



MEETING NOTES

PROJECT:	23982 I-70 West Vail Pass Safety and Operations Improvements
PURPOSE:	SWEEP ITF #8 Meeting
DATE HELD:	May 2, 2022
LOCATION:	Online Google Meet Meeting
ATTENDING:	John Kronholm, Project Manager, CDOT Region 3 Karen Berdoulay, Resident Engineer, CDOT Region 3 Rob Beck, Program Engineer, CDOT Region 3 Matt Figgs, Project Manager, CDOT Region 3 Cinnamon Levi-Flinn, Environmental, CDOT Region 3 Paula Durkin, Environmental, CDOT Region 3 Jen Klaetsch, Environmental, CDOT Region 3 Kane Schneider, Maintenance, CDOT Region 3 Joe Bajza, Maintenance, CDOT Region 3 Marcus Dreux, US Forest Service Mark Hane, US Forest Service Melvin Woody, US Forest Service Justin Anderson US Forest Service Kristin Salamek, CDOT USFWS Liaison Julie Smith, EPA Region 8 Dick Cleveland, Town of Vail Siri Roman, ERWSD Larissa Read, ERWSD Bill Hoblitsell, ERWSD Tanner Rausch, Kiewit Megan Wood, Kiewit Bridget Mitchell, Pinyon Environmental Holly Huyck, Pinyon Environmental Randal Lapsley, R S & H Mary Jo Vobejda, Jacobs Jim Clarke, Jacobs Pat Hickey, Jacobs Amy Hopkins, Jacobs Loretta LaRiviere, Jacobs
COPIES:	Attendees

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

1. Introductions & Meeting Purpose

- a. Karen introduced the attendees at today's meeting.
- b. Mary Jo said this is the 8th meeting of the SWEEP ITF, and our goal today is to look at Maintenance Manual comments and process, give you an update on the Map Book, Schedule, and Next Steps and after this portion of the meeting Karen is going to give a separate presentation to talk about winter maintenance.

2. Work to Date

- EMS ITF Meeting #4 on February 7th. We are meeting with them prior to each project so they are up to speed on how to maintain emergency services during construction.



- PLT Meeting #11 on February 11th
- There were three TT Meetings on Feb 14th, March 14th, and April 18th
- 106/Aesthetic Guidelines were submitted to Consulting Parties and the final version has been uploaded to the project website:
https://www.codot.gov/projects/i70westvailauxiliarylanes/assets/23982_i70_wvp_aestheticguidance_final_110421-9.pdf
- CP#2 Final Plans submitted on March 7th
- Final Maintenance Manual distributed to the ITF for comments
- Addressed comments to the Map Book from MP 180 - 185
- CP #3 FOR (90%) Submittal on March 23rd
- I-70 Virtual Open House on March 31st
- Construction began on April 4th for the early work that needs to be completed prior to recreation path construction.

3. Maintenance Manual

- a. Bridget Mitchell said we are updating the Maintenance Manual in order to comply with an EA commitment that was specific to the I-70 West Vail Pass Auxiliary Lane project. and the purpose is to have a summary of sediment control infrastructure on West Vail Pass. It is not a stand-alone document, there are multiple maintenance documents and SOPs that maintenance personnel are already using and some of that information is included in the current version of the Maintenance Manual.

The big change to the outline since the last submittal was to include our recommended documentation and reporting. We did receive quite a few questions on how maintenance activities and the sand material is being tracked. Again, the manual we are presenting is not inclusive. It references other documents and procedures that CDOT is currently using but we are trying to provide an overview of how that is happening so there is clarification.

The other documents CDOT is currently using are:

- Manual for Maintenance Procedures which covers a lot of maintenance procedures not specific to winter maintenance and how the sand is collected. There is some information that is specific to snow and ice control, vegetation management, and maintenance of the infrastructure, but this is a much broader document that is being used.
- The Winter Operations Statewide Plan is specific to snow and ice operations and control, so this is another thing the maintenance crew is well versed on, and it is updated annually.
- Plan Maintenance (PM) Field Manual. This is where we obtained a lot of information for our manual. This field manual goes into a lot more detail on the dos and don'ts, how things are tracked, and how maintenance personnel should input that information into CDOT's Work Order System. Section 4 of our manual is a summary of the Field Manual and the CDOT Work Order System. If people are looking for more information, I recommend you look at these documents.

