effective at the time and on the date on which the certificate of merger is filed or at such later time and date on which the parties agree and specify in the certificate of merger. This time is referred to as the "effective time of the merger."

Effect of Merger on Outstanding Pacific Units

At the effective time of the merger, each outstanding Pacific common unit, other than units purchased by Plains from LB Pacific prior to the effective time of the merger, will be converted into the right to receive 0.77 Plains common units. The 2% general partner interest of Pacific, the incentive distribution rights in Pacific and the common and subordinated units purchased by Plains from LB Pacific prior to the effective time of the merger will be cancelled without consideration. Certificates representing Pacific common units will be exchanged for certificates representing Plains common units in accordance with the fixed exchange ratio of 0.77 contained in the merger agreement.

Prior to the effective time of the merger, vesting of restricted units granted under Pacific's long-term incentive plan will be accelerated in accordance with the terms of the plan.

If, before the effective time of the merger, the issued and outstanding Plains or Pacific common units are changed into a different number of units as a result of any unit split, distribution, combination, reorganization or other similar transaction, an appropriate adjustment will be made to the exchange ratio.

For a description of Plains' and Pacific's common units and a description of the comparative rights of holders of Plains common units and Pacific common units, please read "Comparison of the Rights of Plains and Pacific Common Unitholders" and "Description of Plains' Common Units."

Exchange of Units; Fractional Units

Exchange Agent. Plains has appointed American Stock Transfer and Trust Company to act as exchange agent for the issuance of Plains common units and for cash payments for fractional common units of Pacific. At or prior to the effective time of the merger, Plains will deposit with the exchange agent, for the benefit of the holders of Pacific's common units, an amount in cash equal to the estimated aggregate cash payment to be made in lieu of fractional common units of Plains, and Plains will authorize the exchange agent to exchange certificates representing Plains common units as described above under "Effect of Merger on Outstanding Pacific Units." Plains will deposit with the exchange agent additional funds as and when necessary to pay cash in lieu of fractional common units of Plains. Plains will pay all costs and fees of the exchange agent and all expenses associated with the exchange process.

After the effective time of the merger, there will be no further transfers on the records of Pacific or its transfer agent of certificates representing Pacific common units. If certificates representing Pacific common units are presented to Pacific or its transfer agent for transfer after the effective time of the merger, they will be canceled against delivery of the certificate or certificates for Plains common units and any cash payments for fractional common units and unpaid distributions.

Exchange of Units. If you own Pacific common units of record as of the effective time of the merger, the exchange agent will mail to you a transmittal letter and instructions explaining how to surrender your Pacific common units to the exchange agent after the effective time of the merger. Pacific common unit certificates should not be returned with the enclosed proxy card.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Pacific common unitholders who deliver a properly completed and signed transmittal letter and any other documents required by the instructions to the transmittal letter to the exchange agent, together with their Pacific common unit certificates, will receive:

certificates representing the number of whole Plains common units to which such holder is entitled in accordance with the merger agreement and as described above under " Effect of Merger on Outstanding Pacific Units;" and

after giving effect to any required tax withholding, a check in the aggregate amount of:

cash equal to the aggregate value of the unitholder's fractional common units of Plains calculated by multiplying the fractional interest by the average closing price of Plains common units on the NYSE during the five trading days ending on the third trading day prior to the effective time of the merger; and

any cash distributions declared by Plains on its common units with a record date after the effective time of the merger and a payment due on or before the date the Pacific unitholder surrendered its unit certificate.

You should surrender your Pacific common unit certificates for exchange only after the effective time of the merger. Until you deliver a properly completed and signed transmittal letter and any other documents required by the instructions to the transmittal letter to the exchange agent, together with your Pacific common unit certificates, the distributions declared by Plains with a record date after the effective time of the merger will accrue, but will not be paid, on Plains common units that you are entitled to receive as a result of the merger. No interest will be paid or accrue on:

the amount of cash to be received in lieu of fractional units of Plains; or

any cash distributions declared by Plains on its common units with a record date after the effective time of the merger and a payment date on or before the date the Pacific unit certificate is surrendered.

The exchange agent will deliver to Plains any Plains common units to be issued in the merger, cash in lieu of fractional units to be paid in connection with the merger and any distributions paid on Plains common units to be issued in the merger that are not claimed by former Pacific unitholders within twelve months after the effective time of the merger. Thereafter, Plains will act as the exchange agent and former Pacific unitholders may look only to Plains for their Plains common units, cash in lieu of fractional units and unpaid distributions. None of Plains, Pacific, the exchange agent or any other person will be liable to any former Pacific unitholder for any amount properly delivered to a public official pursuant to applicable abandoned property, escheat or similar laws. To the extent permitted by applicable law, any amount that would escheat or become the property of any governmental entity shall, immediately prior thereto, become the property of Plains free and clear of all claims or interests of any person previously entitled thereto.

If any certificates representing Plains common units are to be issued in a name other than that in which the certificates representing Pacific common units exchanged for such units are registered, the person requesting the exchange must (1) pay any transfer or other taxes required by reason of the issuance of certificates representing Plains common units in a name other than that of the registered holder of the surrendered Pacific common units or (2) establish to the satisfaction of Plains or the exchange agent that such tax has been paid or is not applicable.

The instructions for effecting the surrender of Pacific common unit certificates will set forth procedures that must be taken by the holder of any Pacific common unit certificate that has been lost, destroyed or stolen. If a Pacific unit certificate has been lost, destroyed or stolen, the exchange agent will issue certificates representing the Plains common units properly issuable in accordance with the merger agreement and any cash payment in lieu of fractional common units only upon receipt of, along

with the letter of transmittal, a duly executed lost certificate affidavit, including an agreement to indemnify Plains, signed exactly as the name or names of the registered holder or holders appeared on the books of Pacific immediately prior to the effective time of the merger, together with a customary bond and such other documents as Plains may reasonably require.

Pacific common unit certificates surrendered for exchange by certain affiliates of Pacific will not be exchanged until Plains has received a written agreement of the kind described below under "Covenants and Other Agreements - Affiliate Agreements."

Conditions to the Merger

Conditions to Each Party's Obligation to Effect the Merger. The obligations of Plains and Pacific to complete the merger are subject to the following conditions:

the adoption and approval by the requisite vote of the Pacific common unitholders (not including LB Pacific) and the Pacific subordinated unitholder of the merger agreement and the merger;

the adoption and approval by the requisite vote of the Plains common unitholders of the merger agreement and the merger, and the approval by the requisite vote of the Plains common unitholders of the issuance of Plains common units pursuant to the merger agreement;

the expiration or early termination of the waiting period under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, which waiting period expired on July 31, 2006;

the approval of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California and the Public Service Commission of the State of Wyoming (and in the case of Wyoming, any protest period subsequent to such approval having lapsed without a protest or, if a protest has been filed, such protest having been resolved to the reasonable satisfaction of the parties);

the consent of the FCC to effect transfers of certain licenses;

satisfaction of requirements under the Competition Act, which requirements have been satisfied;

approval of the merger and sale transactions under the Investment Canada Act, or notice that approval of the merger and sale transactions is not required under the Investment Canada Act;

receipt of all other governmental consents and approvals, the absence of which would, individually or in the aggregate, have a material adverse effect on Pacific or Plains;

the continued effectiveness of the registration statement of which this joint proxy statement/prospectus is a part;

the approval for listing on the NYSE of the Plains common units to be issued in the merger, subject to official notice of issuance; and

the absence of any decree, order, injunction or law that prohibits the merger or makes the merger unlawful.

Plains' obligation to complete the merger is further subject to the following conditions:

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

the representations and warranties of Pacific set forth in the merger agreement being true and correct (without regard to materiality requirements in the merger agreement) as of the closing, other than such failures to be true and correct that would not in the aggregate result in a material adverse effect, and Pacific having performed all of its obligations under the merger agreement in all material respects;

each of the directors of Pacific Energy Management LLC having tendered his or her resignation effective as of the effective time of the merger; and

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Plains having received an opinion of Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. to the effect that for U.S. federal income tax purposes (1) no Plains entity will recognize any income or gain as a result of the merger and related transactions (other than any gain resulting from any decrease in partnership liabilities pursuant to Section 752 of the Code), (2) no gain or loss will be recognized by holders of Plains common units as a result of the merger and related transactions (other than any gain resulting from any decrease in partnership liabilities pursuant to Section 752 of the Code), and (3) 90% of the combined gross income of Pacific and Plains for the most recent four complete calendar quarters ending before the closing date for which the necessary financial information is available are from sources treated as "qualifying income" within the meaning of Section 7704(d) of the Code.

Pacific's obligation to complete the merger is further subject to the following conditions:

the representations and warranties of Plains set forth in the merger agreement being true and correct (without regard to materiality requirements in the merger agreement) as of the closing, other than such failures to be true and correct that would not in the aggregate result in a material adverse effect, and Plains having performed all of its obligations under the merger agreement in all material respects; and

Pacific having received an opinion of Baker Botts L.L.P. to the effect that for U.S. federal income tax purposes (1) no Pacific entity will recognize any income or gain as a result of the merger and related transactions (other than any gain resulting from any decrease in partnership liabilities pursuant to Section 752 of the Code), and (2) no gain or loss will be recognized by holders of Pacific common units as a result of the merger (other than with respect to cash received in lieu of fractional Plains common units and any gain resulting from any decrease in partnership liabilities pursuant to Section 752 of the Code).

Waiver of Conditions. Either Plains or Pacific may choose to complete the merger even though any condition to its obligation has not been satisfied if the necessary unitholder approvals have been obtained and the law allows it to do so.

Representations and Warranties

The merger agreement contains reciprocal representations and warranties by each of the parties to the merger agreement, many of which provide that the representation and warranty does not extend to matters where the failure of the representation and warranty to be accurate would not result in a material adverse effect on the party making the representation and warranty. These representations and warranties concern, among other things:

organization and standing;

authorization to enter into the merger agreement and to complete the merger and related transactions;

the absence of defaults, breaches and other conflicts caused by entering into the merger agreement and completing the merger;

capitalization;

the accuracy of financial statements;

the absence of certain undisclosed liabilities;

reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission;

cash distributions paid to unitholders;

compliance with applicable laws and permits;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

material contracts and arrangements;

the absence of material litigation;

the absence of violations or liabilities under environmental laws;

title to properties and rights of way;

insurance matters;

tax matters;

labor matters and employee benefits;

books and records;

absence of changes in operations and material adverse effects;

regulatory matters;

approvals under state takeover laws;

receipt of financial advisors' opinions in connection with the merger;

approvals under state laws governing partnerships; and

broker's fees.

For purposes of the merger agreement, "material adverse effect," when used with respect to any party, means any change, effect, event or occurrence with respect to the condition (financial or otherwise), properties, assets, liabilities, obligations (whether absolute, accrued, conditional or otherwise), businesses, operations or results of operations of the such party's consolidated group, that is, or would reasonably be expected to be, material and adverse to such party's consolidated group or that materially and adversely affects the ability of such party to consummate the merger and sale transactions; however, a material adverse effect does not include any change, effect, event or occurrence with respect to the condition (financial or otherwise), properties, assets, liabilities, obligations (whether absolute, accrued, conditional or otherwise), businesses, operations or results of operations of any member of such party's consolidated group directly or indirectly arising out of or attributable to:

any decrease in the market price of such party's publicly traded equity securities (but not any change or effect underlying such decrease to the extent such change or effect would otherwise contribute to a material adverse effect);

changes in the general state of the industries in which such party's consolidated group operates to the extent that such changes would have the same general effect on companies engaged in such industries;

changes in general economic conditions (including changes in commodity prices) that would have the same general effect on companies engaged in the same lines of business as those conducted by such party's consolidated group;

the announcement or proposed consummation of the merger agreement and the merger and sale transactions;

changes in generally accepted accounting principles; or

acts of terrorism, war, sabotage or insurrection not directly damaging or impacting such person, to the extent such acts have the same general effect on companies engaged in the same lines of business as those conducted by such party's consolidated group.

Covenants and Other Agreements

Affirmative Covenants. Prior to the merger, except as permitted by the negative covenants described below, each of Plains and Pacific has agreed with respect to itself and its consolidated group:

to conduct the business of its consolidated group in the ordinary course and consistent with its past practices;

to use its commercially reasonable efforts to preserve intact the present business organizations and material rights and franchises of its consolidated group, to keep available the services of its officers and employees, and to preserve the material relationships with its consolidated group's customers, suppliers and others having business dealings with them; and

to maintain and keep the material properties and assets of its consolidated group in as good repair and condition, including any material insurance coverage, as at the date of execution of the merger agreement, subject to ordinary wear and tear.

Negative Covenants. Prior to the merger and unless the other party consents in writing (which consent may not be unreasonably withheld, delayed or conditioned), and subject to specified exceptions, each of Plains and Pacific has agreed (and has agreed to cause their respective general partners and consolidated group):

not to make any material change in the conduct of its business and operations;

not to make any changes to its governing documents (other than changes that do not adversely affect the other party);

not to issue, deliver or sell or authorize or propose the issuance, delivery or sale of, any of its equity securities or securities convertible into its equity securities, or subscriptions, rights, warrants or options to acquire or other agreements or commitments of any character obligating it to issue any such securities, other than:

issuances pursuant to options, warrants and phantom unit awards in existence on the date of the merger agreement;

issuances of restricted units or unit options to current or newly-hired employees, consistent with past practice, by Pacific of up to 50,000 common units, or by Plains of up to 1.5 million common units;

with respect to Pacific, issuances of equity securities up to an aggregate of \$150 million; and

with respect to Plains, issuances of equity securities up to an aggregate of \$500 million;

not to declare, set aside or pay any distributions in respect of its equity securities, or split, combine or reclassify any of its equity securities or issue or authorize the issuance of any other securities in respect of, in lieu of or in substitution for any of its equity securities, or purchase, redeem or otherwise acquire, directly or indirectly, any of its equity securities, except for

distributions to the holders of Pacific common units of no more than \$0.5675 per common unit per quarter, plus the proportionate distribution on the general partner interests in Pacific and payments under Pacific's incentive distribution rights,

distributions to the holders of Plains common units of no more than \$0.80 per common unit per quarter, plus the proportionate distribution on the general partner interests in Plains and payments under Plains' incentive distribution rights, and

any distributions from Pacific's subsidiaries to Pacific, or from Plains' subsidiaries to Plains;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

not to merge into or with any other person, other than mergers between or among any of Pacific or its wholly owned subsidiaries or between or among any of Plains or its wholly owned subsidiaries or as permitted in the following bullet point;

not to acquire, through merger, consolidation or otherwise, all or substantially all of the business or assets of any person or acquire any interest in or contribute any assets to any partnership or joint venture (other than contributions to joint ventures as required under applicable governing documents) or enter into any similar arrangement, for consideration in excess of, in the case of Pacific, \$200 million individually or in the aggregate, or, in the case of Plains, in excess of \$350 million individually, or \$700 million in the aggregate;

other than in the ordinary course of business consistent with past practices, not to enter into any material contract or agreement or terminate or amend in any material respect any material contract or agreement to which it is a party or waive any material rights under any material contract or agreement to which it is a party;

not to purchase any securities of or make any investment in any person except in specified circumstances and otherwise up to an additional \$5 million;

not to incur, assume or guarantee any indebtedness for borrowed money, issue, assume or guarantee any debt securities, grant any option, warrant or right to purchase any debt securities, or issue any securities convertible into or exchangeable for any debt securities, other than in connection with

borrowings in the ordinary course of business by Pacific under its existing bank credit facilities or by Plains under its existing bank credit facilities (including, with respect to Plains, its contango facility);

the refinancing or replacement of existing indebtedness (provided, in the case of Pacific, such refinancing or replacement is on substantially comparable terms), including the refinancing of Pacific's existing indebtedness by Plains;

the incurrence by Pacific of up to \$50 million in principal amount of indebtedness, or the incurrence by Plains of up to \$1 billion in principal amount of indebtedness; and

in connection with specified permitted acquisitions and capital expenditures;

not to sell, assign, transfer, abandon, lease or otherwise dispose of assets having a fair market value, in the case of Pacific, in excess of \$5 million in the aggregate, or, in the case of Plains, in excess of \$10 million in the aggregate other than idled assets, dispositions of inventory or worn-out or obsolete equipment for fair value in the ordinary course of business consistent with past practices;

not to settle any claims, demands, lawsuits or regulatory proceedings for damages to the extent such settlements in the aggregate assess damages in excess of \$10 million, in the case of Pacific, or \$20 million, in the case of Plains (other than to the extent insured, reserved against in such party's financial statements or covered by an indemnity obligation);

not to settle any claims, demands, lawsuits or state or federal regulatory proceedings seeking an injunction or other equitable relief where such settlements would have a material adverse effect;

not to make any capital expenditure in excess of \$25 million in the aggregate, in the case of Pacific, and \$100 million, in the case of Plains other than scheduled capital expenditures or as required on an emergency basis or for the safety of persons or the environment;

not to make any material change in its tax methods, principles or elections;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

not to make any material change to financial reporting and accounting methods other than as required by a change in generally accepted accounting principles;

not to fail to file on a timely basis all applications and other documents necessary to maintain, renew or extend any material permit, license, variance or any other material approval required by any governmental entity for the continuing operation of its business;

not to (A) grant any increases in the compensation of any of its officers or employees, except in the ordinary course of business consistent with past practices, (B) amend any existing employment or severance or termination contract with any officer or employee, (C) become obligated under any new pension plan, welfare plan, multiemployer plan, employee benefit plan, severance plan, change of control or other benefit arrangement or similar plan or arrangement, or (D) amend any employee benefit plan, if such amendment would have the effect of enhancing any benefits thereunder;

not to adopt or vote to adopt a plan of complete or partial dissolution or liquidation; or

not to agree or commit to do any of the foregoing.

Other Agreements Relating to the Period Before the Effective Time. The merger agreement contains additional agreements between Plains and Pacific relating to, among other things:

providing prompt notification to the other party of (1) any event, condition or circumstance that could reasonably be expected to result in any representation or warranty contained in the merger agreement being inaccurate in any material respect at the effective time of the merger or any condition to closing not being satisfied; (2) any material adverse effect, and (3) any material breach by the notifying party of any obligation in the merger agreement;

providing access to information with respect to the other party;

cooperation regarding required filings or other interactions with governmental and other agencies and organizations;

the preparation, filing and distribution of this joint proxy statement/prospectus;

convening and holding the Plains and Pacific unitholder meetings;

in the case of Pacific, using its commercially reasonable efforts to deliver affiliate letters in customary form;

subject to the terms and conditions of the merger agreement, using commercially reasonable efforts to take, or cause to be taken, all appropriate action, and to do or cause to be done, all things necessary, proper or advisable under applicable laws to consummate and make effective the transactions contemplated by the merger agreement;

making certain public announcements;

expenses;

satisfying conditions to a consent or approval of any governmental entity necessary for the consummation of the merger and sale transactions;

tax matters;

satisfying the requirements under Section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

coordinating record dates and payment dates for distributions to unitholders;

delivering "comfort letters" and certain consents of auditors; and

cooperating with Plains' financing activities.

Employee Matters

The merger agreement requires Plains to provide employee benefits to employees of Pacific who become Plains employees at the effective time of the merger that are substantially comparable in the aggregate to the employee benefits provided to similarly situated employees of Plains, with full service credit under Plains' benefit plans for prior service with Pacific to the extent such service was recognized under a comparable Pacific plan. At the closing of the merger, Plains is required to deliver documents providing for the assumption by Plains of each employment agreement or severance plan or arrangement of Pacific. The merger agreement also requires Plains to pay specified severance benefits to employees of Pacific who are terminated within twelve months following the effective time of the merger.

The merger agreement provides that Pacific will pay, before the merger occurs, the pro-rated portion of cash bonuses payable to employees who participate in Pacific's Annual Incentive Plan. In addition, Plains will pay, on or before the 30th day following the consummation of the merger, retention payments to specified Pacific employees not to exceed \$1,250,000 in the aggregate. Pacific will adjust the terms of all restricted units of Pacific as necessary to provide that the restrictions on such units will lapse as of the effective time of the merger.

Plains will maintain directors' and officers' liability insurance for six years after the effective time of the merger to cover persons who are or were covered by Pacific's existing directors' and officers' liability insurance policies at any time before the effective time of the merger. The terms of the insurance will be substantially no less advantageous to such persons than the existing insurance with respect to acts or omissions committed prior to the effective time of the merger.

Non-Solicitation

In the merger agreement, Pacific and its general partner entities have agreed that they and Pacific's subsidiaries will not, directly or indirectly, and will direct and use their reasonable best efforts to cause such parties' representatives not to:

take any action to solicit, initiate, or knowingly encourage or knowingly facilitate the making of any takeover proposal or any inquiry with respect to a takeover proposal or engage in discussions or negotiations with any person with respect to a takeover proposal;

disclose any non-public information or afford access to properties, books or records to any person that has made or is considering making a takeover proposal; or

approve or recommend, or propose to approve or recommend, or execute or enter into any letter of intent or agreement relating to a takeover proposal.

