

**Prescotts No.3 Overlay MSL
Signalling PAP Sign Off Comments**

Ground Plan 161418-NRD-DRG-ESG-000001 Version A02

1. What cable route system is proposed for under the roadway and will it be strong enough for heavy farm machinery? This needs to be a buried pipe URX and not troughing as shown.
2. Are cattle guards required? The signage includes herding animals across the crossing. Confirmation required that no animals use the crossing.
3. Has the land owner been consulted/agreed to J01 sign being installed on their land?
4. Vandalism protection for equipment will be required (e.g. MSL light cages, fencing around VAMOS loc, toughened signs). There is evidence of gun shots on signage at this site.
5. Are LED deck lights required?
6. Is there a risk of signs and the VAMOS unit being struck by farm vehicles? VAMOS units look particularly vulnerable and may need moving to reduce this risk.
7. New fencing to be metallic or GRP, not wood as specified (E03).
8. Existing wooden fencing in the YO corner to be renewed with metallic or GRP fencing with these works.
9. Can deck width be extended to provide compliant width (300mm wider than gates), as per compliance review items 1.27 & 1.28?

OMSL Spec Issue 3.1

1. 4.3.1.1 (item 4) – fault reporting not yet resolved.
2. 4.3.1.7 (item 18) – this wording contradicts the design log entry no.4. Can it be confirmed which power supply solution is being used?
3. 4.3.1.8 (item 26) – can it be confirmed that new URXs will be provided for Prescotts No.3, Prescotts No.1 and Canal Bridge level crossings for new cabling being installed?
4. 4.3.1.11 (item 29) – ground plan doesn't show a new deck being provided.
5. 4.3.1.11 (item 36) – Section C notice will be required.
6. 4.3.1.11 (item 43) – this contradicts the ground plan signage, which states the user should stop, look, listen if the crossing is failed.
7. 4.3.1.11 (item 47) – are cattle guards required? The ground plan signage suggests animals are herded over the crossing.
8. 4.3.1.15 (item 59) – this contradicts the ground plan signage, which states the user should stop, look, listen if the crossing is failed.
9. 4.3.1.16 (item 61) – VAMOS cannot provide remote download of data.
10. 4.3.1.16 (item 62) – fault reporting not yet resolved.
11. 3.5 (item 77) – has the Operations Manager been consulted on this?
12. 3.5 (item 79) – fault reporting not yet resolved.
13. 3.9 (item 83) – training should not be required, as this isn't the first VAMOS in the Preston DU. Confirm with the S&TME.
14. Appendix D – no spares should be required, as this isn't the first VAMOS in the Preston DU. Confirm with the S&TME.
15. Appendix G – wrong Section Manager.
16. Appendix G – caging round the MSL light units required, and fencing round the VAMOS loc, to reduce the potential damage from this equipment being shot at. Can the signs be toughened for the same reason?
17. Appendix H – project team to confirm that Canal Bridge will be commissioned at the same time or before Prescotts No.3.
18. Appendix H – will a bender unit be provided in 101G location?

Compliance Review Version 2.0

1. 1.24 – can the deck be extended to provide a compliant width?
2. 1.27 & 1.28 – risk assessment required to support this decision. Is some minor re-profiling being carried out (ground plan shows this)?