- b. Since our last meeting Holly and I met with Chuck Decker who was leading maintenance for this region. We went through our manual and discussed the summary of control measures and the proposed maintenance activities. We wanted to make sure we were presenting correct information and providing something that would be useful to personnel. The intent of the document is a summary that is specific to this corridor that maintenance personnel can use.

In Section 3 of our manual, Table 3.1 summarizes the control measures which are in three categories: Prevention, Conveyance, and Treatment into one fact sheet. We identified the activities that maintenance personnel are performing including timing. We received some questions about timing and that was verified with Chuck to ensure its accuracy. We also included equipment used. This is a great summary but it's not the only thing being used. All the other manuals are used by personnel as they perform these activities.

Another thing we wanted to do is capture a better description of control measures used on the corridor including details, verbiage and in some instances, pictures. Personnel can see what these look like and what the intent of these control measures are and how to maintain them.

In Section 4 a lot of the information was taken right out of the Field Manual and is a summary of the activities that are specific to sediment removal. Again, we are not trying to reinvent the wheel, CDOT processes are not unique to this corridor, but we wanted to provide a summary specific to sediment removal because we did receive a lot of questions about how this is being tracked.

- c. We received comments from the US Forest Service, Colorado Parks and Wildlife Water Quality Control Division, Eagle River Water and Sanitation District, and the Watershed Council. There was some overlap in the comments.

A lot of the comments were relevant to mag chloride use and that is why Karen is providing a separate presentation where she will discuss this in detail. We understand this is important to a lot of the corridor stakeholders, but it is not something we are addressing in our Sediment Control Action Plan or Maintenance Manual because the driving force of these documents is the EA Mitigation Commitment and what we are required to do for those.

We received input from Colorado Parks and Wildlife regarding the boreal toad habitat and making sure we are performing proper maintenance to prevent noxious weed and other invasive species being introduced into sensitive habitat along the corridor. We did reference some of the procedures that CDOT is currently doing.

I do understand there is a recent MOU between CDOT and Parks and Wildlife relevant to SB 40 which addresses this. CPW said there is an MOU specific to boreal toad habitat and maybe that is something that CDOT can work with this group on at a later date, not necessarily tied into this project. But we did touch on some of the current activities that are happening to prevent those introductions.

Holly clarified that what CDOT has for the boreal toads is a guideline rather than an MOU. It talks about what the steps are that would help with the boreal toads. It is still a good basis for whatever is done on West Vail Pass.

1. Melvin asked if the comment about the boreal toad was just about addressing the wetlands that were potentially impacted?

Bridget said we received two comments from CPW. They wanted to understand the disinfectant procedures that CDOT is using to make sure they were not introducing noxious weeds or other invasive species that could impact their habitat. The second comment was a request to potentially have an MOU between CPW and CDOT so there are clear SOPs of what maintenance staff should do if they encounter toads. That is something that I think CDOT is open to that discussion and there is an MOU on another area, but it wasn't something that was going to be included in the Maintenance Manual.

Holly said there is an existing version of an MOU between CDOT and Summit County or the Forest Service on Straight Creek. One of the concerns was not only fungus but also the zebra mussel not getting into any of the water bodies along Black Gore or Vail Pass. There is a format for doing the MOU, but it would be outside of the SCAP.

Bridget said if an MOU does happen in the future, it would be worth appending or referencing it in the Maintenance Manual, so it is very clear what the direction is and what those procedures are.

We received comments from multiple agencies on estimation of sediment capture, potential breakthrough, and tracking. The sizing of the proposed sediment capture features were included in the SCAP to make sure we are adequately addressing future use of sediment.

Timing of maintenance was also something that people were concerned about. We addressed the timing in Table 3 for when these control measures are being inspected and maintained to make sure we are optimizing our maintenance. There was a lot of discussion about capturing sediment post winter prior to significant runoff.

2. Marcus asked what polishing wetlands entails and will this be part of the 404 mitigation?

Pat said the polishing wetlands concept is that the SCAP features would capture a lot of the sediment but there would still be some of the suspended fine sediments and some highway runoff including petroleum products and salt that we would be looking to entrain in a secondary treatment wetland feature below the SCAP. Unfortunately, there is not a lot of room to do that so even though it was well intentioned to include those, I'm not sure we have found the room to include them at this time.