Pacific and its general partner entities also have agreed to immediately cease and cause to be terminated all existing discussions or negotiations with any person conducted before the date of the merger agreement with respect to any takeover proposal. Pacific and its general partner entities also have agreed to enforce, and not terminate or grant any waiver with respect to, existing confidentiality, standstill or similar agreements.

Notwithstanding those agreements, at any time prior to the Pacific unitholder approval, Pacific and its general partner entities may, in response to a bona fide unsolicited written takeover proposal that is made after the date of the merger agreement and that did not result from a breach of the non-solicitation provisions, furnish information and participate in discussions or negotiations with respect to a takeover proposal if:

Pacific's conflicts committee determines in good faith after consultation with its financial advisor that the takeover proposal constitutes or is reasonably likely to result in a superior proposal, and after consultation with outside legal counsel, that the failure to do so would be reasonably likely

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

to constitute a violation of its fiduciary duties owed to Pacific's unitholders under applicable law; and

Pacific and its affiliates comply with the non-solicitation provisions in the merger agreement.

Neither the board of directors nor the conflicts committee of the general partner of Pacific may withdraw, modify or qualify, or propose publicly to withdraw, modify or qualify its recommendation of the merger or sale transactions, recommend, adopt, approve or execute, as applicable (or propose publicly to do so), any takeover proposal or any agreement that may lead to a takeover proposal, or fail to reaffirm its recommendation upon request made by Plains, unless:

the approval of Pacific's unitholders has not been obtained;

it determines in good faith, after consulting with outside legal counsel, that failure to change its recommendation would be reasonably likely to constitute a violation of its fiduciary obligations owed to Pacific's unitholders under applicable law;

at least three business days prior to taking any such action, Pacific has provided Plains with notice of such a change in its recommendation and related information; and

Pacific has given Plains at least three business days after delivery of each such notice to propose revisions to the terms of the merger agreement (or to make another proposal) and has negotiated in good faith with Plains with respect to such proposed revisions or other proposal, if any.

Pacific has agreed that it will notify Plains immediately if it receives a takeover proposal or any request for non-public information relating to Pacific or for access to the properties, books or records of Pacific by any person that has made a takeover proposal, and will thereafter keep Plains reasonably and promptly informed of any material changes to the terms of any such takeover proposal or request.

Termination

Before the effective time of the merger, the merger agreement may be terminated:

by mutual written agreement of Plains and Pacific;

by Plains or Pacific, if:

the merger has not been consummated on or before November 30, 2006 (so long as the party seeking to terminate did not prevent the merger from occurring by failing to perform or observe its obligations under the merger agreement), but if the merger has not been consummated solely because the parties have not received regulatory approvals, then the outside date will be automatically extended to February 28, 2007;

a governmental entity shall have issued a final and non-appealable order, decree or ruling or taken any other action permanently restraining, enjoining or otherwise prohibiting the merger, so long as the party seeking termination has complied with its obligations under the merger agreement to attempt to remove the prohibition; or

the required unitholder approvals shall not have been obtained at their respective meetings of unitholders;

by Pacific, if:

Plains materially breaches any of its representations, warranties or agreements in the merger agreement or if any of Plains' representations or warranties becomes materially untrue, resulting in a condition to the merger not being satisfied, provided that Pacific is not likewise in material breach of the merger agreement;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

the conflicts committee of Pacific's general partner so elects in order to accept a superior proposal that was not solicited after the date of the merger agreement and was made after the date of the merger agreement without breach of the non-solicitation covenant, but only if:

Pacific provides written notice to Plains that it is prepared to terminate the merger agreement, which notice shall include the terms of the superior proposal;

Plains does not make, within three business days after the receipt of such notice, a written offer that Pacific's conflicts committee determines in good faith is at least as favorable from a financial point of view to Pacific's unitholders (other than LB Pacific), and is at least as favorable from a financial point of view to all of Pacific's equityholders, as the superior proposal;

Pacific negotiates in good faith with Plains with respect to such written offer; and

Pacific pays to Plains a \$40 million termination fee; or

the board of directors of Plains' general partner withdraws or qualifies its recommendation for approval of the transactions contemplated by the merger agreement;

by Plains, if:

Pacific materially breaches any of its representations, warranties or agreements in the merger agreement or if any of Pacific's representations or warranties becomes materially untrue, resulting in a condition to the merger not being satisfied, provided that Plains is not likewise in material breach of the merger agreement; or

the board of directors of Pacific's general partner withdraws, qualifies or fails to reaffirm its recommendation for approval of the transactions contemplated by the merger agreement or recommends an alternative transaction.

Termination Fees and Expenses

Termination Fees and Expenses Potentially Payable by Pacific

Pacific will pay Plains a fee of \$40 million if:

the merger agreement is terminated because the board of directors or conflicts committee of Pacific's general partner changes its recommendation regarding the transaction or fails to reaffirm its recommendation of the transaction, or recommends, adopts or approves (or proposes publicly to do so) any other takeover proposal;

the conflicts committee of Pacific's general partner terminates the merger agreement to accept a superior transaction; or

a termination occurs pursuant to the outside date provision after a competing proposal to acquire Pacific has been made, and Pacific consummates another acquisition transaction pursuant to which Pacific is acquired within twelve months of such termination.

Additionally, if Pacific's unitholders vote not to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger, Pacific will pay Plains a fee of \$10 million. If the negative vote occurs after a competing proposal to acquire Pacific has been made, Pacific will pay Plains an additional fee of \$30 million if Pacific consummates another acquisition transaction pursuant to which Pacific is acquired within twelve months of the negative

vote.

Termination Fees and Expenses Potentially Payable by Plains

Plains will pay Pacific a fee of \$40 million if:

the merger agreement is terminated because the board of directors of Plains' general partner changes its recommendation regarding the transaction; or

a termination occurs pursuant to the outside date provision after a competing proposal to acquire Plains has been made, and Plains consummates another acquisition transaction pursuant to which Plains is acquired within twelve months of such termination.

Additionally, if Plains' unitholders vote not to approve and adopt the merger agreement and the merger, Plains will pay Pacific a fee of \$10 million. If the negative vote occurs after a competing proposal to acquire Plains has been made, Plains will pay Pacific an additional fee of \$30 million if Plains consummates another acquisition transaction pursuant to which Plains is acquired within twelve months of the negative vote.

Amendment; Extension and Waiver

Amendment. The merger agreement may be amended at any time by the action or authorization of each party's (or its general partner's) board of directors or conflicts committee; however, if the merger agreement has been adopted by Pacific's unitholders and Plains' unitholders, then, no amendment shall be made which by law requires further approval by such unitholders without such further approval.

Extension and Waiver. At any time prior to the effective time of the merger, each of Pacific and Plains may, to the extent permitted by law,

grant the other party additional time to perform its obligations under the merger agreement;

waive any inaccuracies in the representations and warranties of the other party; and

waive compliance with any agreements or conditions for the benefit of that party.

THE MERGER PARTIES' BUSINESSES

Pacific's Business

This section summarizes information from Pacific's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2005 and its other filings incorporated into this joint proxy statement/prospectus by reference. For a more detailed discussion of Pacific's business, please read Pacific's 2005 Annual Report on Form 10-K and its other filings incorporated into this document by reference.

Overview

Pacific is a publicly traded Delaware limited partnership formed in February 2002. Pacific is engaged principally in the business of gathering, transporting, storing, and distributing crude oil, refined products and other related products. It generates revenue primarily by transporting such commodities on its pipelines, by leasing capacity in its storage tanks, and by providing other terminalling services. Pacific also buys and sells crude oil, activities that are generally complementary to its other crude oil operations. Pacific conducts its business through two business units, the West Coast Business Unit, incorporating activities in California and the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania area, and the Rocky Mountain Business Unit, which includes activities in five Rocky Mountain states and the province of Alberta, Canada.

Pacific is managed by its general partner, Pacific Energy GP, LP, which is managed by its general partner, Pacific Energy Management LLC, and thus the officers and Board of Directors of Pacific Energy Management LLC manage the business affairs of Pacific Energy GP, LP and Pacific. Pacific's general partner is owned by LB Pacific, which is owned by certain entities controlled by Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., the parent entity of Lehman Brothers Inc., and First Reserve Corporation. References to Pacific's general partner in this joint proxy statement/prospectus refer to Pacific Energy GP, LP and Pacific Energy Management LLC.

West Coast Business Unit

Pacific's West Coast Business Unit includes the only common carrier pipelines that deliver crude oil produced in California's San Joaquin Valley and the two primary California outer continental shelf producing fields, Point Arguello and the Santa Ynez Unit, to refineries and terminal facilities in the Los Angeles Basin and in Bakersfield. It also includes a proprietary crude oil gathering and blending operation in the San Joaquin Valley, as well as an oil storage and distribution system servicing the Los Angeles Basin, which Pacific believes strategically positions it to benefit from the projected increase in marine imports of crude oil into this region. Pacific's West Coast Business Unit also includes refined products terminals that serve the San Francisco, California and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania areas.

Pacific's West Coast Business Unit is comprised of the following assets, all of which it operates and owns 100%:

Line 2000: Line 2000 is an intrastate common carrier crude oil pipeline that consists of a 130-mile insulated trunk pipeline with a permitted throughput capacity of 130,000 barrels per day ("bpd") that transports crude oil produced in the San Joaquin Valley and California outer continental shelf to refineries and terminal facilities in the Los Angeles Basin.

The Line 63 System: The Line 63 system is an intrastate common carrier crude oil pipeline system that consists of a 107-mile trunk pipeline with a throughput capacity of approximately 105,000 bpd, which transports crude oil from the San Joaquin Valley to Los Angeles, 60 miles of distribution pipelines, 156 miles of gathering pipelines and 22 storage tanks with a total of approximately 1.2 million barrels of storage capacity. Most of these storage assets are located in the San Joaquin Valley and are primarily used to facilitate the transportation of crude oil on Pacific's pipelines.

Pacific Terminals Storage and Distribution System: The Pacific Terminals storage and distribution system is a crude oil storage and pipeline distribution system located in the Los Angeles Basin that consists of 70 miles of distribution pipelines in active service and 34 storage tanks with a total of approximately 9.0 million barrels of storage capacity. Of this total, approximately 6.7 million barrels are in active commercial service, 0.5 million barrels are used primarily for throughput to other storage tanks and do not generate revenue independently, approximately 1.5 million barrels are idle but could be reconditioned and brought into service and approximately 0.3 million barrels are in displacement oil service.

PMT Gathering and Blending System: The PMT gathering and blending system is a proprietary crude oil pipeline system located in the San Joaquin Valley that consists of 103 miles of gathering pipelines and six storage and blending facilities with a total of approximately 0.3 million barrels of storage capacity and up to 51,000 bpd of blending capacity. The PMT gathering and blending system is interconnected to Pacific's Line 63 system. Pacific's subsidiary, Pacific Marketing and Transportation LLC, uses the PMT gathering and blending system in connection with its crude oil buying, blending and selling activities, which are generally complementary to Pacific's pipeline transportation business.

Pacific Atlantic Terminals: Pacific recently acquired the Martinez terminal and Richmond terminal in the San Francisco, California area. The Martinez and Richmond terminals currently have 4.1 million barrels of combined storage capacity. Pacific also recently acquired the North Philadelphia, South Philadelphia and the Paulsboro, New Jersey terminals in the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania area. These terminals handle refined products and have a combined storage capacity of 3.1 million barrels.

Pier 400: Pacific is developing a deepwater petroleum import terminal at Pier 400 and Terminal Island in the Port of Los Angeles to handle marine receipts of crude oil and refinery feedstocks. As currently envisioned, the project would include a deep water berth, high capacity transfer infrastructure and storage tanks, with a pipeline distribution system that will connect to various customers, some directly, and some through the Pacific Terminals storage and distribution system. The total project cost is estimated to be \$315 million. If successful, this project would allow Pacific to increase its participation in the growing Los Angeles marine import business. Pacific has entered into agreements with ConocoPhillips and two subsidiaries of Valero Energy Corporation that provide long term customer commitments to off-load a total of 140,000 bpd of crude oil at the Pier 400 dock. The ConocoPhillips and Valero agreements are subject to satisfaction of various conditions, such as the achievement of various progress milestones, financing, continued economic viability and completion of other ancillary agreements related to the project. Pacific is negotiating similar long term off-loading agreements with other potential customers. Pacific expects construction of the Pier 400 terminal to be completed and the facility to be placed in service in the first quarter of 2009.

Expansion Projects: In the West Coast Business Unit, Pacific is currently constructing 450,000 barrels of storage capacity at the Martinez terminal which is expected to be completed in the third quarter of 2006. Due to strong customer demand, Pacific has recently increased its capital budget to provide for the construction of an additional 850,000 barrels of storage capacity at the Martinez terminal for completion in 2007. At Pacific's Philadelphia area terminals, it is completing an ethanol expansion project which will enable it to increase ethanol handling and blending capabilities and increase its marine receipt capabilities. At the Pacific Terminals system, Pacific is refurbishing 600,000 barrels of black oil storage as well as making infrastructure changes to increase pumping capacity and improve operating efficiencies. The storage tanks are expected to be completed in the second half of 2006. The infrastructure changes will be completed in 2007.

Rocky Mountain Business Unit

Pacific's Rocky Mountain Business Unit consists of various interests in pipelines that transport crude oil produced in Canada and the U.S. Rocky Mountain region to refineries in Montana, Wyoming,

Colorado and Utah. Deliveries also are made to the refining and marketing center of Edmonton, Alberta through Pacific's Rangeland system. Pacific delivers crude oil to these refineries directly through its pipelines or indirectly through connections with third-party pipelines. Pacific's Rocky Mountain Business Unit also includes a pipeline system that delivers refined products to various markets in the U.S. Rocky Mountain region.

Pacific's Rocky Mountain Business Unit is comprised of the following assets:

Rangeland System: The Rangeland system includes the Rangeland pipeline and the Mid Alberta pipeline. The Mid Alberta pipeline is a 138-mile proprietary pipeline with a throughput capacity of approximately 50,000 bpd if transporting light crude oil. The Mid Alberta pipeline originates in Edmonton, Alberta and terminates in Sundre, Alberta where it connects to the Rangeland pipeline. The Rangeland pipeline is a proprietary pipeline system that consists of approximately 800 miles of gathering and trunk pipelines and is capable of transporting crude oil, condensate and butane either north to Edmonton, Alberta via third-party pipeline connections or south to the U.S./Canadian border near Cutbank, Montana where it connects to the Western Corridor system. The trunk pipeline from Sundre, Alberta to the U.S./Canadian border consists of approximately 250 miles of trunk pipelines and has a current throughput capacity of approximately 85,000 bpd if transporting light crude oil. The trunk system from Sundre, Alberta north to Rimbey, Alberta is a bi-directional system that consists of three parallel trunk pipelines: a 56-mile pipeline for low sulfur crude oil, a 63-mile pipeline for high sulfur crude oil, and a 56-mile pipeline for condensate and butane.

Western Corridor System: The Western Corridor system is an interstate and intrastate common carrier crude oil pipeline system that consists of 1,012 miles of pipelines extending from dual origination points at the U.S./Canadian border near Cutbank, Montana, where it receives deliveries from the Rangeland pipeline, and at Cutbank, Montana, where it receives deliveries from Cenex pipeline, and terminating at Guernsey, Wyoming with connections in Wyoming to Frontier pipeline, Suncor pipeline, Platte pipeline and Pacific's Salt Lake City Core system. The Western Corridor system consists of three contiguous trunk pipelines: Glacier pipeline, Beartooth pipeline and Big Horn pipeline. Pacific owns various undivided interests in each of these three pipelines, which give it rights to a specified portion of each pipeline's throughput capacity. Glacier and Beartooth pipelines provide Pacific with approximately 25,000 bpd of throughput capacity from the U.S./Canadian border to Elk Basin, Wyoming. Big Horn pipeline provides Pacific with approximately 33,900 bpd of throughput capacity from Elk Basin, Wyoming to Guernsey, Wyoming. Pacific operates the Beartooth and Big Horn pipelines. ConocoPhillips Pipe Line Company owns the remaining undivided interests in each pipeline and operates Glacier pipeline. Pacific also owns various undivided interests in 22 storage tanks that provide it with a total of approximately 1.3 million barrels of storage capacity.

Salt Lake City Core System: The Salt Lake City Core system is an interstate and intrastate common carrier crude oil pipeline system that consists of 955 miles of trunk pipelines with a combined throughput capacity of approximately 114,000 bpd to Salt Lake City, 209 miles of gathering pipelines, and 32 storage tanks with a total of approximately 1.5 million barrels of storage capacity. This system originates in Ft. Laramie, Wyoming, receives deliveries from the Western Corridor system at Guernsey, Wyoming and extends west to Wamsutter, Wyoming, where it divides, with a northern segment continuing west, eventually delivering to Salt Lake City, and a southern segment extending south to Rangely, Colorado, where it delivers to a ChevronTexaco pipeline that serves refineries in Salt Lake City. Pacific operates and owns 100% of the Salt Lake City Core system.

Frontier Pipeline: Frontier pipeline is an interstate common carrier crude oil pipeline that consists of a 289-mile trunk pipeline with a throughput capacity of approximately 62,200 bpd and three storage tanks with a total of approximately 274,000 barrels of storage capacity. Frontier pipeline originates in Casper, Wyoming, a hub for the distribution of crude oil produced in Canada and in the U.S. Rocky Mountain region, and receives deliveries from the Western Corridor system. Frontier pipeline also

receives Canadian crude oil, including Canadian synthetic crude, via connections with Express pipeline and other connecting carriers in Casper, Wyoming. Frontier pipeline delivers crude oil into the Salt Lake City Core system for ultimate delivery into Salt Lake City. Pacific operates Frontier pipeline and owns a 22.22% partnership interest in Frontier Pipeline Company, a general partnership that owns Frontier pipeline. Enbridge, Inc. owns the remaining partnership interest in Frontier Pipeline Company.

Rocky Mountain Products Pipeline (formerly the "West Pipeline System"): On September 30, 2005 Pacific acquired the West Pipeline System, which consists of a 550 mile refined products pipeline extending from Casper, Wyoming east to Rapid City, South Dakota and south to Colorado Springs, Colorado. The West Pipeline System includes products terminals at Rapid City, South Dakota, Cheyenne, Wyoming and Denver and Colorado Springs, Colorado with a combined storage capacity of 1.7 million barrels.

Recent Developments: The Rocky Mountain Business Unit accomplished several positive initiatives in the first half of 2006. The construction of the initiating facility for synthetic crude oil in Edmonton, Alberta was completed in March 2006, and initial movements of synthetic crude oil began immediately thereafter. This connection provides direct access to synthetic crude oil in Edmonton for delivery through Pacific's pipeline systems to U.S. Rocky Mountain refineries. In addition, to facilitate the movement and maintain the quality of synthetic crude oil, three 120,000 barrel tanks were constructed at storage facilities along the Rangeland and Western Corridor systems.

The Rocky Mountain Business Unit, through one of Pacific's subsidiaries, Rocky Mountain Pipeline System LLC, or RMPS, proceeded with its plans to construct a Salt Lake City core expansion project that will expand its crude oil pipeline system from the terminus of Frontier Pipeline near Evanston, Wyoming to the Salt Lake City, Utah refining complex. The new 16-inch pipeline, which will be 91 miles in length, will be able to transport multiple grades of crude oil in segregated batches and will provide 95,000 barrels per day of capacity to meet increased crude oil demand in Salt Lake City. The project will be constructed in two phases, the first phase estimated to be completed in December 2006, the second phase in the fourth quarter of 2007. The total cost for both phases of the project is expected to be approximately \$77 million and is supported by firm, 10-year transportation agreements that have been executed with four Salt Lake City refiners.

In addition, RMPS signed a transportation agreement with Frontier Oil and Refining Company pursuant to which RMPS will construct a 24-inch crude oil pipeline, approximately 10 miles in length, from Guernsey, Wyoming to RMPS's Fort Laramie, Wyoming tank farm and a 16-inch crude oil pipeline, approximately 85 miles in length, from Fort Laramie to Frontier Oil's Cheyenne refinery, in exchange for Frontier Oil's ten-year firm commitment to ship 35,000 barrels per day on the new pipeline and lease approximately 300,000 barrels of storage capacity at Fort Laramie. The total project cost is estimated to be \$59 million. The project began in the second quarter of 2006 and is expected to be completed in the second quarter of 2007. Initial capacity will be 55,000 barrels per day, which can be expanded to a capacity of 90,000 barrels per day.