We would not include these as part of the 404 mitigation. As you can imagine these wetlands will probably not be highly functioning wetlands, but the reality



is they may not function at a high level due to the contaminants they are intended to contain. So, they would be extra features not included in our 404 process.

3. Melvin said Table 1.3 references West Vail Pass Winter Operations Plan, but he hasn't seen this document.

Kane said he will provide a copy to Karen to share with the ITF.

4. Bill said thank you to the entire project team for incorporating our comments and thinking hard about how this is all going to work. There's a lot of balls in the air with construction season ramping up and the maintenance crews have been working all winter to do their work.

4. Construction Package Update

- a. Randal said Construction Package 2 work is going to begin this spring and it will include work along portions of the rec trail further away from the bridge area. We have already started putting in some of the crossing features into the creeks to allow construction to begin on the other side of the creek. We are doing that now to avoid impacting fish spawning season. We are looking at optimizing four of the SCAP features in this area. The remaining sediment control ponds will be continue to be designed and constructed in CP 2 & 3.

The pond at MP 185.9 elements includes a hard base on the bottom and hard side walls. This pond will have maintenance access off of I-70. There are weir holes to allow excess flows to overtop if we get a significant rainfall that would allow the runoff to move on down to an inlet and pipe to continue onto Black Gore Creek.

The pond at MP 186.5 will be accessed off of the bike trail. As Pat mentioned, some of the areas we are trying to fit these in are fairly limited so this is a location where the pond is configured so it is not as rectangular as some of the other ones that will allow us to put it up closely to the pond near I-70 where the sediment comes down and be able to capture and contain that as well as the do maintenance on it.

The pond at MP 186.9 is more of a traditional type of location where access for maintenance will be off of the existing trail. Maintenance will be able to drive straight into the pond, load up and transport the material off site.

There are a number of different styles of ponds. We spent a lot of time trying to optimize the locations of the ponds and looked at different configurations to capture as much sediment as possible and provide easy access for CDOT's equipment.

1. Mary Jo asked if the pond location slides to the same scale. The third pond appears to be much smaller than the other two.

Randal said the examples are not the same scale. We were just trying to show approximate locations and access points. Most sediment ponds are the same width and length. We did look at them in terms of how much sediment we thought would be getting there so the size of the pond is tied to the sediment load.

2. Marcus asked if the temporary creek crossings have been completed.

Matt said all of the crossings are in and are performing well so we are ready for runoff.

3. Melvin asked if it would be possible to have a site visit to see the crossings?

Matt said yes, but because it is an active construction site he will work with Kiewit to find a time that will be safe for a site visit.

5. Wetlands Permitting

- a. Pat said CP #2 Nationwide Section 404 authorization was received in March 2022. In this package we were able to reduce our impacts from what the EA had estimated by 0.35 acres which is a reflection of the great job the design team did to reduce and minimize impacts.
- b. CP #3 preconstruction notification request for Nationwide 404 authorization was submitted in late April 2022. We were able to reduce our impacts by 1.2 acres. The permit authorization is expected to be received just prior to construction. It has been a tight timeline to get these permit packages submitted but we're attempting to stay on schedule to meet the tight construction windows.
- c. A site visit will be scheduled with US Army Corps and possibly the EPA sometime in June to evaluate the jurisdictional nature of the wetlands for CP 4 & 5. We would have preferred to do a determination for every package but because a lot of the wetlands in CP 2 & 3 were much closer to Black Gore and Polk Creek, there was no question in the jurisdictional nature of those features. CP 4 gets into wetlands that are closer to the edge of the highway with a lot of roadside swales and ditches, and many of them will likely not be jurisdictional because they are isolated and/or constructed drainage features in an upland (not previously a natural wetland area), and that will further reduce Section 404 permit impacts for CP 4 & 5.

We made our preliminary determination of what the jurisdictional or non-jurisdictional features should be, but it is up to the Corps and EPA to let us know if they agree with us and to confirm the determinations.

- d. We worked closely with the design team to minimize impacts to wetland features and streams by using these strategies:
 - Wetland delineation integrated into the design
 - SCAP design recommendations integrated into design
 - Consolidation of drainage outfalls
 - Use of low tailwater basin energy dissipators
 - Steepen roadside slopes (guardrails/barriers)
 - Retaining walls to reduce footprint (guardrails/barriers)
 - Bioswales
 - Preservation of existing vegetation
 - Revegetation of temp impacts
- e. In CP 3 we included a large wetland mitigation plan which focused on three locations. MP 185 is a bioswale and at the other end we are doing a fen restoration above the CDOT maintenance facility that was adversely affected in the past. We will be restoring



the hydrology and vegetative community of that system. As the fen drains down hill, there is a secondary wetland system we are going to create below the fen.

Bioswale: If you have ridden or walked the trail you will quite often see some nice willow thickets and wetland vegetation growing in the bio swale along the edge of the trail. A lot of the impacts we are accounting for in our project are to these drainage features that are existing along the trail or the edge of the highway. Therefore, the bioswales are an in-kind replacement for many of the impacts that are occurring as a result of the project. When we reconstruct this section of the trail, located on the north side of the realigned trail segment, we will construct a wider swale which will have a flat bottom with stair stepping that will allow for some moisture to be trapped in the swale and it will be revegetated with the willow and sedge vegetation.

The idea here is that we are going to be taking advantage of the snow melt in the spring as this swale will inevitably capture the snow melt from the hillside above before it reaches the highway. Because of the steep nature of this area, we anticipate they will also be some intersecting of shallow groundwater at wetter times of the year.

Fen restoration: About 200' to the east of the sand shed there is a rock escarpment that is about 30' high and the fen wetland complex is perched above that. The lower part of the fen complex has been adversely affected in the past by ditching which drained the fen. We don't know why the ditching was dug here but we know it has been there since at least the 1980s. We will plug up the ditch, import some salvaged wetland material from the West Vail Pass Rest Area impacted wetlands. The timing seems to be just right to where we can salvage this high-quality material which is similar to the community we would like to reestablish in this fen. Once we plug the ditch, that groundwater should be restored, there is water moving down the fen but also laterally across the length of the fen. We anticipate we will be able to hydrate the entire fen complex and restore the vegetation.

This fen drains out in two locations around the east and west side of the rock escarpment which directs a lot of water along this steep grade behind the shed and as a result an eroded channel has formed. We will capture that water and redirect it to a more flat, terraced sloping system to create wetlands and address the soil erosion issue. We will take advantage of the out-letting water from the fen and redirect it into some terraced sloped wetland features, again using the same high quality salvaged wetland soil from the rest area.

1. Marcus said he was looking through some old files from when they constructed the sand shed and he believes he can find an aerial photo from the 1960s and will provide it to the project team.
2. Melvin inquired when the restoration work is planned for.

Pat said we are installing groundwater wells up there very soon and we are hoping to get some baseline groundwater data in the fen early this year. The actual work will probably occur in 2023. We are having some coordination discussions with the rest area team, making sure we are going to be able to use that soil. We want to keep it alive. The rhizome and live seed bank are key to making a successful restoration so we're really at the discretion of the other

project so we are trying to build in some flexibility as to when this can be constructed based on when we can anticipate getting the salvage topsoil. We may end up starting construction in the late summer/early fall of this year if that is when the soil arrives. It wouldn't be earlier than sometime in July because we don't want to be in there when there when there is a high-water table.

The other added benefit of this lower wetland is that all the water coming off the hillside has had an adverse effect on the operations of the CDOT facility and so by working with that water and deliberately redirecting it where we want it to go, we will help with flooding that might be occurring in that CDOT facility.

6. Schedule

Mary Jo said the schedule is always being updated. We always like to point out the construction package start dates and what will be completed by the end of this construction year (2022). This construction season will include the remote closure system, rec path relocation, a large cut wall and the bridge substructure.

There is an ALIVE Meeting scheduled for May 9th that will discuss research findings on recommendations for the size of the large wildlife crossing underpasses.

The recreation trail construction begins on May 16th.

CP #3 is getting ready for its final submittal next week.

There will be a PLT Meeting on May 13th, and a TT Meeting on May 15th and we are expecting to meet with you again in the summer to review the Map Book from MP 185-190 when the design for that portion of the project is at 60%.

3. Larissa asked for confirmation that the next TT Meeting starts at 9:30 instead of 9:00 am.

Karen said, yes it starts at 9:30. Some team members had a conflict with the 9:00 am start time.

7. CDOT Winter Materials Discussion

- a. Karen said she met with our maintenance teams to better understand the history and use of Magnesium Chloride (Mag Cl).