Plains' Business

This section summarizes information from Plains' Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2005. For a more detailed discussion of Plains' business, please read the "Business and Properties" section contained in its 2005 Annual Report on Form 10-K.

Plains is engaged in intrastate and interstate crude oil transportation and crude oil gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage, as well as the marketing and storage of liquefied petroleum gas and other natural gas related petroleum products. In addition, through its 50% equity ownership in PAA/Vulcan, Plains is engaged in the development and operation of natural gas storage facilities.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Plains is one of the largest midstream crude oil companies in North America. As of June 30, 2006, Plains owned approximately 15,000 miles of active crude oil pipelines, approximately 39 million barrels of active terminalling and storage capacity and over 500 transport trucks. Currently, Plains handles an average of over 3 million barrels per day of physical crude oil through its extensive network of assets located in major oil producing regions of the United States and Canada.

Business Segments

Plains' operations consist of two operating segments:

pipeline transportation operations ("Pipeline"); and

gathering, marketing, terminalling and storage operations ("GMT&S").

Through its Pipeline segment, Plains is engaged in interstate and intrastate crude oil pipeline transportation and certain related margin activities. Through its GMT&S segment, Plains is engaged in the purchase and resale of crude oil and LPG at various points along the distribution chain and in the operation of certain terminalling and storage assets.

Pipeline Operations

Plains owns approximately 15,000 miles of active gathering and mainline crude oil pipelines located throughout the United States and Canada. Approximately 13,000 miles of these pipelines are used in Plains' pipeline operations segment with the remainder used in Plains' GMT&S segment. Plains' activities from pipeline operations generally consist of transporting crude oil for a fee and third party leases of pipeline capacity, as well as barrel exchanges and buy/sell arrangements.

Major Pipeline Assets

All American Pipeline System

The All American Pipeline is a common carrier crude oil pipeline system that transports crude oil produced from certain outer continental shelf, or OCS, fields offshore California via connecting pipelines to refinery markets in California. The system extends approximately 10 miles along the California coast from Las Flores to Gaviota (24-inch diameter pipe) and continues from Gaviota approximately 126 miles to Plains' station in Emidio, California (30-inch diameter pipe). Between Gaviota and Plains' Emidio Station, the All American Pipeline interconnects with Plains' San Joaquin Valley, or SJV, Gathering System as well as various third party intrastate pipelines. The system is subject to tariff rates regulated by the FERC.

Basin Pipeline System

The Basin Pipeline System, in which Plains owns an approximate 87% undivided joint interest, is a primary route for transporting Permian Basin crude oil to Cushing, Oklahoma, for further delivery to Mid-Continent and Midwest refining centers. Plains acquired its interest in the Basin Pipeline System in August 2002. Since acquisition, Plains has been the operator of the system. The Basin system is a 515-mile mainline, telescoping crude oil system with a capacity ranging from approximately 144,000 barrels per day to 400,000 barrels per day depending on the segment. System throughput (as measured by system deliveries) was approximately 290,000 barrels per day (net to Plains' interest) during 2005.

The Basin system consists of three primary movements of crude oil: (i) barrels that are shipped from Jal, New Mexico to the West Texas markets of Wink and Midland, where they are exchanged and/or further shipped to refining centers; (ii) barrels that are shipped to the Mid-Continent region on the Midland to Wichita Falls segment and the Wichita Falls to Cushing segment; and (iii) foreign and Gulf of Mexico barrels that are delivered into Basin at Wichita Falls and delivered to a connecting carrier or shipped to Cushing for further distribution to Mid-Continent or Midwest refineries. The system also includes approximately 5.5 million barrels (4.8 million barrels, net to Plains' interest) of crude oil storage capacity located along the system.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

In 2004, Plains expanded an approximate 425-mile section of the system from Midland to Cushing. With the completion of this expansion, the capacity of this section has increased approximately 15%, from 350,000 barrels per day to approximately 400,000 barrels per day. The Basin system is subject to tariff rates regulated by the FERC.

Capline/Capwood Pipeline Systems

The Capline Pipeline System, in which Plains own a 22% undivided joint interest, is a 633-mile, 40-inch mainline crude oil pipeline originating in St. James, Louisiana, and terminating in Patoka, Illinois. The Capline Pipeline System is one of the primary transportation routes for crude oil shipped into the Midwestern U.S., accessing over 2.7 million barrels of refining capacity in PADD II. Shell is the operator of this system. Capline has direct connections to a significant amount of crude production in the Gulf of Mexico. In addition, with its two active docks capable of handling 600,000-barrel tankers as well as access to the Louisiana Offshore Oil Port ("LOOP"), it is a key transporter of sweet and light sour foreign crude to PADD II. With a total system operating capacity of 1.14 million barrels per day of crude oil, approximately 248,000 barrels per day are subject to Plains' interest. During 2005, throughput on Plains' interest averaged approximately 132,000 barrels per day.

The Capwood Pipeline System, in which Plains owns a 76% undivided joint interest, is a 58-mile, 20-inch mainline crude oil pipeline originating in Patoka, Illinois, and terminating in Wood River, Illinois. The Capwood Pipeline System has an operating capacity of 277,000 barrels per day of crude oil. Of that capacity, approximately 211,000 barrels per day are subject to Plains' interest. The system has the ability to deliver crude oil at Wood River to several other PADD II refineries and pipelines. Movements on the Capwood system are driven by the volumes shipped on Capline as well as by volumes of Canadian crude that can be delivered to Patoka via the Mustang Pipeline. Plains assumed the operatorship of the Capwood system from Shell Pipeline Company LP at the time of purchase. During 2005 throughput net to Plains' interest averaged approximately 107,000 barrels per day.

Gathering, Marketing, Terminalling and Storage Operations

The combination of Plains' gathering and marketing operations and Plains' terminalling and storage operations provides a counter-cyclical balance that has a stabilizing effect on Plains' operations and cash flow. The strategic use of Plains' terminalling and storage assets in conjunction with Plains' gathering and marketing operations generally provides Plains with the flexibility to maintain a base level of margin irrespective of whether a strong or weak market exists and, in certain circumstances, to realize incremental margin during volatile market conditions. Following is a description of Plains' activities with respect to this segment.

Gathering and Marketing Operations

Crude Oil. Plains' gathering and marketing activities include:

purchasing crude oil from producers at the wellhead and in bulk from aggregators at major pipeline interconnects or trading locations, as well as foreign cargoes at their load port and various other locations in transit;

transporting crude oil on Plains' own proprietary gathering assets and Plains' common carrier pipelines or, when necessary or cost effective, assets owned and operated by third parties, including pipelines, trucks, barges and ocean-going vessels;

exchanging crude oil for another grade of crude oil or at a different geographic location, as appropriate, in order to maximize margins or meet contract delivery requirements; and

marketing crude oil to refiners or other resellers.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Plains purchases crude oil from multiple producers and believes that it generally has established broad-based relationships with the crude oil producers in Plains' areas of operations. Gathering and marketing activities involve relatively large volumes of transactions, often with lower margins than pipeline and terminalling and storage operations.

Liquefied Petroleum Gas and Other Petroleum Products. Plains also markets and stores LPG and other petroleum products in the United States and Canada. These activities include:

purchasing LPG (primarily propane and butane) from producers at gas plants and in bulk at major pipeline terminal points and storage locations;

transporting the LPG via common carrier pipelines, railcars and trucks to Plains' own terminals and third party facilities for subsequent resale to retailers and other wholesale customers;

exchanging product to other locations to maximize margins and/or to meet contract delivery requirements; and

engaging in isomerization, fractionation, marketing and transportation of natural gas liquids.

Plains purchases LPG from numerous producers and has established long-term, broad based relationships with LPG producers in Plains' areas of operation. Plains purchases LPG directly from gas plants, major pipeline terminals, refineries and storage locations. Marketing activities for LPG typically consist of smaller volumes per transaction relative to crude oil.

Terminalling and Storage Operations

Plains owns approximately 39 million barrels of active above-ground crude oil terminalling and storage assets. Approximately 15 million barrels of capacity are used in Plains' GMT&S segment, and the remaining 24 million barrels are used in Plains' Pipeline segment. Plains' storage and terminalling operations increase Plains' margins in its business of purchasing and selling crude oil and also generate revenue through a combination of storage and throughput charges to third parties. Storage fees are generated when Plains leases tank capacity to third parties. Terminalling fees, also referred to as throughput fees, are generated when Plains receives crude oil from one connecting pipeline and redelivers crude oil to another connecting carrier in volumes that allow the refinery to receive its crude oil on a ratable basis throughout a delivery period. Both terminalling and storage fees are generally earned from:

refiners and gatherers that segregate or custom blend crudes for refining feedstocks; and

pipeline operators, refiners or traders that need segregated tankage for foreign cargoes.

The tankage that is used to support Plains' arbitrage activities positions Plains to capture margins in a contango market (when the oil prices for future deliveries are higher than the current prices) or when the market switches from contango to backwardation (when the oil prices for future deliveries are lower than the current prices).

Plains' most significant terminalling and storage asset is Plains' Cushing Terminal located at the Cushing Interchange. The Cushing Interchange is one of the largest wet-barrel trading hubs in the U.S. and the delivery point for crude oil futures contracts traded on the NYMEX. The Cushing Terminal has been designated by the NYMEX as an approved delivery location for crude oil delivered under the NYMEX light sweet crude oil futures contract. As the NYMEX delivery point and a cash market hub, the Cushing Interchange serves as a primary source of refinery feedstock for the Midwest refiners and plays an integral role in establishing and maintaining markets for many varieties of foreign and domestic crude oil. The Cushing Terminal currently consists of fourteen 100,000-barrel tanks, four 150,000-barrel tanks and twenty 270,000-barrel tanks, all of which are used to store and terminal crude oil. The Cushing Terminal also includes a pipeline manifold and pumping system that has an estimated

throughput capacity of over 1.0 million barrels per day. The Cushing Terminal is connected to the major pipelines and other terminals in the Cushing Interchange through pipelines that range in size from 10 inches to 24 inches in diameter.

In 2005, Plains began construction of a 3.2 million barrel crude oil terminal at the St. James crude oil interchange in Louisiana, which is one of the three most liquid crude oil interchanges in the United States. Plains plans to build seven tanks ranging from 190,000 barrels to 625,000 barrels at the St. James Terminal, which is expected to be operational in mid-2007. The facility also will include a manifold and header system that will allow for receipts and deliveries with connecting pipelines at their maximum operating capacity.

Natural Gas Storage

The Pine Prairie facility is expected to become partially operational in 2007 and fully operational in 2009, and Plains believes it is well positioned to benefit from evolving market dynamics. The facility is located near Gulf Coast supply sources and near the existing Lake Charles LNG terminal, which is the largest LNG import facility in the United States. When completed, Plains expects the Pine Prairie facility to be a 24 Bcf salt cavern storage facility designed for high deliverability operating characteristics and multi-cycle capabilities. The site is located approximately 50 miles from the Henry Hub, the delivery point for NYMEX natural gas futures contracts, and is currently intended to interconnect with seven major pipelines serving the Midwest and the East Coast. Three additional pipelines are also located in the vicinity and offer the potential for future interconnects. Plains believes that the facility's operating characteristics and strategic location position Pine Prairie to support the commercial functions of power generators, pipelines, utilities, energy merchants and LNG re-gasification terminal operators and provide potential customers with superior flexibility in managing their price and volumetric risk and balancing their natural gas requirements.

The Bluewater gas storage facility, which is located in Michigan, is a depleted reservoir facility with an approximate 23 Bcf of capacity and is also strategically positioned. Natural gas storage facilities in the northern tier of the U.S. are traditionally used to meet seasonal demand and are typically cycled once or twice during a given year. Natural gas is injected during the summer months in order to provide for adequate deliverability during the peak demand winter months. Michigan is a very active market for natural gas storage as it meets nearly 75% of its peak winter demand from storage withdrawals. The Bluewater facility has direct interconnects to four major pipelines and has indirect access to another four pipelines as well as to Dawn, a major natural gas market hub in Canada.

Selected Combined Company Growth Projects

The following tables set forth selected internal growth projects of the combined company and Plains' estimates of their in-service dates, which reflect certain of Plains' risk adjustments.

Plains Projects	Estimated In-Service Date
St. James, Louisiana storage facility	Second Quarter 2007
Kerrobert tankage	First Quarter 2007
Spraberry system expansion	First Quarter 2007
High Prairie rail terminals	First Quarter 2007
East Texas/Louisiana tankage	First Quarter 2007
Wichita Falls tankage	First Quarter 2007
Midale/Regina truck terminal	Fourth Quarter 2006
Basin connection Oklahoma	Mid-Year 2006
Mobile/Ten Mile tankage and metering	Second Quarter 2007
PAA/Vulcan Gas Storage Pine Prairie Facility	Third Quarter 2007-Fourth Quarter 2009
Pacific Projects	Estimated In-Service Date
Guernsey to Cheyenne pipeline	Third Quarter 2007
Evanston to Salt Lake City pipeline	First Quarter 2008
Martinez terminal expansion Phase I	Third Quarter 2006
Paulsboro terminal expansion	Third Quarter 2008
Pier 400 project	First Quarter 2009

SELECTED FINANCIAL INFORMATION OF PLAINS AND PACIFIC

The following tables set forth, for the periods and at the dates indicated, selected historical and pro forma financial information for Plains and selected historical financial information for Pacific. The selected historical financial information has been derived from the audited and unaudited financial statements of each partnership for the periods indicated. The selected historical financial information for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2005 are derived from and should be read in conjunction with the audited financial statements and accompanying footnotes for such periods incorporated by reference into this document. The selected historical financial information for the six-month periods ended June 30, 2005 and 2006 are derived from and should be read in conjunction with the unaudited financial statements and accompanying footnotes for such periods incorporated by reference into this document. Certain reclassifications have been made to prior year financial statements to conform to the 2005 presentation.

For a complete discussion of the pro forma adjustments underlying the amounts in the table below, please read the section titled "Unaudited Pro Forma Condensed Combined Financial Statements" beginning on page F-1 of this document.

Selected Historical and Pro Forma Financial Information of Plains

	Plains Consolidated Historical						Plains Pro Forma		
	For the Year Ended December 31,					For the Six Months Ended June 30,		For the Year Ended December 31,	For the Six Months Ended June 30,
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2005	2006	2005	2006
(Dollars in millions, except per unit amounts)									
Statement of operations data:									
Total revenues(1)	\$ 6,868.2	\$ 8,384.2	\$ 12,589.9	\$ 20,975.5	\$ 31,177.3	\$ 13,799.2	\$ 13,527.8	\$ 31,389.0	\$ 13,661.8
Income before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle(2)(6)	\$ 43.7	\$ 65.3	\$ 59.4	\$ 133.1	\$ 217.8	\$ 95.1	\$ 137.4	\$ 198.9	\$ 147.4
Basic net income per limited partner unit before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle(2)	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.34	\$ 1.01	\$ 1.94	\$ 2.77	\$ 1.27	\$ 1.47	\$ 2.07	\$ 1.32
Diluted net income per limited partner unit before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle(2)	\$ 1.12	\$ 1.34	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.94	\$ 2.72	\$ 1.26	\$ 1.45	\$ 2.04	\$ 1.31
Balance sheet data (at end of period):									
Total assets	\$ 1,261.2	\$ 1,666.6	\$ 2,095.6	\$ 3,160.4	\$ 4,120.3	\$ 4,134.5	\$ 6,018.3	\$ 8,677.6	\$ 8,677.6
Total debt(3)	\$ 456.2	\$ 609.0	\$ 646.3	\$ 1,124.5	\$ 1,330.1	\$ 1,773.9	\$ 2,443.6	\$ 3,821.0	\$ 3,821.0
Partners' capital	\$ 402.8	\$ 511.6	\$ 746.7	\$ 1,070.2	\$ 1,330.7	\$ 1,000.0	\$ 1,526.1	\$ 2,548.7	\$ 2,548.7
Other financial data:									
Distributions per limited partner unit(4)(5)	\$ 2.0000	\$ 2.1375	\$ 2.2125	\$ 2.3525	\$ 2.6500	\$ 1.2875	\$ 1.4325		N/A

- (1) Includes buy/sell transactions. See Note 2 to Plains' consolidated financial statements in Plains' Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2005 incorporated by reference herein.
- (2) Income from continuing operations before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle, on a pro forma basis for the impact of Plains' January 1, 2004 change in method of accounting for pipeline linefill in third party assets, would have been \$38.4 million, \$64.8 million and \$61.4 million for 2001, 2002 and 2003, respectively. In addition, basic net income per limited partner unit before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle would have been \$0.97 (\$0.97 diluted), \$1.33 (\$1.33 diluted) and \$1.05 (\$1.04 diluted) for 2001, 2002 and 2003, respectively.
- (3) Total debt includes short-term debt of \$101.5 million, \$99.3 million, \$127.3 million, \$175.5 million and \$378.4 million for the year ended 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005, respectively, and \$820.8 and \$1,188.5 for the six months ended June 30, 2005 and 2006, respectively. Total debt also includes short-term debt of \$1,188.5 million for the Plains pro forma six months ended June 30, 2006.
- (4) Distributions represent those declared with respect to the period and paid in the following period.
- (5) Plains' general partner is entitled to receive 2% proportional distributions and incentive distributions if the amount Plains distributes with respect to any quarter exceeds levels specified in Plains' partnership agreement. See Note 5 to Plains' consolidated financial statements in Plains' Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2005 incorporated by reference herein.
- (6) The Plains pro forma income before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle for the year ended December 31, 2005 includes, as required, the following pro forma adjustments related to the acquisition of the Valero assets that Pacific acquired effective September 30, 2005: (i) depreciation

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

expense for the entire year of approximately \$11 million associated with Plains' estimated purchase price allocated to the Valero assets; and (ii) interest expense of approximately \$11 million for the entire year on the \$175 million 6¹/₄% senior notes issued to fund the asset acquisition. However, since the Valero transaction was an asset acquisition, the Plains pro forma income before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle for the year ended December 31, 2005 does not include revenues and related operating expenses for the period prior to the asset acquisition by Pacific. In addition, the Plains pro forma income before cumulative effect of change in accounting principle for the year ended December 31, 2005 and the six months ended June 30, 2006 does not include any synergies that Plains expects to achieve as a result of the merger with Pacific. For further discussion of potential business combination synergies, see the section captioned "The Merger - Additional Financial Considerations of the Parties."

Selected Historical Consolidated Financial Information of Pacific

	Year Ended December 31,					Six Months Ended June 30,	
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2005	2006
(Dollars in millions, except per unit amounts)							
Statement of operations data:							
Total revenues	\$ 73.6	\$ 124.2	\$ 135.8	\$ 181.4	\$ 224.3	\$ 102.0	\$ 149.3
Income from continuing operations	\$ 15.6	\$ 33.6	\$ 25.0	\$ 35.7	\$ 39.6	\$ 15.6	\$ 33.1
Income from continuing operations per unit:							
Basic net income per limited partner unit(1)	\$	\$ 0.55	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.23	\$ 1.25	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.83
Diluted net income per limited partner unit(1)	\$	\$ 0.55	\$ 1.09	\$ 1.23	\$ 1.25	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.83
Balance Sheet Data (at period end):							
Total assets	\$ 372.2	\$ 487.0	\$ 650.2	\$ 869.9	\$ 1,476.5	\$ 884.3	\$ 1,588.0
Total debt, including current portion	\$ 181.3	\$ 225.0	\$ 298.0	\$ 357.2	\$ 565.6	\$ 359.2	\$ 635.4
Net partners' capital (net parent investment)	\$ 157.4	\$ 215.3	\$ 295.1	\$ 422.5	\$ 698.2	\$ 408.2	\$ 692.0
Other financial data:							
Distributions per limited partner unit(1)(2)	\$	\$ 0.7993	\$ 1.9000	\$ 1.9625	\$ 2.0925	\$ 1.0250	\$ 1.1350

(1)

On July 26, 2002, Pacific completed its initial public offering of common units. Net income per limited partner unit is based on net income of \$11.8 million for the period from July 26, 2002 to December 31, 2002. Weighted average limited partner units outstanding for 2002 was calculated for the period from July 26, 2002 to December 31, 2002.

(2)

Distributions represent those declared with respect to the period and paid in the following period.

DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS OF THE COMBINED COMPANY**Directors and Executive Officers**

The following persons currently serve as directors and executive officers of Plains and will serve as directors and executive officers of the combined company at the effective time of the merger. Certain owners of Plains' general partner each have the right to separately designate a member of its board. Such designees are indicated in the footnote to the following table.

Name	Age (as of 8/15/06)	Position with Plains' General Partner
Greg L. Armstrong(1)	48	Chairman of the Board, Chief Executive Officer and Director
Harry N. Pefanis	49	President and Chief Operating Officer
Phillip D. Kramer	50	Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
George R. Coiner	55	Senior Group Vice President
W. David Duckett	51	President PMC (Nova Scotia) Company (the general partner of Plains Marketing Canada, L.P.)
Mark F. Shires	49	Senior Vice President Operations
Alfred A. Lindseth	36	Senior Vice President Technology, Process & Risk Management
Lawrence J. Dreyfuss	51	Vice President and General Counsel Commercial & Litigation
James B. Fryfogle	54	Vice President Refinery Supply
Jim G. Hester	46	Vice President Acquisitions
Tim Moore	48	Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary
Daniel J. Nerbonne	49	Vice President Engineering
John F. Russell	57	Vice President Pipeline Operations
Robert M. Sanford	56	Vice President Lease Supply
Al Swanson	42	Vice President Finance and Treasurer
Tina L. Val	37	Vice President Accounting and Chief Accounting Officer
Troy E. Valenzuela	45	Vice President Environmental, Health and Safety
John P. vonBerg	52	Vice President Trading
David N. Capobianco(1)	37	Director
Everardo Goyanes	62	Director
Gary R. Petersen(1)	60	Director
Robert V. Sinnott(1)	57	Director
Arthur L. Smith	53	Director
J. Taft Symonds	67	Director

(1)

The limited liability company agreement of Plains' general partner specifies that the Chief Executive Officer of the general partner will be a member of the board of directors. The agreement also provides that certain of the owners of Plains' general partner have the right to designate a member of its board of directors. Mr. Capobianco has been so designated by Vulcan Energy Corporation, of which he is Chairman of the Board. Vulcan Energy Corporation entered into an agreement with Plains' general partner pursuant to which Vulcan Energy Corporation has agreed to restrict certain of its voting rights to help preserve a balanced board. Vulcan Energy Corporation has agreed that, with respect to any action taken with respect to the election or removal of an independent director, Vulcan Energy Corporation will vote all of its interest in excess of 49.9% in the same way and proportionate to the votes of all membership interests other

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

than its own. One board seat is currently vacant. The seat can be filled by a vote of the majority in interest. The restriction on Vulcan Energy Corporation's voting rights does not affect its rights with respect to the vacant board seat. As a result, with an interest in excess of 54% Vulcan Energy Corporation effectively controls the vacant board seat. Mr. Petersen has been designated by E-Holdings III, L.P., an affiliate of EnCap Investments L.P., of which he is Senior Managing Director. Mr. Sinnott has been designated by KAFU Holdings, L.P., which is affiliated with Kayne Anderson Investment Management, Inc., of which he is President.

Greg L. Armstrong has served as Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer since Plains' formation in 1998. He has also served as a director of Plains' general partner or former general partner since Plains' formation. In addition, he was President, Chief Executive Officer and director of Plains Resources Inc. from 1992 to May 2001. He previously served Plains Resources as: President and Chief Operating Officer from October to December 1992; Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer from June to October 1992; Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer from 1991 to 1992; Vice President and Chief Financial Officer from 1984 to 1991; Corporate Secretary from 1981 to 1988; and Treasurer from 1984 to 1987. Mr. Armstrong is also a director of National Oilwell Varco, Inc.

Harry N. Pefanis has served as President and Chief Operating Officer since Plains' formation in 1998. He was also a director of Plains' former general partner. In addition, he was Executive Vice President Midstream of Plains Resources from May 1998 to May 2001. He previously served Plains Resources as: Senior Vice President from February 1996 until May 1998; Vice President Products Marketing from 1988 to February 1996; Manager of Products Marketing from 1987 to 1988; and Special Assistant for Corporate Planning from 1983 to 1987. Mr. Pefanis was also President of several former midstream subsidiaries of Plains Resources until Plains' formation.

Phillip D. Kramer has served as Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer since Plains' formation in 1998. In addition, he was Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Plains Resources from May 1998 to May 2001. He previously served Plains Resources as: Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer from May 1997 until May 1998; Vice President and Chief Financial Officer from 1992 to 1997; Vice President from 1988 to 1992; Treasurer from 1987 to 2001; and Controller from 1983 to 1987.

George R. Coiner has served as Senior Group Vice President since February 2004 and as Senior Vice President from Plains' formation in 1998 to February 2004. In addition, he was Vice President of Plains Marketing & Transportation Inc. from November 1995 until Plains' formation. Prior to joining Plains Marketing & Transportation Inc., he was Senior Vice President, Marketing with Scurlock Permian LLC.

W. David Duckett has served as President of PMC (Nova Scotia) Company since June 2003, and Executive Vice President of PMC (Nova Scotia) Company from July 2001 to June 2003. Mr. Duckett was with CANPET Energy Group Inc. from 1985 to 2001, where he served in various capacities, including most recently as President, Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board.

Mark F. Shires has served as Senior Vice President Operations since June 2003 and as Vice President Operations from August 1999 to June 2003. He served as Manager of Operations from April 1999 to August 1999. In addition, he was a business consultant from 1996 until April 1999. He served as a consultant to Plains Marketing & Transportation Inc. and Plains All American Pipeline, LP from May 1998 until April 1999. He previously served as President of Plains Terminal & Transfer Corporation, from 1993 to 1996.

Alfred A. Lindseth has served as Senior Vice President Technology, Process & Risk Management since June 2003 and as Vice President Administration from March 2001 to June 2003. He served as Risk Manager from March 2000 to March 2001. He previously served PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP in its Financial Risk Management Practice section as a Consultant from 1997 to 1999 and as Principal

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Consultant from 1999 to March 2000. He also served GSC Energy, an energy risk management brokerage and consulting firm, as Manager of its Oil & Gas Hedging Program from 1995 to 1996 and as Director of Research and Trading from 1996 to 1997.

Lawrence J. Dreyfuss has served as Vice President and General Counsel Commercial & Litigation since August 2006, as Vice President and Associate General Counsel from February 2004 to August 2006, and as Associate General Counsel from June 2001 to February 2004. Mr. Dreyfuss has held a senior management position in the Law Department since May 1999. In addition, he was a Vice President of Scurlock Permian LLC from 1987 to 1999.

James B. Fryfogle has served as Vice President Refinery Supply since March 2005. He served as Vice President Lease Operations from July 2004 until March 2005. Prior to joining Plains in January 2004, Mr. Fryfogle served as Manager of Crude Supply and Trading for Marathon Ashland Petroleum. Mr. Fryfogle had held numerous positions of increasing responsibility with Marathon Ashland Petroleum or its affiliates or predecessors since 1975.

Jim G. Hester has served as Vice President Acquisitions since March 2002. Prior to joining Plains, Mr. Hester was Senior Vice President Special Projects of Plains Resources. From May 2001 to December 2001, he was Senior Vice President Operations for Plains Resources. From May 1999 to May 2001, he was Vice President Business Development and Acquisitions of Plains Resources. He was Manager of Business Development and Acquisitions of Plains Resources from 1997 to May 1999, Manager of Corporate Development from 1995 to 1997 and Manager of Special Projects from 1993 to 1995. He was Assistant Controller from 1991 to 1993, Accounting Manager from 1990 to 1991 and Revenue Accounting Supervisor from 1988 to 1990.

Tim Moore has served as Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary since May 2000. In addition, he was Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary of Plains Resources from May 2000 to May 2001. Prior to joining Plains Resources, he served in various positions, including General Counsel Corporate, with TransTexas Gas Corporation from 1994 to 2000. He previously was a corporate attorney with the Houston office of Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP. Mr. Moore also has seven years of energy industry experience as a petroleum geologist.

Daniel J. Nerbonne has served as Vice President Engineering since February 2005. Prior to joining Plains, Mr. Nerbonne was General Manager of Portfolio Projects for Shell Oil Products US from January 2004 to January 2005 and served in various capacities, including General Manager of Commercial and Joint Interest, with Shell Pipeline Company or its predecessors from 1998. From 1980 to 1998 Mr. Nerbonne held numerous positions of increasing responsibility in engineering, operations, and business development, including Vice President of Business Development from December 1996 to April 1998, with Texaco Trading and Transportation or its affiliates.

John F. Russell has served as Vice President Pipeline Operations since July 2004. Prior to joining Plains, Mr. Russell served as Vice President of Business Development & Joint Interest for ExxonMobil Pipeline Company. Mr. Russell had held numerous positions of increasing responsibility with ExxonMobil Pipeline Company or its affiliates or predecessors since 1974.

Robert Sanford has served as Vice President Lease Supply since June 2006. He served as Managing Director Lease Acquisitions and Trucking from July 2005 to June 2006 and as Director of South Texas and Mid Continent Business Units from April 2004 to July 2005. Mr. Sanford was with Link Energy/EOTT Energy from 1994 to April 2004, where he held various positions of increasing responsibility.

Al Swanson has served as Vice President Finance and Treasurer since August 2005, as Vice President and Treasurer from February 2004 to August 2005 and as Treasurer from May 2001 to February 2004. In addition, he held finance related positions at Plains Resources including Treasurer from February 2001 to May 2001 and Director of Treasury from November 2000 to February 2001.

Prior to joining Plains Resources, he served as Treasurer of Santa Fe Snyder Corporation from 1999 to October 2000 and in various capacities at Snyder Oil Corporation including Director of Corporate Finance from 1998, Controller SOCO Offshore, Inc. from 1997, and Accounting Manager from 1992. Mr. Swanson began his career with Apache Corporation in 1986 serving in internal audit and accounting.

Tina L. Val has served as Vice President Accounting and Chief Accounting Officer since June 2003. She served as Controller from April 2000 until she was elected to her current position. From January 1998 to January 2000, Ms. Val served as a consultant to Conoco de Venezuela S.A. She previously served as Senior Financial Analyst for Plains Resources from October 1994 to July 1997.

Troy E. Valenzuela has served as Vice President Environmental, Health and Safety, or EH&S, since July 2002, and has had oversight responsibility for the environmental, safety and regulatory compliance efforts of Plains and Plains' predecessors since 1992. He was Director of EH&S with Plains Resources from January 1996 to June 2002, and Manager of EH&S from July 1992 to December 1995. Prior to his time with Plains Resources, Mr. Valenzuela spent seven years with Chevron USA Production Company in various EH&S roles.

John P. vonBerg has served as Vice President Trading since May 2003 and Director of these activities since joining Plains in January 2002. He was with Genesis Energy in differing capacities as a Director, Vice Chairman, President and CEO from 1996 through 2001, and from 1993 to 1996 he served as a Vice President and a Crude Oil Manager for Phibro Energy USA. Mr. vonBerg began his career with Marathon Oil Company, spending 13 years in various disciplines.

David N. Capobianco has served as a director of Plains' general partner since July 2004. Mr. Capobianco is Chairman of the board of directors of Vulcan Energy Corporation and a Managing Director and co-head of Private Equity of Vulcan Capital, an affiliate of Vulcan Inc., where he has been employed since April 2003. Previously, he served as a member of Greenhill Capital from 2001 to April 2003 and Harvest Partners from 1995 to 2001. Mr. Capobianco is Chairman of the board of Vulcan Resources Florida, and is a director of PAA/Vulcan and ICAT Holdings. Mr. Capobianco received a BA in Economics from Duke University and an MBA from Harvard.

Everardo Goyanes has served as a director of Plains' general partner or former general partner since May 1999. Mr. Goyanes has been President and Chief Executive Officer of Liberty Energy Holdings, LLC (an energy investment firm) since May 2000. From 1999 to May 2000, he was a financial consultant specializing in natural resources. From 1989 to 1999, he was Managing Director of the Natural Resources Group of ING Barings Furman Selz (a banking firm). He was a financial consultant from 1987 to 1989 and was Vice President Finance of Forest Oil Corporation from 1983 to 1987. Mr. Goyanes received a BA in Economics from Cornell University and a Masters degree in Finance (honors) from Babson Institute.

Gary R. Petersen has served as a director of Plains' general partner since June 2001. Mr. Petersen is Senior Managing Director of EnCap Investments L.P., an investment management firm which he co-founded in 1988. He had previously served as Senior Vice President and Manager of the Corporate Finance Division of the Energy Banking Group for RepublicBank Corporation. Prior to his position at RepublicBank, he was Executive Vice President and a member of the Board of Directors of Nicklos Oil & Gas Company from 1979 to 1984. He served from 1970 to 1971 in the U.S. Army as a First Lieutenant in the Finance Corps and as an Army Officer in the National Security Agency.

Robert V. Sinnott has served as a director of Plains' general partner or former general partner since September 1998. Mr. Sinnott is President, Chief Investment Officer and Senior Managing Director of energy investments of Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors, L.P. (an investment management firm). He also served as a Managing Director from 1992 to 1996 and as a Senior Managing Director from 1996 until assuming his current role in 2005. He is also President of Kayne Anderson Investment

Management, Inc., the general partner of Kayne Anderson Capital Advisors, L.P. He was Vice President and Senior Securities Officer of the Investment Banking Division of Citibank from 1986 to 1992. Mr. Sinnott received a BA from the University of Virginia and an MBA from Harvard.

Arthur L. Smith has served as a director of Plains' general partner or former general partner since February 1999. Mr. Smith is Chairman and CEO of John S. Herold, Inc. (a petroleum research and consulting firm), a position he has held since 1984. From 1976 to 1984 Mr. Smith was a securities analyst with Argus Research Corp., The First Boston Corporation and Oppenheimer & Co., Inc. Mr. Smith holds the CFA designation. He serves on the boards of Kuwait Energy (a private oil and gas exploration and production firm), non-profit Dress for Success Houston and the Board of Visitors for the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences at Duke University. Mr. Smith received a BA from Duke University and an MBA from NYU's Stern School of Business.

J. Taft Symonds has served as a director of Plains' general partner since June 2001. Mr. Symonds is Chairman of the Board of Symonds Trust Co. Ltd. (a private investment firm) and Chairman of the Board of Tetra Technologies, Inc. (an oil and gas services firm). From 1978 to 2004 he was Chairman of the Board and Chief Financial Officer of Maurice Pincoffs Company, Inc. (an international marketing firm). Mr. Symonds has a background in both investment and commercial banking, including merchant banking in New York, London and Hong Kong with Paine Webber, Robert Fleming Group and Banque de la Societe Financiere Europeenne. He is Chairman of the Houston Arboretum and Nature Center. Mr. Symonds received a BA from Stanford University and an MBA from Harvard.

**COMPARISON OF THE RIGHTS OF PLAINS
AND PACIFIC COMMON UNITHOLDERS**

The following describes the material differences between the rights of Plains common unitholders and the rights of Pacific common unitholders. It is not a complete summary of the provisions affecting, and the differences between, the rights of Plains unitholders and Pacific unitholders. The rights of Plains unitholders are governed by the Third Amended and Restated Agreement of Limited Partnership of Plains All American Pipeline, L.P., as amended, and the rights of Pacific unitholders are governed by the First Amended and Restated Agreement of Limited Partnership of Pacific Energy Partners, L.P., as amended, and you should refer to each document for a complete description of the rights of Plains and Pacific unitholders, respectively. If the merger is consummated, Pacific unitholders will become Plains unitholders, and their rights as Plains unitholders will be governed by Delaware law and Plains' partnership agreement. You should refer to Plains' current report on Form 8-K filed with the Commission on August 27, 2001 and Plains' Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q filed with the SEC on May 10, 2004, for a copy of Plains' partnership agreement and the amendment thereto, respectively, which are incorporated by reference herein. For Pacific's partnership agreement and the amendments thereto, please refer to Pacific's quarterly report on Form 10-Q filed with the Commission on September 5, 2002, Pacific's Form S-3 filed with the Commission on August 1, 2003, Pacific's annual report on Form 10-K filed with the Commission on March 15, 2004 and Pacific's Form 10-Q filed with the Commission on May 5, 2004. This summary is qualified in its entirety by reference to the Delaware Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act, the Plains partnership agreement and the Pacific partnership agreement.

PURPOSE AND TERM OF EXISTENCE

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Plains' stated purposes under its partnership agreement are to serve as a partner of its operating partnerships and as the sole stockholder of the general partner of its operating partnerships, and to engage in any lawful business activities that may be engaged by its operating partnership, or that are approved by its general partner, provided that the general partner must reasonably determine that such activity generates or enhances "qualifying income" within the meaning of Section 7704 of the Code.

Pacific's stated purposes under its partnership agreement are to serve as a member of its operating company and to engage in any lawful business activities that may be engaged by its operating company or that are approved by its general partner.

Plains' partnership existence will continue until December 31, 2088, unless sooner dissolved pursuant to the terms of Plains' partnership agreement.

Pacific's partnership existence will continue until dissolved pursuant to the terms of its partnership agreement.

DISTRIBUTIONS OF AVAILABLE CASH

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Within 45 days following the end of each quarter, Plains will distribute all of its available cash to its partners of record as of the applicable record date.

Within 45 days following the end of each quarter, Pacific will distribute all of its available cash to its partners of record as of the applicable record date.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Available cash is defined in Plains' partnership agreement and generally means, for any quarter ending prior to liquidation, all cash on hand at the end of such calendar quarter, less the amount of cash reserves that is necessary or appropriate in the reasonable discretion of Plains' general partner to:

provide for the proper conduct of business;

comply with applicable law or debt instrument or other agreement or obligation; or

provide funds for distributions to unitholders and the general partner in respect of any one or more of the next four quarters.

Available cash is defined in Pacific's partnership agreement and generally means, with respect to each fiscal calendar quarter, all cash on hand at the end of such calendar quarter, less the amount of cash reserves that is necessary or appropriate in the reasonable discretion of Pacific's general partner to:

provide for the proper conduct of business;

comply with applicable law or any debt instrument or other agreement or obligation; or

provide funds for distributions to unitholders and to Pacific's general partner for any one or more of the next four quarters.

OPERATING SURPLUS AND CAPITAL SURPLUS

PLAINS

Cash distributions are characterized as distributions from either operating surplus or capital surplus. Plains distributes available cash from operating surplus differently than available cash from capital surplus.

Operating surplus is defined in Plains' partnership agreement and generally means:

\$25.0 million plus all cash and cash equivalents on hand on the closing date of Plains' initial public offering; plus

all cash receipts since the closing of Plains' initial public offering, excluding cash from borrowings that are not working capital borrowings, sales of equity and debt securities and sales or other dispositions of assets outside the ordinary course of business; less

all of Plains' operating expenses and debt service payments, but not including payments required in connection with the sale of assets or any refinancing with the proceeds of new indebtedness or an equity offering, and including maintenance capital expenditures; and less

PACIFIC

Cash distributions are characterized as distributions from either operating surplus or capital surplus. Pacific distributes available cash from operating surplus differently than available cash from capital surplus.

Operating surplus is defined in Pacific's partnership agreement and generally means:

\$15.0 million plus all cash and cash equivalents on hand on the closing date of Pacific's initial public offering; plus

all cash receipts since the closing of Pacific's initial public offering, excluding cash from borrowings that are not working capital borrowings, sales of equity and debt securities and sales or other dispositions of assets outside the ordinary course of business; plus

working capital borrowings made after the end of a quarter but before the date of determination of operating surplus for that quarter; less

the amount of cash reserves the Plains general partner deems necessary or advisable to provide funds for future operating expenditures.

all operating expenditures since the closing of Pacific's initial public offering, including the repayment of working capital borrowings, but not the repayment of other borrowings, and including maintenance capital expenditures; and less

the amount of cash reserves the Pacific general partner deems necessary or advisable to provide funds for future operating expenditures.

Capital surplus is generally generated only by borrowings (other than borrowings for working capital purposes), sales of debt and equity securities and sales or other dispositions of assets for cash (other than inventory, accounts receivable and other assets disposed of in the ordinary course of business).

Capital surplus is generally generated only by borrowings (other than borrowings for working capital purposes), sales of debt and equity securities and sales or other dispositions of assets for cash (other than inventory, accounts receivable and other assets disposed of in the ordinary course of business).

To avoid the difficulty of trying to determine whether available cash Plains distributes is from operating surplus or from capital surplus, all available cash Plains distributes from any source will be treated as distributed from operating surplus until the sum of all available cash distributed since the closing date of Plains' initial public offering equals the operating surplus as of the end of the quarter prior to such distribution. Any available cash in excess of such amount (regardless of its source) will be deemed to be from capital surplus and distributed accordingly.

To avoid the difficulty of trying to determine whether available cash Pacific distributes is from operating surplus or from capital surplus, all available cash Pacific distributes from any source will be treated as distributed from operating surplus until the sum of all available cash distributed since the closing date of Pacific's initial public offering equals the operating surplus as of the end of the quarter prior to such distribution. Any available cash in excess of such amount (regardless of its source) will be deemed to be from capital surplus and distributed accordingly.

If available cash from capital surplus is distributed in respect of each common unit in an aggregate amount per common unit equal to the initial public offering price of the common units, the distinction between operating surplus and capital surplus will cease, and all distributions of available cash will be treated as if they were from operating surplus. To date there have been no distributions from capital surplus, and Plains does not anticipate that there will be significant distributions from capital surplus.

If available cash from capital surplus is distributed in respect of each common unit in an aggregate amount per common unit equal to the initial public offering price of the common units, the distinction between operating surplus and capital surplus will cease, and all distributions of available cash will be treated as if they were from operating surplus. To date there have been no distributions from capital surplus, and Pacific does not anticipate that there will be significant distributions from capital surplus.

SUBORDINATION PERIOD

PLAINS

Plains has no subordinated units outstanding. Pursuant to the terms of Plains' partnership agreement and having satisfied the financial tests contained therein, in November 2003 25% of the subordinated units converted to common units on a one-for-one basis. In February 2004, all of the remaining subordinated units converted to common units on a one-for-one basis.

PACIFIC

Pacific currently has 7,848,750 subordinated units outstanding. Accordingly, Pacific is currently in its "subordination period," which generally will not end prior to June 30, 2007. During the subordination period, the common units have the right to receive distributions of available cash from operating surplus in an amount equal to the minimum quarterly distribution of \$0.4625 per unit per quarter, plus any arrearages in the payment of the minimum quarterly distribution on the common units from prior quarters, before any distributions of available cash from operating surplus may be made on the subordinated units. LB Pacific currently holds all the 7,848,750 outstanding subordinated units.

Upon expiration of the subordination period, each outstanding subordinated unit will convert into one common unit and will then participate pro rata with the other common units in distributions of available cash. In addition, upon removal of the general partner other than for cause, each subordinated unit will immediately convert into one common unit.

The subordination period is defined in Pacific's partnership agreement, and will end on the first day of any quarter beginning after June 30, 2007 on which each of the following tests are met:

distributions of available cash from operating surplus on each of the outstanding common units and subordinated units equaled or exceeded the minimum quarterly distribution for each of the three consecutive, non-overlapping four-quarter periods immediately preceding that date;

the adjusted operating surplus generated during each of the three consecutive, non-overlapping four-quarter periods immediately preceding that date equaled or exceeded the sum of the minimum quarterly distributions on all of the outstanding common units and subordinated units during those periods on a fully diluted basis plus the related distribution on the 2% general partner interest during those periods; and

there are no arrearages in payment of the minimum quarterly distribution on the common units.

INCENTIVE DISTRIBUTIONS

PLAINS

Incentive distribution rights represent the right to receive an increasing percentage of quarterly distributions of available cash from operating surplus, up to 48%, after the minimum quarterly distribution and the target distribution levels have been achieved. Plains' general partner currently holds the incentive distribution rights, but may transfer these rights separately from its general partner interest, subject to restrictions in the partnership agreement.

For any quarter that Plains distributes available cash from operating surplus to the common unitholders in an amount equal to the minimum quarterly distribution on all units, then Plains will distribute any additional available cash from operating surplus for that quarter among the unitholders, the general partner and the holders of the incentive distribution rights (if other than the general partner) in the following manner:

First, 85% to all unitholders, pro rata, 13% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until each unitholder receives a total of \$0.495 per unit for that quarter (the first target distribution);

Second, 75% to all unitholders, pro rata, 23% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until each unitholder receives a total of \$0.675 per unit for that quarter (the second target distribution); and

Thereafter, 50% to all unitholders, pro rata, 48% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner.

Plains is currently making distributions to its general partner at the 50% level.

PACIFIC

Incentive distribution rights represent the right to receive an increasing percentage of quarterly distributions of available cash from operating surplus, up to 48%, after the minimum quarterly distribution and the target distribution levels have been achieved. Pacific's general partner currently holds the incentive distribution rights, but may transfer these rights separately from its general partner interest, subject to restrictions in the partnership agreement.

For any quarter that Pacific distributes available cash from operating surplus on each common unit and subordinated unit in an amount equal to the minimum quarterly distribution plus the amount necessary to eliminate any cumulative arrearages in payment of the minimum quarterly distribution, then Pacific will distribute any additional available cash from operating surplus for that quarter among the unitholders, the general partner and the holders of the incentive distributions rights (if other than the general partner) in the following manner:

First, 98% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until each unitholder has received a total of \$0.5125 per unit for that quarter (the first target distribution) ;

Second, 85% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 13% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until each unitholder has received a total of \$0.5875 per unit for that quarter (the second target distribution);

Third, 75% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 23% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until each unitholder has received a total of \$0.7000 per unit for that quarter (the third target distribution); and

Thereafter, 50% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 48% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner.

Pacific is currently making incentive distributions to its general partner at the 15% level.

DISTRIBUTIONS OF AVAILABLE CASH FROM OPERATING SURPLUS

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Currently Plains distributes available cash from operating surplus with respect to any fiscal quarter in the following manner:

First, 98% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Plains distributes for each unit an amount equal to the minimum quarterly distribution for that quarter; and

Thereafter, in the manner described in " Incentive Distributions" above.

The minimum quarterly distribution and the first target distribution are subject to adjustment as described below in "Adjustments to the Minimum Quarterly Distribution and Target Distribution Levels."

During the subordination period. Currently Pacific distributes available cash from operating surplus with respect to any fiscal quarter in the following manner:

First, 98% to the common unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Pacific has distributed for each outstanding common unit an amount equal to the minimum quarterly distribution for that quarter;

Second, 98% to the common unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Pacific has distributed for each outstanding common unit an amount equal to any arrearages in payment of the minimum quarterly distribution on the common units for any prior quarters during the subordination period;

Third, 98% to the subordinated unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Pacific has distributed for each subordinated unit an amount equal to the minimum quarterly distribution for that quarter; and

Thereafter, in the manner described in " Incentive Distributions" above.

After the subordination period. After the end of the subordination period, Pacific will distribute available cash from operating surplus with respect to any fiscal quarter in the following manner:

First, 98% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Pacific has distributed for each outstanding unit an amount equal to the minimum quarterly distribution for that quarter; and

Thereafter, in the manner described in " Incentive Distributions" above.

The minimum quarterly distribution and the first target distribution are subject to adjustment as described below in "Adjustment to the Minimum Quarterly Distribution and Target Distribution Levels."

DISTRIBUTIONS OF AVAILABLE CASH FROM CAPITAL SURPLUS

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Plains will make distributions of available cash from capital surplus, if any, in the following manner:

Pacific will make distributions of available cash from capital surplus, if any, in the following manner:

First, 98% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Plains has distributed, for each common unit that was issued in the initial public offering, an amount of available cash from capital surplus equal to the initial public offering price; and

First, 98% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Pacific has distributed for each common unit that was issued in the initial public offering, an amount of available cash from capital surplus equal to the initial public offering price;

Thereafter, Plains will make all distributions of available cash from capital surplus as if they were from operating surplus.

Second, 98% to the common unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Pacific has distributed for each common unit, an amount of available cash from capital surplus equal to any unpaid arrearages in payment of the minimum quarterly distribution on the common units; and

Thereafter, Pacific will make all distributions of available cash from capital surplus as if they were from operating surplus.

Plains' partnership agreement treats a distribution of available cash from capital surplus as the repayment of the initial unit price from the initial public offering, which is a return of capital. The initial public offering price less any distributions of capital surplus per unit is referred to as the unrecovered initial unit price. Each time a distribution of capital surplus is made, the minimum quarterly distribution and the target distribution levels will be reduced in the same proportion as the corresponding reduction in the unrecovered initial unit price.

Pacific's partnership agreement treats a distribution of available cash from capital surplus as the repayment of the initial unit price from the initial public offering, which is a return of capital. The initial public offering price less any distributions of capital surplus per unit is referred to as the unrecovered initial unit price. Each time a distribution of capital surplus is made, the minimum quarterly distribution and the target distribution levels will be reduced in the same proportion as the corresponding reduction in the unrecovered initial unit price.

Once Plains distributes capital surplus on a unit in an amount equal to the initial unit price, Plains will reduce the minimum quarterly distribution and the target distribution levels to zero and Plains will make all future distributions from operating surplus, with 50% being paid to the holders of units, 48% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights and 2% to the general partner.

Once Pacific distributes capital surplus on a unit in an amount equal to the initial unit price, Pacific will reduce the minimum quarterly distribution and the target distribution levels to zero and Pacific will make all future distributions from operating surplus, with 50% being paid to the holders of units, 48% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights and 2% to the general partner.

**ADJUSTMENT TO THE MINIMUM QUARTERLY DISTRIBUTION
AND TARGET DISTRIBUTION LEVELS**

PLAINS

PACIFIC

In addition to adjusting the minimum quarterly distribution and target distribution levels to reflect a distribution of capital surplus, if Plains combines its units into fewer units or subdivides its units into a greater number of units, Plains will proportionately adjust:

- the minimum quarterly distribution;
- the target distribution levels;
- the unrecovered initial unit price; and
- other amounts calculated on a per unit basis.

For example, if a two-for-one split of the common units should occur, the minimum quarterly distribution, the target distribution levels and the unrecovered initial unit price would each be reduced to 50% of its level immediately prior to the two-for-one split.

In addition, if legislation is enacted or if existing law is modified or interpreted by the relevant governmental authority so that Plains becomes taxable as a corporation or otherwise subject to taxation as an entity for federal, state or local income tax purposes, Plains will adjust the minimum quarterly distribution and each of the target distribution levels, respectively, to equal the product obtained by multiplying the amount thereof by one minus the sum of (a) the maximum effective federal income tax rate to which Plains was subject plus (b) any increase in state and local income taxes to which Plains is subject for the taxable year of the event, after adjusting for any allowable deductions for federal income tax purposes for the payment of state and local income taxes. For example, if Plains became subject to a maximum marginal federal, and effective state and local, income tax rate of 38%, then the minimum quarterly distribution and the target distribution levels would each be reduced to 62% of the amount immediately prior to that adjustment.

In addition to adjusting the minimum quarterly distribution and target distribution levels to reflect a distribution of capital surplus, if Pacific combines its units into fewer units or subdivides its units into a greater number of units, Pacific will proportionately adjust:

- the minimum quarterly distribution;
- the target distribution levels;
- the unrecovered initial unit price;
- the number of common units issuable during the subordination period without a unitholder vote; and
- other amounts calculated on a per unit basis.

For example, if a two-for-one split of the common units should occur, the minimum quarterly distribution, the target distribution levels and the unrecovered initial unit price would each be reduced to 50% of its level immediately prior to the two-for-one split.

In addition, if legislation is enacted or if existing law is modified or interpreted by the relevant governmental authority so that Pacific becomes taxable as a corporation or otherwise subject to taxation as an entity for federal, state or local income tax purposes, Pacific will adjust the minimum quarterly distribution and each of the target distribution levels, respectively, to equal the product obtained by multiplying the amount thereof by one minus the sum of (a) the maximum effective federal income tax rate to which Pacific was subject plus (b) any increase in state and local income taxes to which Pacific is subject for the taxable year of the event, after adjusting for any allowable deductions for federal income tax purposes for the payment of state and local income taxes. For example, if Pacific became subject to a maximum marginal federal, and effective state and local, income tax rate of 38%, then the minimum quarterly distribution and the target distribution levels would each be reduced to 62% of the amount immediately prior to that adjustment.

DISTRIBUTIONS OF CASH UPON LIQUIDATION

PLAINS

PACIFIC

If Plains dissolves in accordance with its partnership agreement, it will sell or otherwise dispose of its assets in a process called a liquidation. Plains will first apply the proceeds of liquidation to the payment of its creditors. Plains will distribute any remaining proceeds to the unitholders and its general partner in accordance with their capital account balances, as adjusted.

If Pacific dissolves in accordance with its partnership agreement, it will sell or otherwise dispose of its assets in a process called a liquidation. Pacific will first apply the proceeds of liquidation to the payment of its creditors. Pacific will distribute any remaining proceeds to the unitholders and its general partner, in accordance with their capital account balances, as adjusted.

The manner of the adjustment is set forth in the partnership agreement. Plains will allocate any gain or unrealized gain attributable to assets distributed in kind, in the following manner:

The manner of the adjustment is set forth in the partnership agreement. If Pacific's liquidation occurs before the end of the subordination period, it will allocate any gain or unrealized gain attributable to assets distributed in kind, in the following manner:

First, to its general partner and the holders of units who have negative balances in their capital accounts to the extent of and in proportion to those negative balances;

First, to its general partner and the holders of units who have negative balances in their capital accounts to the extent of and in proportion to those negative balances;

Second, 98% to the common unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until the capital account in respect of each outstanding common unit is equal to the sum of:

Second, 98% to the common unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until the capital account for each outstanding common unit is equal to the sum of:

the unrecovered initial unit price for that common unit; plus

the unrecovered initial unit price for that common unit; plus

the amount of the minimum quarterly distribution for the quarter during which liquidation occurs;

the amount of the minimum quarterly distribution for the quarter during which the liquidation occurs; plus

any unpaid arrearages in payment of the minimum quarterly distribution on that common unit;

Third, 85% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 13% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Plains allocates under this paragraph an amount per unit equal to

Third, 98% to the subordinated unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until the capital account for each outstanding subordinated unit is equal to the sum of:

the sum of:

the unrecovered initial unit price on that subordinated unit; plus

the sum of the excess of the first target distribution per unit over the minimum quarterly distribution per unit for each quarter of Plains' existence; less

the amount of the minimum quarterly distribution for the quarter during which the liquidation occurs;

the cumulative amount per unit of any distributions of available cash from operating surplus in excess of the minimum quarterly distribution per unit that was distributed 85% to the unitholders, pro rata, 13% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, and 2% to the general partner for each quarter of Plains' existence (collectively, the first target distribution amount");

Fourth, 75% to all unitholders, pro rata, 23% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner until the capital account in respect of each common unit then outstanding is equal to the sum of:

the sum of the excess of the second target distribution per unit over the first target distribution per unit for each quarter of Plains' existence; less

the cumulative amount per unit of any distributions of available cash from operating surplus in excess of the first target distribution per unit that was distributed 75% to the unitholders, pro rata, 23% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner for each quarter of Plains' existence; and

Thereafter, any remaining amount 50% to all unitholders, pro rata, 48% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner.

Upon Plains' liquidation, Plains will allocate any loss to the general partner and each unitholder as follows:

Fourth, 98% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, pro rata, until Pacific allocates under this paragraph an amount per unit equal to:

the sum of the excess of the first target distribution per unit over the minimum quarterly distribution per unit for each quarter of Pacific's existence; less

the cumulative amount per unit of any distributions of available cash from operating surplus in excess of the minimum quarterly distribution per unit that was distributed 98% to the unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner for each quarter of Pacific's existence;

Fifth, 85% to all unitholders, pro rata, and 13% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Pacific allocates under this paragraph an amount per unit equal to:

the sum of the excess of the second target distribution per unit over the first target distribution per unit for each quarter of Pacific's existence; less

First, 98% to the holders of common units who have positive balances in their capital accounts in proportion to those positive balances and 2% to the general partner, until the capital accounts of the common unitholders have been reduced to zero; and

Thereafter, 100% to the general partner.

In addition, interim adjustments to capital accounts will be made at the time Plains issues additional partnership interests or makes distributions of property. These adjustments will be based on the fair market value of the interests or the property distributed and any gain or loss would be allocated to the unitholders and the general partner in the same way that a gain or loss is allocated upon liquidation. If positive interim adjustments are made to the capital accounts, any subsequent negative adjustments to the capital accounts resulting from the issuance of additional interests, distributions of property, or upon liquidation, will be allocated in a way that, to the extent possible, in the capital account balances of the general partner equaling the amount which would have been the general partner's capital account balances if no prior positive adjustments to the capital accounts had been made.

the cumulative amount per unit of any distributions of available cash from operating surplus in excess of the minimum quarterly distribution per unit that was distributed 98% to the unitholders, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner for each quarter of Pacific's existence;

Sixth, 75% to all unitholders, pro rata, 23% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until Pacific allocates under this paragraph an amount per unit equal to:

the sum of the excess of the third target distribution per unit over the second target distribution per unit for each quarter of Pacific's existence; less

the cumulative amount per unit of any distributions of available cash from operating surplus in excess of the second target distribution per unit that was distributed 75% to the unitholders, pro rata, and 23% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner for each quarter of Pacific's existence; and

Thereafter, 50% to all unitholders, pro rata, 48% to the holders of the incentive distribution rights, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner. If the liquidation occurs after the end of the subordination period, the distinction between common units and subordinated units will disappear, so that clause (3) of the second bullet point above and all of the third bullet point above will no longer be applicable.

Upon Pacific's liquidation, Pacific will allocate any loss to the general partner and each unitholder as follows:

First, 98% to holders of subordinated units, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until the capital accounts of the holders of the subordinated units have been reduced to zero;

Second, 98% to the holders of common units, pro rata, and 2% to the general partner, until the capital accounts of the common unitholders have been reduced to zero; and

Thereafter, 100% to the general partner.

If the liquidation occurs after the end of the subordination period, the distinction between common units and subordinated units will disappear, so that all of the first bullet point above will no longer be applicable.

In addition, interim adjustments to capital account will be made upon the issuance of additional units. In doing so, Pacific will allocate any unrealized gain and, for tax purposes, unrecognized gain or loss resulting from the adjustments to the unitholders and the general partner in the same manner as Pacific will allocate gain or loss upon liquidation. If Pacific makes positive adjustments to the capital accounts upon the issuance of additional units, Pacific will allocate any later negative adjustments to the capital accounts resulting from the issuance of additional units or upon liquidation in a manner which results, to the extent possible, in the general partner's capital account balance equaling the amount which it would have been if no earlier positive adjustments to the capital accounts had been made.

MERGER/CONSOLIDATION

PLAINS

Merger or consolidation of Plains requires the prior approval of Plains' general partner. The general partner must also approve the merger agreement, which must include certain information as set forth in Plains' partnership agreement. Once approved by the general partner, the merger agreement must be submitted to a vote of Plains' limited partners, and the merger agreement will be approved upon receipt of the affirmative vote of a majority of Plains' outstanding common units (unless the affirmative vote of the holders of a greater

PACIFIC

Merger or consolidation of Pacific requires the prior approval of Pacific's general partner. The general partner must also approve the merger agreement, which must include certain information as set forth in Pacific's partnership agreement. Once approved by the general partner, the merger agreement must be submitted to a vote of Pacific limited partners, and the merger agreement will be approved upon receipt of the affirmative vote of a majority of Pacific's outstanding common units (unless the affirmative vote of the holders of a greater

PLAINS

percentage of common units is required under Delaware law).

PACIFIC

percentage of common units is required under Delaware law and excluding common units held by the general partner and its affiliates) and a majority of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units, voting as separate classes.

141

DISPOSAL OF ASSETS

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Plains' general partner may not sell, exchange or otherwise dispose of all or substantially all of Plains' assets in a single transaction or a series of related transactions or approve on behalf of Plains, the sale, exchange or other disposition of all or substantially all the assets of Plains without the approval of a majority of Plains' outstanding units. However, Plains' general partner may mortgage, pledge, hypothecate or grant a security interest in all or substantially all of Plains' assets without that approval. In addition, the general partner may sell any or all of Plains' assets in a forced sale pursuant to the foreclosure or other realization of any encumbrance without the approval of Plains' unitholders.

Pacific's general partner may not sell, exchange or otherwise dispose of all or substantially all of Pacific's assets in a single transaction or a series of related transactions or approve on behalf of Pacific, the sale, exchange or other disposition of all or substantially all of the Pacific's assets without the approval of a majority of Pacific's outstanding common units and a majority of Pacific's outstanding subordinated units, voting as separate classes. However, Pacific's general partner may mortgage, pledge, hypothecate or grant a security interest in all or substantially all of Pacific's assets without that approval. In addition, the general partner may sell all or substantially all of Pacific's assets in a forced sale pursuant to the foreclosure or other realization of any encumbrance without the approval of Pacific's unitholders.

TRANSFER OF GENERAL PARTNER INTEREST

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Prior to December 31, 2008, Plains' general partner may not transfer all or any part of its general partner interest in Plains unless such transfer (a) has been approved by the prior written consent or vote of at least a majority of the outstanding common units (excluding any common units held by the general partner and its affiliates) or (b) is of all, but not less than all, of its general partner interest to (i) an affiliate of the general partner or (ii) another person in connection with the merger or consolidation of the general partner with or into another person or the transfer by the general partner of all or substantially all of its assets to another person.

On or after December 31, 2008, Plains' general partner may transfer all or any part of its general partner interest in Plains without unitholder approval.

Prior to June 30, 2012, Pacific's general partner may not transfer all or any part of its general partner interest in Pacific unless such transfer (a) has been approved by the prior written consent or vote of at least a majority of the outstanding common units (excluding any common units held by the general partner and its affiliates) or (b) is of all, but not less than all, of its general partner interest to (i) an affiliate of the general partner or (ii) another person in connection with the merger or consolidation of the general partner with or into another person or the transfer by the general partner of all or substantially all of its assets to another person.

On or after June 30, 2012, Pacific's general partner may transfer all or any part of its general partner interest in Pacific without unitholder approval.

WITHDRAWAL OF GENERAL PARTNER

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Plains' general partner has agreed not to withdraw voluntarily as general partner prior to December 31, 2008, without first providing 90 days' written notice and obtaining the approval of the holders of a majority of Plains' outstanding common units, excluding those held by the general partner and its affiliates, and furnishing an opinion of counsel stating that such withdrawal (following the selection of the successor general partner) would not result in the loss of the limited liability of any of Plains' limited partners or of a member of Plains' operating partnerships or cause Plains or its operating partnerships to be treated as an association taxable as a corporation or otherwise to be taxed as an entity for federal income tax purposes.

At any time after December 31, 2008, Plains' general partner may withdraw as general partner without first obtaining approval of any unitholder by giving 90 days' written notice, and that withdrawal will not constitute a breach of Plains' partnership agreement. In addition, the general partner may withdraw without unitholder approval upon 90 days notice to Plains' limited partners if at least 50% of Plains' outstanding units are held or controlled by one person and its affiliates other than the general partner and its affiliates.

Upon the voluntary withdrawal of the general partner, the holders of a majority of Plains' outstanding units, excluding the units held by the withdrawing general partner and its affiliates, may elect a successor to the withdrawing general partner. If a successor is not elected, or is elected but an opinion of counsel regarding limited liability and tax matters cannot be obtained, Plains will be dissolved, wound up and liquidated, unless within 90 days after that withdrawal, the holders of a majority of Plains' outstanding units, excluding the units held by the withdrawing general partner and its affiliates, agree to continue Plains' business and to appoint a successor general partner.

Pacific's general partner has agreed not to withdraw voluntarily as general partner prior to June 30, 2012, without first providing 90 days' written notice and obtaining the approval of the holders of a majority of Pacific's outstanding common units, excluding those held by the general partner and its affiliates, and furnishing an opinion of counsel stating that such withdrawal (following the selection of the successor general partner) would not result in the loss of the limited liability of any of Pacific's limited partners or of a member of Pacific's operating company or cause Pacific or its operating company to be treated as an association taxable as a corporation or otherwise to be taxed as an entity for federal income tax purposes.

At any time after June 30, 2012, Pacific's general partner may withdraw as general partner without first obtaining approval of any unitholder by giving 90 days' written notice, and that withdrawal will not constitute a breach of Pacific's partnership agreement. In addition, the general partner may withdraw without unitholder approval upon 90 days notice to Pacific's limited partners if at least 50% of Pacific's outstanding units are held or controlled by one person and its affiliates other than the general partner and its affiliates.

Upon the withdrawal of the general partner, the holders of a majority of Pacific's outstanding common units, excluding the units held by the withdrawing general partner and its affiliates, and subordinated units, voting as separate classes, may select a successor to the withdrawing general partner. If a successor is not elected, or is elected but an opinion of counsel regarding limited liability and tax matters cannot be obtained, Pacific will be dissolved, wound up and liquidated, unless within 90 days after that withdrawal, the holders of a majority of Pacific's outstanding units, excluding the common units held by the withdrawing general partner and its affiliates, agree to continue business and to appoint a successor general partner.

REMOVAL OF GENERAL PARTNER

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Plains' general partner may not be removed unless that removal is approved by the vote of the holders of not less than 66²/₃% of Plains' outstanding units, including units held by its general partner and its affiliates, and Plains receives an opinion of counsel regarding limited liability and tax matters. In addition, any removal of the general partner is subject to the approval of a successor general partner by the vote of the holders of a majority of Plains' outstanding common units, including those held by Plains' general partner and its affiliates.

If the general partner is removed as the general partner under circumstances where cause does not exist, and units held by the general partner and its affiliates are not voted in favor of that removal, the general partner will have the right to convert its general partner interest and its incentive distribution rights into common units or to receive cash in exchange for those interests.

While Plains' partnership agreement limits the ability of its general partner to withdraw, it allows the general partner interest to be transferred to an affiliate or to a third party as part of the merger or consolidation of the general partner with or into another entity or the transfer by its general partner of all or substantially all of its assets to another entity.

Pacific's general partner may not be removed unless that removal is approved by the vote of the holders of not less than 66²/₃% of Pacific's outstanding units, including units held by its general partner and its affiliates, and Pacific receives an opinion of counsel regarding limited liability and tax matters. In addition, any removal of the general partner is subject to the approval of a successor general partner by the vote of the holders of a majority of the outstanding common units and subordinated units, voting as separate classes.

If the general partner is removed as the general partner under circumstances where cause does not exist, and units held by the general partner and its affiliates are not voted in favor of that removal:

the subordination period will end and all outstanding subordinated units will immediately convert into common units on a one-for-one basis;

any existing arrearages in payment of the minimum quarterly distribution on the common units will be extinguished; and

the general partner will have the right to convert its general partner interest and its incentive distribution rights into common units or to receive cash in exchange for those interests.

While Pacific's partnership agreement limits the ability of its general partner to withdraw, it allows the general partner interest to be transferred to an affiliate or to a third party as part of the merger or consolidation of the general partner with or into another entity or the transfer by its general partner of all or substantially all of its assets to another entity.

LIMITED CALL RIGHTS

PLAINS

If at any time Plains' general partner and its affiliates own more than 80% of the then-issued and outstanding limited partner interests of any class, the general partner will have the right to purchase all, but not less than all, of the outstanding limited partner interests of that class that are held by non-affiliated persons. The record date for determining ownership of the limited partner interests would be selected by the general partner on at least 10 but not more than 60 days' notice. The purchase price in the event of a purchase under these provisions would be the greater of (1) the current market price (as defined in Plains' partnership agreement) of the limited partner interests of the class as of the date three days prior to the date that notice is mailed to the limited partners as provided in Plains' partnership agreement and (2) the highest cash price paid by the general partner or any of its affiliates for any limited partner interest of the class purchased within the 90 days preceding the date the general partner mails notice of its election to purchase the units.

PACIFIC

If at any time Pacific's general partner and its affiliates hold more than 80% of the then-issued and outstanding limited partner interests of any class, the general partner will have the right to purchase all, but not less than all, of the outstanding limited partner interests of that class that are held by non-affiliated persons. The record date for determining ownership of the limited partner interests would be selected by the general partner on at least 10 but not more than 60 days' notice. The purchase price in the event of a purchase under these provisions would be the greater of (1) the current market price (as defined in Pacific's partnership agreement) of the limited partner interests of the class as of the date three days prior to the date that notice is mailed to the limited partners as provided in Pacific's partnership agreement and (2) the highest cash price paid by the general partner or any of its affiliates for any limited partner interest of the class purchased within the 90 days preceding the date the general partner mails notice of its election to purchase the units.

LIMITED PREEMPTIVE RIGHTS

PLAINS

Plains' general partner has the right, which it may from time to time assign in whole or in part to any of its affiliates, to purchase partnership securities from Plains whenever, and on the same terms that, Plains issues partnership securities to persons other than the general partner and its affiliates, to the extent necessary to maintain the percentage interests of the general partner and its affiliates equal to that which existed immediately prior to the issuance of such partnership securities. The holders of common units have no preemptive rights to acquire additional common units or other partnership interest in Plains.

PACIFIC

Pacific's general partner has the right, which it may from time to time assign in whole or in part to any of its affiliates, to purchase partnership securities from Pacific whenever, and on the same terms that, Pacific issues partnership securities to persons other than the general partner and its affiliates, to the extent necessary to maintain the percentage interests of the general partner and its affiliates equal to that which existed immediately prior to the issuance of such partnership securities. The holders of common units have no preemptive rights to acquire additional common units or other partnership interest in Pacific.

AMENDMENT OF PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Amendments to Plains' partnership agreement may be proposed only by Plains' general partner. Any amendment that materially and adversely affects the rights or preferences of any type or class of limited partner interests in relation to other types or classes of limited partner interests or the general partner interest will require the approval of at least a majority of the type or class of limited partner interests or general partner interests so affected. However, in some circumstances, more particularly described in Plains' partnership agreement, the general partner may make amendments to Plains' partnership agreement without the approval of the limited partners or assignees to reflect:

a change in the name of Plains, the location of its principal place of business, its registered agent or its registered office;

the admission, substitution, withdrawal or removal of partners;

a change to qualify or continue Plains' qualification as a limited partnership or a partnership in which the limited partners have limited liability under the laws of any state or to ensure that neither Plains nor its operating partnerships will be treated as an association taxable as a corporation or otherwise taxed as an entity for federal income tax purposes;

a change that does not adversely affect the limited partners in any material respect;

a change to (a) satisfy any requirements, conditions or guidelines contained in any opinion, directive, order, ruling or regulation of any federal or state agency or judicial authority or contained in any federal or state statute or (b) facilitate the trading of Plains' limited partner interests or comply with any rule, regulation, guideline or requirement of any national securities exchange on which its limited partner interests are listed for trading;

Amendments to Pacific's partnership agreement may be proposed only by Pacific's general partner. Any amendment that materially and adversely affects the rights or preferences of any type or class of limited partner interests in relation to other types or classes of limited partner interests or the general partner interest will require the approval of at least a majority of the type or class of limited partner interests or general partner interests so affected. However, in some circumstances, more particularly described in Pacific's partnership agreement, the general partner may make amendments to Pacific's partnership agreement without the approval of the limited partners or assignees to reflect:

a change in the name of Pacific, the location of its principal place of business, its registered agent or its registered office;

the admission, substitution, withdrawal or removal of partners;

a change that to qualify or continue Pacific's qualification as a limited partnership or a partnership in which the limited partners have limited liability under the laws of any state or to ensure that neither Pacific nor its operating company will be treated as an association taxable as a corporation or otherwise taxed as an entity for federal income tax purposes;

a change that does not adversely affect the limited partners in any material respect;

a change to (a) satisfy any requirements, conditions or guidelines contained in any opinion, directive, order, ruling or regulation of any federal or state agency or judicial authority or contained in any federal or state statute or (b) facilitate the trading of Pacific's limited partner interests or comply with any rule, regulation, guideline or requirement of any national securities exchange on which its limited partner interests are listed for trading;

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

a change in Plains' fiscal year or taxable year and any changes that are necessary or advisable as a result of a change in Plains' fiscal year or taxable year;

an amendment that is necessary to prevent Plains, or its general partner or its directors, officers, trustees or agents from being subjected to the provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, or "plan asset" regulations adopted under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended;

an amendment that is necessary or advisable in connection with the authorization of issuance of any class or series of partnership securities;

any amendment expressly permitted by Plains' partnership agreement to be made by its general partner acting alone;

an amendment effected, necessitated or contemplated by a merger agreement approved in accordance with Plains' partnership agreement;

an amendment that is necessary or advisable to reflect, account for and deal with appropriately Plains' formation, or an investment by Plains in, any corporation, partnership, joint venture, limited liability company or other entity in connection with the conduct of activities permitted by its partnership agreement;

a merger or conveyance to effect a change in Plains' legal form; or

any other amendments substantially similar to the foregoing.

a change in Pacific's fiscal year or taxable year and any changes that are necessary or advisable as a result of a change in Pacific's fiscal year or taxable year;

an amendment that is necessary to prevent Pacific, or its general partner or its directors, officers, trustees or agents from being subjected to the provisions of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, or "plan asset" regulations adopted under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended;

an amendment that is necessary or advisable in connection with the authorization of issuance of any class or series of partnership securities;

any amendment expressly permitted by Pacific's partnership agreement to be made by its general partner acting alone;

an amendment effected, necessitated or contemplated by a merger agreement approved in accordance with Pacific's partnership agreement;

an amendment that is necessary or advisable to reflect, account for and deal with appropriately Pacific's formation, or an investment by Pacific in, any corporation, partnership, joint venture, limited liability company or other entity in connection with the conduct of activities permitted by its partnership agreement;

a merger or conveyance to effect a change in Pacific's legal form; or

any other amendments substantially similar to the foregoing.

Proposed amendments (other than those described above) must be approved by the general partner and the holders of at least a majority of the outstanding common units, unless a greater or different percentage is required under Plains' partnership agreement or by Delaware law. No provision of the partnership agreement that establishes a percentage of outstanding units required to take any action may be amended, altered, changed, repealed or rescinded to reduce such voting percentage unless such amendment is approved by the written consent or the affirmative vote of holders of outstanding units whose aggregate outstanding units constitute not less than the voting requirement sought to be reduced.

No amendment to the partnership agreement (other than those that may be made by the general partner without the approval of Plains' limited partners) will become effective without the approval of at least 90% of the outstanding units voting as a single class unless Plains obtains an opinion of counsel to the effect that such amendment will not affect the limited liability of any limited partner under applicable law.

Proposed amendments (other than those described above) must be approved by the general partner and the holders of at least a majority of the outstanding common units, unless a greater or different percentage is required under Pacific's partnership agreement or by Delaware law. No provision of the partnership agreement that establishes a percentage of outstanding units required to take any action may be amended, altered, changed, repealed or rescinded to reduce such voting percentage unless such amendment is approved by the written consent or the affirmative vote of holders of outstanding units whose aggregate outstanding units constitute not less than the voting requirement sought to be reduced.

No amendment to the partnership agreement (other than those that may be made by the general partner without the approval of Pacific's limited partners) will become effective without the approval of at least 90% of the outstanding units voting as a single class unless Pacific obtains an opinion of counsel to the effect that such amendment will not affect the limited liability of any limited partner under applicable law.

DISSOLUTION OF THE PARTNERSHIP

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Plains will be dissolved, and its affairs will be wound up, upon the occurrence of any of the following:

- the expiration of its term as provided in the partnership agreement;
- withdrawal or removal of the general partner or any other event that results in its ceasing to be Plains' general partner (other than by reason of transfer in accordance with Plains' partnership agreement or withdrawal or removal following approval of a successor);
- an election to dissolve the partnership by the general partner that is approved by the holders of a unit majority;

Pacific will be dissolved, and its affairs will be wound up, upon the occurrence of any of the following:

- withdrawal or removal of the general partner or any other event that results in its ceasing to be Pacific's general partner (other than by reason of transfer in accordance with Pacific's partnership agreement or withdrawal or removal following approval of a successor);
- an election to dissolve the partnership by the general partner that is approved by the holders of a unit majority;
- the entry of a decree of judicial dissolution of Pacific pursuant to the provisions of the Delaware Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act; or

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

the entry of a decree of judicial dissolution of Plains pursuant to the provisions of the Delaware Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act; or

the sale of all or substantially all of the assets and properties of Plains and its affiliates.

the sale of all or substantially all of the assets and properties of Pacific and its affiliates.

LIQUIDATION

PLAINS

Upon Plains' dissolution, unless it is reconstituted and continued as a new limited partnership, the person authorized to wind up Plains' affairs will, acting with all the powers of the general partner that the liquidator deems necessary or desirable in its judgment, liquidate Plains' assets. The proceeds of the liquidation will be applied as follows:

first, towards the payment of all of Plains' creditors and the creation of a reserve for contingent liabilities; and

then, to all partners in accordance with the positive balance in the respective capital accounts.

Under some circumstances and subject to some limitations, the liquidator may defer liquidation or distribution of Plains' assets for a reasonable period of time. If the liquidator determines that a sale would be impractical or would cause a loss to Plains' partners, the general partner may distribute assets in kind to Plains' partners.

PACIFIC

Upon Pacific's dissolution, unless it is reconstituted and continued as a new limited partnership, the person authorized to wind up Pacific's affairs will, acting with all of the powers of the general partner that the liquidator deems necessary or desirable in its judgment, liquidate Pacific's assets. The proceeds of the liquidation will be applied as follows:

first, towards the payment of all of Pacific's creditors and the creation of a reserve for contingent liabilities; and

then, to all partners in accordance with the positive balance in their respective capital accounts.

Under some circumstances and subject to certain limitations, the liquidator may defer liquidation or distribution of Pacific's assets for a reasonable period of time. If the liquidator determines that a sale would be impractical or would cause a loss to Pacific's partners, the general partner may distribute assets in kind to Pacific's partners.

If Pacific liquidates during the subordination period, in some circumstances holders of outstanding common units will be entitled to receive more liquidating distributions per unit than holders of outstanding subordinated units. The per unit difference will depend upon the amount of gain or loss that Pacific recognizes in liquidating its assets. Following conversion of the subordinated units into common units, all units will be treated the same upon liquidation.

MANAGEMENT

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Plains' general partner conducts, directs and manages all of Plains' activities. Except as specifically granted in Plains' partnership agreement, all management powers over the business and affairs of Plains are exclusively vested in the general partner, and no limited partner or assignee may have any power over the business and affairs of Plains. Plains' general partner has full power and authority to do all things and on such terms as it, in its sole discretion, may deem necessary or appropriate to conduct the business of Plains.

Pacific's general partner conducts, directs and manages all of Pacific's activities. Except as specifically granted in Pacific's partnership agreement, all management powers over the business and affairs of Pacific are exclusively vested in the general partner, and no limited partner or assignee may have any power over the business and affairs of Pacific. Pacific's general partner has full power and authority to do all things and on such terms as it, in its sole discretion, may deem necessary or appropriate to conduct the business of Pacific.

CHANGE OF MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Plains' partnership agreement contains specific provisions that are intended to discourage a person or group from attempting to remove the general partner or otherwise change management. Generally, if a person acquires 20% or more of any class of units then outstanding other than from the general partner or its affiliates, the units owned by such person cannot be voted on any matter. In addition, Plains' partnership agreement limits the ability of unitholders to call meetings or to acquire information about Plains' operations, as well as other provisions limiting the unitholders' ability to influence the manner or direction of management.

Pacific's partnership agreement contains specific provisions that are intended to discourage a person or group from attempting to remove its general partner or otherwise change management. Generally, if a person acquires 20% or more of any class of units then outstanding other than from the general partner or its affiliates, the units owned by such person cannot be voted on any matter. In addition, Pacific's partnership agreement limits the ability of unitholders to call meetings or to acquire information about Pacific's operations, as well as other provisions limiting the unitholders' ability to influence the manner or direction of management.

MEETINGS, VOTING

PLAINS

Special meetings of Plains' common unitholders may be called by the general partner or by common unitholders owning 20% or more of Plains' outstanding common units in accordance with the procedures set forth in Plains' partnership agreement. The general partner must send notice of any meetings to all unitholders of record as of a record date which may not be less than 10 or more than 60 days prior to the date of the meeting (or, where approvals are sought without a meeting, the date by which common unitholders must submit approvals) and any such meeting may be held not less than 10 days or more than 60 days after the mailing of notice of the meeting.

Each record holder of a unit has a vote according to his percentage interest in Plains, although additional limited partner interests having special voting rights could be issued. However, if at any time any person or group, other than the general partner and its affiliates, or a direct or subsequently approved transferee of the general partner or its affiliates or a person or group who acquires the units with the prior approval of the board of directors, acquires, in the aggregate, beneficial ownership of 20% or more of any class of units then outstanding, the person or group will lose voting rights on all of its units and the units may not be voted on any matter and will not be considered to be outstanding when sending notices of a meeting of unitholders, calculating required votes, determining the presence of a quorum or for other similar purposes. Common units held in nominee or street name account will be voted by the broker or other nominee in accordance with the instruction of the beneficial owner unless the arrangement between the beneficial owner and his nominee provides otherwise.

Plains common unitholders have no right to elect Plains' general partner on an annual or other continuing basis.

PACIFIC

Special meetings of Pacific's common unitholders may be called by the general partner or by common unitholders owning 20% or more of Pacific's outstanding common units in accordance with the procedures set forth in Pacific's partnership agreement. The general partner must send notice of any meetings to all unitholders of record as of a record date which may not be less than 10 or more than 60 days prior to the date of the meeting (or, where approvals are sought without a meeting, the date by which common unitholders must submit approvals) and any such meeting may be held not less than 10 days or more than 60 days after the mailing of notice of the meeting.

Each record holder of a unit has a vote according to his percentage interest in Pacific, although additional limited partner interests having special voting rights could be issued. However, if at any time any person or group, other than the general partner and its affiliates, or a direct or subsequently approved transferee of the general partner or its affiliates or a person or group who acquires the units with the prior approval of the board of directors, acquires, in the aggregate, beneficial ownership of 20% or more of any class of units then outstanding, the person or group will lose voting rights on all of its units and the units may not be voted on any matter and will not be considered to be outstanding when sending notices of a meeting of unitholders, calculating required votes, determining the presence of a quorum or for other similar purposes. Common units held in nominee or street name account will be voted by the broker or other nominee in accordance with the instruction of the beneficial owner unless the arrangement between the beneficial owner and his nominee provides otherwise. Except as otherwise provided in the partnership agreement, subordinated units will vote together with common units as a single class.

Pacific common unitholders have no right to elect Pacific's general partner on an annual or other continuing basis.

TRANSFER OF UNITS; STATUS AS A LIMITED PARTNER OR ASSIGNEE

PLAINS

Each purchaser of Plains common units must execute a transfer application whereby the purchaser requests admission as a substituted limited partner and makes representations and agrees to provisions stated in the transfer application. If this action is not taken, a purchaser will not be registered as a record holder of common units on the books of the transfer agent or issued a common unit certificate. Purchasers may hold common units in nominee accounts.

Each transfer of Plains limited partnership interests will not be recognized by the partnership unless certificate(s) representing those limited partnership interests are surrendered and such interests are accompanied by a duly executed transfer application. Once such transferee has executed and delivered a transfer application in accordance with Plains' partnership agreement, the transferee of common units is an assignee. Such assignee makes representations and agrees to be bound by the terms and conditions of, and executes, the partnership agreement and gives the consents and approvals and makes the waivers contained in the partnership agreement. An assignee will become a limited partner in respect of the transferred common units upon the consent of the general partner and the recordation of the name of the assignee on Plains' books and records. Such consent may be withheld in the sole discretion of Plains' general partner.

An assignee, pending its admission as a substituted limited partner, is entitled to an interest in Plains equivalent to that of a limited partner with respect to the right to share in allocations and distributions, including liquidating distributions. Plains' general partner will vote and exercise other powers attributable to common units owned by an assignee who has not become a substituted limited partner at the written direction of the assignee. A nominee or broker who has executed a transfer application with respect to common units held in street name or nominee accounts will receive distributions and reports pertaining to its common units.

PACIFIC

Each purchaser of Pacific common units must execute a transfer application whereby the purchaser requests admission as a substituted limited partner and makes representations and agrees to provisions stated in the transfer application. If this action is not taken, a purchaser will not be registered as a record holder of common units on the books of the transfer agent or issued a common unit certificate. Purchasers may hold common units in nominee accounts.

Each transfer of Pacific limited partnership interests will not be recognized by the partnership unless certificate(s) representing those limited partnership interests are surrendered and such interests are accompanied by a duly executed transfer application. Once such transferee has executed and delivered a transfer application in accordance with Pacific's partnership agreement, the transferee of common units is an assignee. Such assignee makes representations and agrees to be bound by the terms and conditions of, and executes, the partnership agreement and gives the consents and approvals and makes the waivers contained in the partnership agreement. An assignee will become a limited partner in respect of the transferred common units upon the consent of the general partner and the recordation of the name of the assignee on Pacific's books and records. Such consent may be withheld in the sole discretion of Pacific's general partner.

An assignee, pending its admission as a substituted limited partner, is entitled to an interest in Pacific equivalent to that of a limited partner with respect to the right to share in allocations and distributions, including liquidating distributions. Pacific's general partner will vote and exercise other powers attributable to common units owned by an assignee who has not become a substituted limited partner at the written direction of the assignee. A nominee or broker who has executed a transfer application with respect to common units held in street name or nominee accounts will receive distributions and reports pertaining to its common units.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

PLAINS

Plains' general partner may take into account the interests of other parties in addition to Plains' interests when resolving conflicts of interest. In effect, these provisions limit Plains' general partner's fiduciary duties to Plains unitholders. Plains' partnership agreement also restricts the remedies available to Plains unitholders for actions taken by Plains' general partner that might, without those limitations, constitute breaches of fiduciary duty. Whenever a conflict arises between Plains' general partner or its affiliates, on the one hand, and Plains, its subsidiaries or any other Plains partner, on the other, Plains' general partner will resolve that conflict. A conflicts committee of the board of directors of Plains' general partner may, at the request of Plains' general partner, review conflicts of interest. Plains' general partner will not be in breach of its obligations under Plains' partnership agreement or its duties to Plains or its unitholders if the resolution of the conflict is considered to be fair and reasonable to Plains. Any resolution is considered to be fair and reasonable to Plains if that resolution is:

approved by the conflicts committee of the board of directors of Plains' general partner, although no party is obligated to seek approval and Plains' general partner may adopt a resolution or course of action that has not received approval;

on terms no less favorable to Plains than those generally being provided to or available from unrelated third parties; or

fair to Plains, taking into account the totality of the relationships between the parties involved, including other transactions that may be particularly favorable or advantageous to Plains.

PACIFIC

Pacific's general partner may take into account the interests of other parties in addition to Pacific's interests when resolving conflicts of interest. In effect, these provisions limit Pacific's general partner's fiduciary duties to Pacific unitholders. Pacific's partnership agreement also restricts the remedies available to Pacific unitholders for actions taken by Pacific's general partner that might, without those limitations, constitute breaches of fiduciary duty. Whenever a conflict arises between Pacific's general partner or its affiliates, on the one hand, and Pacific, its subsidiaries or any other Pacific partner, on the other, Pacific's general partner will resolve that conflict. A conflicts committee of the board of directors of Pacific's general partner may, at the request of Pacific's general partner, review conflicts of interest. Pacific's general partner will not be in breach of its obligations under Pacific's partnership agreement or its duties to Pacific or its unitholders if the resolution of the conflict is considered to be fair and reasonable to Pacific. Any resolution is considered to be fair and reasonable to Pacific if that resolution is:

approved by the conflicts committee of the board of directors of Pacific's general partner, although no party is obligated to seek approval and Pacific's general partner may adopt a resolution or course of action that has not received approval;

on terms no less favorable to Pacific than those generally being provided to or available from unrelated third parties; or

fair to Pacific, taking into account the totality of the relationships between the parties involved, including other transactions that may be particularly favorable or advantageous to Pacific.

PLAINS

PACIFIC

Plains' general partner (including the conflicts committee) may, unless the resolution is specifically provided for in Plains' partnership agreement, consider the following in determining what is fair and reasonable to Plains:

Pacific's general partner (including the conflicts committee) may, unless the resolution is specifically provided for in Pacific's partnership agreement, consider the following in determining what is fair and reasonable to Pacific:

the relative interests of the parties involved in the conflict or affected by the action;

the relative interests of the parties involved in the conflict or affected by the action;

any customary or accepted industry practices or historical dealings with a particular person or entity;

any customary or accepted industry practices or historical dealings with a particular person or entity;

generally accepted accounting practices or principles and other factors it considers relevant, if applicable; and

generally accepted accounting practices or principles and other factors it considers relevant, if applicable; and

such additional factors as Plains' general partner (including the conflicts committee) determines in its sole discretion to be relevant, reasonable or appropriate under the circumstances.

such additional factors as Pacific's general partner (including the conflicts committee) determines in its sole discretion to be relevant, reasonable or appropriate under the circumstances.

DESCRIPTION OF PLAINS' COMMON UNITS

Generally, Plains' common units represent limited partner interests that entitle the holders to participate in Plains' cash distributions and to exercise the rights and privileges available to limited partners under Plains' partnership agreement. Plains' outstanding common units are listed on the NYSE under the symbol "PAA." The transfer agent and registrar for Plains' common units is American Stock Transfer and Trust Company.

Status as Limited Partner or Assignee

Except as described below under " Limited Liability," the common units will be fully paid, and unitholders will not be required to make additional capital contributions to Plains.

An assignee, pending its admission as a substituted limited partner, is entitled to an interest in Plains equivalent to that of a limited partner with respect to the right to share in allocations and distributions, including liquidating distributions. Plains' general partner will vote and exercise other powers attributable to common units owned by an assignee who has not become a substituted limited partner at the written direction of the assignee. A nominee or broker who has executed a transfer application with respect to common units held in street name or nominee accounts will receive distributions and reports pertaining to its common units.

Limited Liability

Assuming that a limited partner does not participate in the control of Plains' business within the meaning of the Delaware Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act (the "Delaware Act") and that it otherwise acts in conformity with the provisions of Plains' partnership agreement, its liability under the Delaware Act will be limited, subject to some possible exceptions, generally to the amount of capital it is obligated to contribute to Plains in respect of his units plus his share of any undistributed profits and assets.

Under the Delaware Act, a limited partnership may not make a distribution to a partner to the extent that at the time of the distribution, after giving effect to the distribution, all liabilities of the partnership, other than liabilities to partners on account of their partnership interests and liabilities for which the recourse of creditors is limited to specific property of the partnership, exceed the fair value of the assets of the limited partnership. For the purposes of determining the fair value of the assets of a limited partnership, the Delaware Act provides that the fair value of the property subject to liability of which recourse of creditors is limited shall be included in the assets of the limited partnership only to the extent that the fair value of that property exceeds the nonrecourse liability. The Delaware Act provides that a limited partner who receives a distribution and who knew at the time of the distribution that the distribution was in violation of the Delaware Act is liable to the limited partnership for the amount of the distribution for three years from the date of the distribution.

Reports and Records

As soon as practicable, but in no event later than 120 days after the close of each fiscal year, Plains' general partner will furnish or make available to each unitholder of record (as of a record date selected by Plains' general partner) an annual report containing Plains' audited financial statements for the past fiscal year. These financial statements will be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. In addition, no later than 45 days after the close of each quarter (except the fourth quarter), Plains' general partner will furnish or make available to each unitholder of record (as of a record date selected by Plains' general partner) a report containing Plains' unaudited financial statements and any other information required by law.

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Plains' general partner will use all reasonable efforts to furnish each unitholder of record information reasonably required for tax reporting purposes within 90 days after the close of each fiscal year. Plains' general partner's ability to furnish this summary tax information will depend on the cooperation of unitholders in supplying information to Plains' general partner. Each unitholder will receive information to assist him in determining his federal and state tax liability and filing his federal and state income tax returns.

A limited partner can, for a purpose reasonably related to the limited partner's interest as a limited partner, upon reasonable demand and at his own expense, have furnished to him:

a current list of the name and last known address of each partner;

a copy of Plains' tax returns;

information as to the amount of cash and a description and statement of the agreed value of any other property or services, contributed or to be contributed by each partner and the date on which each became a partner;

copies of Plains' partnership agreement, Plains' certificate of limited partnership, amendments to either of them and powers of attorney which have been executed under Plains' partnership agreement;

information regarding the status of Plains' business and financial condition; and

any other information regarding Plains' affairs as is just and reasonable.

Plains' general partner may, and intends to, keep confidential from the limited partners trade secrets and other information the disclosure of which Plains' general partner believes in good faith is not in Plains' best interest or which Plains is required by law or by agreements with third parties to keep confidential.

MATERIAL FEDERAL INCOME TAX CONSEQUENCES

The following discussion summarizes the material U.S. federal income tax consequences of the merger that are applicable to Plains unitholders and Pacific unitholders, as well as the material U.S. federal income tax considerations that are applicable to owning Plains common units received in the merger. Unless otherwise noted, the description of the law and the legal conclusions set forth in the discussion relating to the consequences of the merger to Plains and its unitholders and the consequences of holding Plains units are the opinion of Vinson & Elkins L.L.P., counsel to Plains, as to the material United States federal income tax consequences relating to those matters. Unless otherwise noted, the description of the law and the legal conclusions set forth in the discussion relating to the consequences of the merger to Pacific and its unitholders are the opinion of Baker Botts L.L.P., counsel to Pacific, as to the material United States federal income tax consequences relating to those matters. This discussion is based upon current provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or Code, existing and proposed regulations and current administrative rulings and court decisions, all of which are subject to change, possibly with retroactive effect. Changes in these authorities may cause the tax consequences to vary substantially from the consequences described below.

This discussion does not purport to be a complete discussion of all federal income tax consequences of the merger or unit ownership. Moreover, the discussion focuses on Plains unitholders and Pacific unitholders who are individual citizens or residents of the United States and has only limited application to corporations, estates, trusts, nonresident aliens, other unitholders subject to specialized tax treatment, such as tax-exempt institutions, foreign persons, individual retirement accounts, or IRAs, real estate investment trusts, or REITs, or mutual funds, traders in securities that elect to mark-to-market, affiliates of each of Plains' and Pacific's general partners, or persons who hold Plains common units or Pacific common units as part of a hedge, straddle or conversion transaction. Also, the discussion assumes that the Plains common units and Pacific common units are held as capital assets at the time of the merger. Accordingly, Plains strongly urges each Plains unitholder and Pacific unitholder to consult with, and depend upon, his own tax advisor in analyzing the federal, state, local and foreign tax consequences particular to him of the merger and subsequent ownership and disposition of Plains common units received in the merger.

The Merger

No ruling has been or will be requested from the IRS with respect to the tax consequences of the merger. It is a condition of closing, however, that:

Plains receive an opinion of its counsel, Vinson & Elkins L.L.P., to the effect that for U.S. federal income tax purposes:

none of Plains, its general partner or its subsidiaries will recognize any income or gain as a result of the merger (other than any gain resulting from any decrease in partnership liabilities pursuant to Section 752 of the Code);

no gain or loss will be recognized by Plains unitholders as a result of the merger (other than any gain resulting from any decrease in partnership liabilities pursuant to Section 752 of the Code); and

90% of the combined gross income of Pacific and Plains for the most recent four complete calendar quarters ending before the closing date of the merger for which the necessary financial information is available are from sources treated as "qualifying income" within the meaning of Section 7704(d) of the Code; and

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

Pacific receive an opinion of Baker Botts L.L.P., to the effect that for U.S. federal income tax purposes:

none of Pacific, its general partner or its subsidiaries will recognize any income or gain as a result of the merger (other than any gain resulting from any decrease in partnership liabilities pursuant to Section 752 of the Code); and

no gain or loss will be recognized by Pacific unitholders as a result of the merger (other than with respect to cash received in lieu of fractional Plains common units and any gain resulting from any decrease in partnership liabilities pursuant to Section 752 of the Code).

The opinions of counsel will assume that the merger will be consummated in the manner contemplated by, and in accordance with, the terms set forth in the merger agreement and described in this joint proxy statement/prospectus. In addition, the tax opinions delivered to Plains and Pacific will be based on certain factual representations made by officers of Plains, Pacific and their respective general partners.

Unlike a ruling, an opinion of counsel represents only that counsel's best legal judgment and does not bind the IRS or the courts. Accordingly, no assurance can be given that the above-described opinions and the opinions and statements made hereafter in this joint proxy statement/prospectus will be sustained by a court if contested by the IRS.

If either Plains or Pacific waives the receipt of the requisite tax opinion as a condition to closing and the changes to the tax consequences would be material, then this joint proxy statement/prospectus will be amended and recirculated and unitholder approval will be resolicited.

For federal income tax purposes, the merger will be treated as a contribution by Pacific of all of its assets and liabilities to Plains in exchange for Plains common units followed by a liquidation of Pacific in which Plains common units are distributed to the Pacific common unitholders in exchange for their Pacific common units. Except as described below with respect to a net decrease in a unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities and the receipt of cash in lieu of fractional Plains common units, no gain or loss will be recognized by a Pacific unitholder or a Plains unitholder as a result of the merger. Following the merger, a Pacific unitholder that receives Plains common units will be treated as a partner in Plains.

Because the merger will be treated as a contribution by Pacific of all of its assets to Plains in exchange for Plains common units followed by a liquidation of Pacific in which Plains common units are distributed to the Pacific common unitholders, a Pacific common unitholder's holding period for Plains common units received in the merger will not be determined by reference to the holding period of the unitholder's Pacific common units. Instead, a Pacific common unitholder's holding period for the Plains common units received in the merger that are attributable to Pacific's capital assets or assets used in its business as defined in Section 1231 of the Code will include Pacific's holding period in those assets. The holding period for Plains common units received by a Pacific unitholder attributable to other assets of Pacific, such as inventory and receivables, will begin on the day following the merger.

A Pacific unitholder's initial tax basis for his Plains common units received in the merger will be equal to his tax basis in the Pacific common units exchanged therefor, plus his share of Plains nonrecourse liabilities immediately following the merger, minus his share of Pacific nonrecourse liabilities immediately before the merger.

As a result of the merger, a Pacific unitholder will be treated as receiving a deemed cash distribution equal to the excess, if any, of such unitholder's share of Pacific nonrecourse liabilities immediately before the merger over such unitholder's share of the Plains nonrecourse liabilities immediately following the merger. Similarly, a Plains common unitholder will be treated as receiving a deemed cash distribution equal to the excess, if any, of such unitholder's share of the Plains

nonrecourse liabilities immediately before the merger over such unitholder's share of the Plains nonrecourse liabilities immediately following the merger. If the amount of the deemed cash distribution received by a Pacific common unitholder or a Plains common unitholder exceeds such unitholder's basis in its partnership interest, such unitholder will recognize gain in an amount equal to such excess.

A unitholder's share of the nonrecourse liabilities is determined under Section 752 of the Code and regulations promulgated thereunder. The application of these rules in the context of the merger is complex and subject to uncertainty. While there can be no assurance, Plains and Pacific do not anticipate that there will be a material decrease in the amount of nonrecourse liabilities allocable to a Pacific common unitholder or a Plains common unitholder as a result of the merger.

The treatment of the exchange of Pacific common units for Plains common units in the merger as a tax-free exchange (except with respect to a net decrease in a unitholder's share of nonrecourse liabilities and the receipt of cash in lieu of fractional Plains common units) as described above is dependent upon each of Plains and Pacific being treated as a partnership for federal income tax purposes. If either Plains or Pacific were treated as a corporation for federal income tax purposes, the exchange would likely be a taxable transaction for a Pacific common unitholder. Please read " Partnership Status."

A Pacific unitholder who receives cash instead of a fractional Plains common unit in the merger will generally recognize gain or loss equal to the difference between the amount of cash received and the unitholder's adjusted tax basis allocable to such fractional common unit.

Pacific uses the year ending December 31 as its taxable year and the accrual method of accounting for federal income tax purposes. As a result of the merger, Pacific's taxable year will end and Pacific will be required to file a final federal income tax return for the taxable year ending upon the date the merger is effected. Each Pacific unitholder will be required to include in income his share of income, gain, loss and deduction for this period. In addition, a Pacific unitholder who has a taxable year ending on a date other than December 31 and after the date the merger is effected must include his share of income, gain, loss and deduction in income for his taxable year, with the result that he will be required to include in income for his taxable year his share of more than one year of income, gain, loss and deduction from Pacific.

Tax Consequences of Owning Plains Common Units

No ruling has been or will be requested from the IRS regarding any matter affecting Plains following the merger or the consequences of owning Plains common units received in the merger. Instead, Plains will rely on opinions and advice of Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. with respect to such matters. Unlike a ruling, an opinion of counsel represents only that counsel's best legal judgment and does not bind the IRS or the courts. Accordingly, no assurance can be given that the opinions and statements made below will be sustained by a court if contested by the IRS. Any contest of this sort with the IRS may materially and adversely impact the market for the Plains common units and the prices at which Plains common units trade. In addition, the costs of any contest with the IRS will be borne directly or indirectly by the unitholders and the general partner of Plains. Furthermore, the tax treatment of ownership of Plains common units may be significantly modified by future legislative or administrative changes or court decisions. Any modifications may or may not be retroactively applied.

For the reasons described below, Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. has not rendered an opinion with respect to the following specific federal income tax issues:

the treatment of a unitholder whose Plains common units are loaned to a short seller to cover a short sale of Plains common units (please read " Tax Consequences of Plains Common Unit Ownership Treatment of Short Sales");

Edgar Filing: PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE LP - Form S-4/A

whether Plains' monthly convention for allocating taxable income and losses is permitted by existing Treasury regulations (please read "Disposition of Plains Common Units Allocations Between Transferors and Transferees");

whether Plains' method for depreciating Section 743 adjustments is sustainable (please read "Tax Consequences of Plains Common Unit Ownership Section 754 Election"); and

whether a Pacific unitholder will be able to utilize suspended passive losses related to his Pacific common units to offset income from Plains common units.

Partnership Status

A partnership is not a taxable entity and incurs no federal income tax liability. Instead, each partner of a partnership is required to take into account his share of items of income, gain, loss and deduction of the partnership in computing his federal income tax liability, regardless of whether cash distributions are made to him by the partnership. Distributions by a partnership to a partner are generally not taxable unless the amount of cash distributed is in excess of the partner's adjusted basis in his partnership interest.

Section 7704 of the Code provides that publicly traded partnerships will, as a general rule, be taxed as corporations. However, an exception, referred to as the "Qualifying Income Exception," exists with respect to publicly traded partnerships 90% or more of the gross income of which for every taxable year consists of "qualifying income." Qualifying income includes income and gains derived from the exploration, development, mining or production, processing, refining, transportation and marketing of any mineral or natural resource. Other types of qualifying income include interest other than from a financial business, dividends, gains from the sale of real property and gains from the sale or other disposition of assets held for the production of income that otherwise constitutes qualifying income. Plains estimates that less than 4% of its gross income after the completion of the merger is not qualifying income; however, this estimate could change from time to time. Based upon and subject to this estimate, the factual representations made by Plains, Pacific and their general partners and a review of the applicable legal authorities, Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. is of the opinion that at least 90% of the combined gross income of Plains and Pacific constitutes qualifying income.

No ruling has been or will be sought from the IRS and the IRS has made no determination as to the status of Plains, the Plains operating partnerships or Pacific as partnerships for federal income tax purposes or whether Plains' operations generate "qualifying income" under Section 7704 of the Code. Instead, Plains will rely on the opinion of Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. on such matters. It is the opinion of Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. that, based upon the Code, its regulations, published revenue rulings and court decisions and the representations described below, Plains and the Plains operating partnerships will each be classified as a partnership for federal income tax purposes.

In rendering its opinion, Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. has relied on factual representations made by Plains and its general partner. The representations made by Plains and its general partner upon which counsel has relied include:

Neither Plains nor the Plains operating partnerships will elect to be treated as a corporation; and

For each taxable year, more than 90% of Plains' gross income will be income that Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. has opined or will opine is "qualifying income" within the meaning of Section 7704(d) of the Code.

If Plains fails to meet the Qualifying Income Exception, other than as a result of a failure which is determined by the IRS to be inadvertent and which is cured within a reasonable time after discovery, Plains will be treated as if it had transferred all of its assets, subject to liabilities, to a newly formed

corporation, on the first day of the year in which it fails to meet the Qualifying Income Exception, in return for stock in that corporation, and then distributed that stock to the unitholders in liquidation of their interests in it. This contribution and liquidation should be tax-free to unitholders and Plains so long as Plains, at that time, does not have liabilities in excess of the tax basis of its assets. Thereafter, Plains would be treated as a corporation for federal income tax purposes.

If Plains were taxable as a corporation in any taxable year, either as a result of a failure to meet the Qualifying Income Exception or otherwise, its items of income, gain, loss and deduction would be reflected only on its tax return rather than being passed through to the unitholders, and its net income would be taxed at corporate rates. In addition, any distribution made to a unitholder would be treated as either taxable dividend income, to the extent of the current or accumulated earnings and profits of Plains, or, in the absence of earnings and profits, a nontaxable return of capital, to the extent of the unitholder's tax basis in his Plains common units, or taxable capital gain, after the unitholder's tax basis in his Plains common units is reduced to zero. Accordingly, taxation as a corporation would result in a material reduction in a unitholder's cash flow and after-tax return and thus would likely result in a substantial reduction of the value of the Plains common units.

The discussion below is based on Vinson & Elkins L.L.P.'s opinion that Plains will be classified as a partnership for federal income tax purposes.

Limited Partner Status

Unitholders who have become limited partners of Plains will be treated as partners of Plains for federal income tax purposes. Also:

assignees who have executed and delivered transfer applications and are awaiting admission as limited partners, and

unitholders whose Plains common units are held in street name or by a nominee and who have the right to direct the nominee in the exercise of all substantive rights attendant to the ownership of their Plains common units,

will be treated as partners of Plains for federal income tax purposes. As there is no direct or indirect controlling authority addressing assignees of Plains common units who are entitled to execute and deliver transfer applications and become entitled to direct the exercise of attendant rights, but who fail to execute and deliver transfer applications, the opinion of Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. does not extend to these persons. Furthermore, a purchaser or other transferee of Plains common units who does not execute and deliver a transfer application may not receive some federal income tax information or reports furnished to the record holders of Plains common units unless the units are held in a nominee or street name account and the nominee or broker has executed and delivered a transfer application for those units.

A beneficial owner of Plains common units whose units have been transferred to a short seller to complete a short sale would appear to lose his status as a partner with respect to those units for federal income tax purposes. Please read " Tax Consequences of Plains Common Unit Ownership Treatment of Short Sales."

Income, gain, deductions or losses would not appear to be reportable by a unitholder who is not a partner for federal income tax purposes, and any cash distributions received by a unitholder who is not a partner for federal income tax purposes would therefore be fully taxable as ordinary income. These holders are urged to consult their own tax advisors with respect to their status as partners in Plains for federal income tax purposes.

Tax Consequences of Plains Common Unit Ownership

Flow-through of Taxable Income. Plains will not pay any federal income tax. Instead, each unitholder will be required to report on his income tax return his share of the income, gains, losses and deductions of Plains without regard to whether corresponding cash distributions are received by him. Consequently, Plains may allocate income to a unitholder even if he has not received a cash distribution. Each unitholder will be required to include in income his allocable share of the income, gains, losses and deductions for the taxable year ending with or within his taxable year. The taxable year of Plains ends on December 31.

Treatment of Distributions. Distributions by Plains to a unitholder generally will not be taxable to the unitholder for federal income tax purposes to the extent of his tax basis in his Plains common units immediately before the distribution. Cash distributions in excess of a unitholder's tax basis generally will be considered to be gain from the sale or exchange of the Plains common units, taxable in accordance with the rules described under "Disposition of Plains Common Units" below. Any reduction in a unitholder's share of Plains liabilities for which no partner, including the general partner, bears the economic risk of loss, known as "nonrecourse liabilities," will be treated as a distribution of cash to that unitholder. To the extent distributions by Plains cause a unitholder's "at risk" amount to be less than zero at the end of any taxable year, he must recapture any losses deducted in previous years. Please read "Limitations on Deductibility of Losses."

A decrease in a unitholder's percentage interest in Plains because of the issuance of additional Plains common units will decrease his share of nonrecourse liabilities, and thus will result in a corresponding deemed distribution of cash. A non-pro rata distribution of money or property may result in ordinary income to a unitholder, regardless of his tax basis in his Plains common units, if the distribution reduces the unitholder's share of Plains' "unrealized receivables," including depreciation recapture, and/or substantially appreciated "inventory items," both as defined in the Code, and collectively, "Section 751 Assets." To that extent, he will be treated as having been distributed his proportionate share of the Section 751 Assets and having exchanged those assets with Plains in return for the non-pro rata portion of the actual distribution made to him. This latter deemed exchange will generally result in the unitholder's realization of ordinary income. That income will equal the excess of (1) the non-pro rata portion of that distribution over (2) the unitholder's tax basis for the share of Section 751 Assets deemed relinquished in the exchange.

Basis of Plains Common Units. A unitholder's initial tax basis for his Plains common units received in the merger will be equal to his tax basis in the Pacific common units exchanged therefor, plus his share of Plains nonrecourse liabilities, minus his share of Pacific nonrecourse liabilities immediately before the merger. That initial tax basis will be increased by his share of Plains income and by any increases in his share of Plains nonrecourse liabilities. That basis will be decreased, but not below zero, by distributions, by the unitholder's share of Plains losses, by any decreases in his share of Plains nonrecourse liabilities and by his share of Plains' expenditures that are not deductible in computing taxable income and are not required to be capitalized. A unitholder will have no share of Plains debt which is recourse to the general partner, but will have a share, generally based on his share of profits, of nonrecourse liabilities. Please read "Disposition of Plains Common Units Recognition of Gain or Loss."

Limitations on Deductibility of Losses. The ability of a unitholder to deduct his share of Plains losses is limited first by his basis and the amount he has at risk, and second, by application of the passive loss rules.

The deduction by a unitholder of his share of Plains losses will first be limited to the tax basis in his Plains common units and, in the case of an individual unitholder or a corporate unitholder, if more than 50% of the value of the corporate unitholder's stock is owned directly or indirectly by five or fewer individuals or some tax exempt organizations, to the amount for which the unitholder is

considered to be "at risk" with respect to Plains activities, if that is less than his tax basis. A unitholder must recapture losses deducted in previous years as income from such activity to the extent that distributions cause his at risk amount to be less than zero at the end of any taxable year. Losses disallowed to a unitholder or recaptured as a result of these limitations will carry forward and will be allowable to the extent that his tax basis or at risk amount, whichever is the limiting factor, is subsequently increased. Upon the taxable disposition of a Plains common unit, any gain recognized by a unitholder can be offset by losses that were previously suspended by the at risk limitation but may not be offset by losses suspended by the basis limitation. Any excess loss above that gain previously suspended by the at risk or basis limitations is no longer utilizable.

In general, a unitholder will be at risk to the extent of the tax basis of his Plains common units, excluding any portion of that basis attributable to his share of Plains nonrecourse liabilities, reduced by any amount of money he borrows to acquire or hold his Plains common units, if the lender of those borrowed funds owns an interest in Plains, is related to the unitholder or can look only to the Plains common units for repayment. A unitholder's at risk amount will increase or decrease as the tax basis of the unitholder's Plains common units increases or decreases, other than tax basis increases or decreases attributable to increases or decreases in his share of Plains nonrecourse liabilities.

Second, the passive loss limitation rules generally provide that individuals, estates, trusts and some closely-held corporations and personal service corporations can deduct losses from passive activities, which are generally corporate or partnership activities in which the taxpayer does not materially participate, only to the extent of the taxpayer's income from those passive activities. The passive loss limitation rules are applied separately with respect to each publicly traded partnership. Consequently, any passive losses generated by Plains will be available to offset only passive income generated by Plains in the future and will not be available to offset income from other passive activities or investments, including Plains' investments or investments in other publicly traded partnerships, or salary or active business income.

Passive losses that are not deductible because they exceed a unitholder's share of income Plains generates may be deducted in full when he disposes of his entire ownership interest in Plains in a fully taxable transaction with an unrelated party. The passive activity loss rules are applied after other applicable limitations on deductions, including the at risk rules and the basis limitation.

A unitholder's share of Plains net income may be offset by any suspended passive losses, but it may not be offset by any other current or carryover losses from other passive activities, including those attributable to other publicly traded partnerships.

There is no guidance as to whether suspended passive activity losses of Pacific common units will be available to offset passive activity income that is allocated to a former Pacific common unitholder from Plains activities after the merger. The IRS may contend that Plains is not the same partnership as Pacific and, accordingly, the passive loss limitation rules will not allow use of such losses until such time as all of such unitholder's Plains common units are sold. A Plains common unitholder may take the position, however, that Plains should be deemed a continuation of Pacific for this purpose such that any suspended Pacific losses would be available to offset Plains taxable income allocated to such unitholder. Because of the lack of guidance with respect to this issue, Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. is unable to opine as to whether suspended passive activity losses arising from Pacific activities will be available to offset Plains taxable income allocated to a former Pacific common unitholder following the merger. If you have losses with respect to Pacific common units, please consult your tax advisor.

Limitations on Interest Deductions. The deductibility of a non-corporate taxpayer's "investment interest expense" is generally limited to the amount of that taxpayer's "net investment income." Investment interest expense includes:

interest on indebtedness properly allocable to property held for investment;

Plains' interest expense attributed to portfolio income; and

the portion of interest expense incurred to purchase or carry an interest in a passive activity to the extent attributable to portfolio income.

The computation of a unitholder's investment interest expense will take into account interest on any margin account borrowing or other loan incurred to purchase or carry a Plains common unit. Net investment income includes gross income from property held for investment and amounts treated as portfolio income under the passive loss rules, less deductible expenses, other than interest, directly connected with the production of investment income, but generally does not include gains attributable to the disposition of property held for investment. The IRS has indicated that net passive income earned by a publicly traded partnership will be treated as investment income to unitholders. In addition, the unitholder's share of Plains' portfolio income will be treated as investment income.

Entity-Level Collections. If Plains is required or elects under applicable law to pay any federal, state or local income tax on behalf of any unitholder or the general partner or any former unitholder, it is authorized to pay those taxes from its funds. That payment, if made, will be treated as a distribution of cash to the unitholder on whose behalf the payment was made. If the payment is made on behalf of a person whose identity cannot be determined, Plains is authorized to treat the payment as a distribution to all current unitholders. Plains is authorized to amend the partnership agreement in the manner necessary to maintain uniformity of intrinsic tax characteristics of Plains common units and to adjust later distributions so that after giving effect to these distributions the priority and characterization of distributions otherwise applicable under the partnership agreement is maintained as nearly as is practicable. Payments by Plains as described above could give rise to an overpayment of tax on behalf of an individual unitholder in which event the unitholder would be required to file a claim in order to obtain a credit or refund.

Allocation of Income, Gain, Loss and Deduction. In general, if Plains has a net profit, items of income, gain, loss and deduction will be allocated among the general partner and the unitholders in accordance with their percentage interests in Plains. At any time that incentive distributions are made to the general partner, gross income will be allocated to the general partner to the extent of these distributions. If Plains has a net loss for the entire year, that loss will be allocated first to the general partner and the unitholders in accordance with their percentage interests to the extent of their positive capital accounts and, second, to the general partner.

Specified items of income, gain, loss and deduction will be allocated to account for the difference between the tax basis and fair market value of property contributed to Plains by the general partner and its affiliates, referred to in this discussion as "Contributed Property." The effect of these allocations to a Pacific unitholder as a result of the merger will be essentially the same as if the tax basis of Plains' assets were equal to their fair market value at the time of merger. Conversely, specified items of income, gain, loss and deduction will be allocated to account for the difference between the tax basis and fair market value of property deemed contributed to Plains by Pacific in the merger. The effect of these allocations to a Plains unitholder as a result of the merger will be essentially the same as if the tax basis of Pacific assets were equal to their fair market value at the time of merger. In addition, items of recapture income will be allocated to the extent possible to the partner who was allocated the deduction giving rise to the treatment of that gain as recapture income in order to minimize the recognition of ordinary income by some unitholders. Finally, although Plains does not expect that its operations will result in the creation of negative capital accounts, if negative capital accounts nevertheless result, items of Plains income and gain will be allocated in an amount and manner to eliminate the negative balance as quickly as possible.

Under these rules, in the event that Plains is required to divest itself of certain assets following the merger under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 or to otherwise satisfy regulatory requirements, all or a portion of any gain recognized as a result of such divestitures of

Pacific assets may be required to be allocated to the pre-merger Pacific unitholders and all or a portion of any gain recognized as a result of such divestitures of Plains assets may be required to be allocated to the pre-merger Plains unitholders. No special distributions will be made to the unitholders with respect to any tax liability resulting from such allocations.

An allocation of items of Plains income, gain, loss or deduction, other than an allocation required by the Code to eliminate the difference between a partner's book capital account credited with the fair market value of Contributed Property, and "tax" capital account credited with the tax basis of Contributed Property referred to in this discussion as the "Book-Tax Disparity," will generally be given effect for federal income tax purposes in determining a partner's share of an item of income, gain, loss or deduction only if the allocation has substantial economic effect. In any other case, a partner's share of an item will be determined on the basis of his interest in Plains, which will be determined by taking into account all the facts and circumstances, including his relative contributions to Plains, the interests of all the partners in profits and losses, the interest of all the partners in cash flow and other nonliquidating distributions and rights of all the partners to distributions of capital upon liquidation.

Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. is of the opinion that, with the exception of the issues described in " Tax Consequences of Plains Common Unit Ownership Section 754 Election" and " Disposition of Plains Common Units Allocations Between Transferors and Transferees," allocations under the Plains partnership agreement will be given effect for federal income tax purposes in determining a partner's share of an item of income, gain, loss or deduction.

Treatment of Short Sales. A unitholder whose Plains common units are loaned to a "short seller" to cover a short sale of Plains common units may be considered as having disposed of those units. If so, he would no longer be a partner for those Plains common units during the period of the loan and may recognize gain or loss from the disposition. As a result, during this period:

any of Plains' income, gain, loss or deduction with respect to those Plains common units would not be reportable by the unitholder;

any cash distributions received by the unitholder as to those Plains common units would be fully taxable; and

all of these distributions would appear to be ordinary income.

Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. has not rendered an opinion regarding the treatment of a unitholder whose Plains common units are loaned to a short seller to cover a short sale of Plains common units; therefore unitholders desiring to assure their status as partners and avoid the risk of gain recognition from a loan to a short seller should modify any applicable brokerage account agreements to prohibit their brokers from borrowing their Plains common units. The IRS has announced that it is actively studying issues relating to the tax treatment of short sales of partnership interests. Please also read " Disposition of Plains Common Units Recognition of Gain or Loss."

Alternative Minimum Tax. Each unitholder will be required to take into account his distributive share of any items of Plains income, gain, loss or deduction for purposes of the alternative minimum tax. The current minimum tax rate for noncorporate taxpayers is 26% on the first \$175,000 of alternative minimum taxable income in excess of the exemption amount and 28% on any additional alternative minimum taxable income. Plains strongly recommends that unitholders consult with their tax advisors as to the impact of owning Plains common units on their liability for the alternative minimum tax.

Tax Rates. In general the highest effective U.S. federal income tax rate for individuals currently is 35% and the maximum U.S. federal income tax rate for net capital gains of an individual currently is 15% if the asset disposed of was held for more than 12 months at the time of disposition.

Section 754 Election. Plains has made the election permitted by Section 754 of the Code. That election is irrevocable without the consent of the IRS. The election generally permits Plains to adjust a Plains common unit purchaser's tax basis in Plains' assets ("inside basis") under Section 743(b) of the Code to reflect his purchase price. This election does not apply to a person who purchases Plains common units directly from Plains. The Section 743(b) adjustment belongs to the purchaser and not to other unitholders. For purposes of this discussion, a unitholder's inside basis in Plains' assets will be considered to have two components (1) his share of the tax basis in Plains' assets ("common basis") and (2) his Section 743(b) adjustment to that basis.

Treasury regulations under Section 743 of the Code require that, if the remedial allocation method is adopted (which Plains has adopted), a portion of the Section 743(b) adjustment attributable to recovery property be depreciated over the remaining cost recovery period for the Section 704(c) built-in gain. Under Treasury regulation Section 1.167(c)-1(a)(6), a Section 743(b) adjustment attributable to property subject to depreciation under Section 167 of the Code rather than cost recovery deductions under Section 168 is generally required to be depreciated using either the straight-line method or the 150% declining balance method. Under the Plains partnership agreement, its general partner is authorized to take a position to preserve the uniformity of Plains common units even if that position is not consistent with these Treasury regulations. Please read " Tax Treatment of Operations" and " Uniformity of Plains Common Units."

Although Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. is unable to opine as to the validity of this approach because there is no direct or indirect controlling authority on this issue, Plains intends to depreciate the portion of a Section 743(b) adjustment attributable to unrealized appreciation in the value of Contributed Property, to the extent of any unamortized Book-Tax Disparity, using a rate of depreciation or amortization derived from the depreciation or amortization method and useful life applied to the common basis of the property, or treat that portion as non-amortizable to the extent attributable to property the common basis of which is not amortizable. This method is consistent with the methods employed by other publicly traded partnerships and is consistent with the regulations under Section 743 but is arguably inconsistent with Treasury regulation Section 1.167(c)-1(a)(6), but the Internal Revenue Service has not to Plains' knowledge challenged the method. To the extent this Section 743(b) adjustment is attributable to appreciation in value in excess of the unamortized Book-Tax Disparity, Plains will apply the rules described in the Treasury regulations and legislative history. If Plains determines that this position cannot reasonably be taken, it may take a depreciation or amortization position under which all purchasers acquiring Plains common units in the same month would receive depreciation or amortization, whether attributable to common basis or a Section 743(b) adjustment, based upon the same applicable rate as if they had purchased a direct interest in Plains' assets. This kind of aggregate approach may result in lower annual depreciation or amortization deductions than would otherwise be allowable to some unitholders. Please read " Uniformity of Plains Common Units."

A Section 754 election is advantageous if the transferee's tax basis in his Plains common units is higher than those units' share of the aggregate tax basis of Plains' assets immediately prior to the transfer. In that case, as a result of the election the transferee would have, among other items, a greater amount of depreciation and depletion deductions and his share of any gain or loss on a sale of Plains' assets would be less. Conversely, a Section 754 election is disadvantageous if the transferee's tax basis in his Plains common units is lower than those units' share of the aggregate tax basis of the Plains' assets immediately prior to the transfer. Thus the fair market value of the Plains common units may be affected either favorably or unfavorably by the election.

The calculations involved in the Section 754 election are complex and will be made on the basis of assumptions as to the value of Plains' assets and other matters. For example, the allocation of the Section 743(b) adjustment among the Plains' assets must be made in accordance with the Code. The IRS could seek to reallocate some or all of any Section 743(b) adjustment allocated by Plains to its

tangible assets to goodwill instead. Goodwill, as an intangible asset, is generally amortizable over a longer period of time or under a less accelerated method than Plains' tangible assets. There are no assurances that the determinations Plains makes will not be successfully challenged by the IRS and that the deductions resulting from them will not be reduced or disallowed altogether. Should the IRS require a different basis adjustment to be made, and should, in Plains' opinion the expense of compliance exceed the benefit of the election, it may seek permission from the IRS to revoke its Section 754 election. If permission is granted a subsequent purchaser of Plains common units may be allocated more income than he would have been allocated had the election not been revoked.

Tax Treatment of Operations

Accounting Method and Taxable Year. Pla