In 1988 CDOT use of Mag Cl started in Glenwood Canyon because it was better than using Sodium Chloride.

In 1990 CDOT expanded use of Mag Cl to Denver area to address the issue of particulate matter air pollution caused by using traction sand.

In 1995 after a year of significant road closures, CDOT expanded use of Mag Cl to I-70 corridor.

The reasons we started using Mag Cl is that it improved air quality by reducing the amount of sand in the air and the waterways. With sand there were a lot of cases of windshield and paint damage to cars, so we were able to reduce some of that by using



smaller sand but switching to Mag Cl and traction sand really helped us reduce the damage to cars.

We also found Mag Cl is a more effective deicing product over a larger temperature range and it is more effective at reducing black ice and avoiding snow packed roads and there is a documented reduction of crashes after we started implementing the use of Mag Cl.

- b. The specifications for deicer have been refined over time. There has always been groups of different DOTs that have come together to try to develop the best Mag Cl specifications. The most prominent groups were the Southwest States Coalition of which Colorado was a member and the Pacific Northwest Snow Fighters. We went with the Pacific Northwest Snow Fighters group requirements pretty early in the process because the Southwest States did not include product limits on lead, arsenic, zinc, sodium, and barium.

Between 1999 and 2002 all the groups continued to develop the Mag Cl specifications. In 2002, a major specification change included adding an ammonia constituent and defining the test procedure to hold manufacturers accountable. The ammonia was added based on research studies with the Caliber deicing products and impacts to the BOD. There are two different requirements, one for liquid and one for granular.

1. Melvin asked about the percent variations for liquids on the previous slide and there are some asterisks on the product limits. Can you expound on that?

Karen said it's a great question, but she doesn't know what those mean. The slide came from a memo that someone else developed. She will pull up the memo and let him know what those mean.

- c. The EPA oversees the use of deicers. In the early 2000s there was a group developed called Clear Roads and that group is also a conglomerate of DOTs. It took a while for this group to get a lot of traction but around 2019 the states in the Pacific Snow Fighters shifted to using Clear Roads so we also moved over. It is a group of 36 DOTs who each contribute \$25,000 annually to fund research and share the information with the members. The group also evaluates winter materials, equipment, and methods that help us develop specifications and recommendations. The group studies and promotes innovative techniques and technologies to save agencies money, improve safety, and increase efficiency, and they support technology transfer by developing field guides and training to promote results of research projects. They are a central foundation to share information so that no one group is trying to figure it all out on their own.

We use the Clear Roads recommendations, but we also adjust them in areas we feel we want to make them more restrictive to reduce impacts.

We are more restrictive on some items:

- Barium: Clear Roads allows less than 100 ppm, and we allow only 10 ppm
- Selenium Clear Roads allows less or equal to 5 ppm and we allow 0.30 ppm
- Phosphorous Clear Road allows 2500 ppm, and we allow only 25 ppm
- Cyanide Clear Roads is less than equal to .20 but we only go to 0.125 ppm.



- Clear Roads allows a corrosion rate of greater than 70% and the corrosion rate we allow is 30%

We control the restrictions by having a notice to manufacturers that all materials must be on the approved products list and that list needs the Clear Roads and our specifications. We control three different materials: liquid deicer, granular deicer, and corrosion inhibitors.

We have specifications for deicer specific to liquid and granular. We have very specific guidelines for the deicing products, testing procedures, field inspection, unloading inspecting and testing, requirements for delivery, how we order and pick it up from the vendor, price reductions and remedies if it doesn't quite meet the specifications, and a defined delivery zone map. We have quite a few different suppliers and different pricing agreements for winter materials.

Once they are delivered to the maintenance facility, we continue to test them in central locations throughout the state which is managed by our Quality Control Program. We also hire a third-party company to test the materials at the maintenance facilities using random samples. There is very specific testing protocol that is in our Winter Operations Manual.

- d. The operational need for the deicer is defined in our Winter Operations Plan. How we select our materials and applications varies on the location, equipment, storage, traffic volumes, snow falls, wind speeds, and temperatures. The materials are purchased by our procurement statewide contract for granular, liquid, and salt/sand mixtures and as mentioned before, they need to be meet both Clear Roads and CDOT's specifications.

We reduced our sand/salt application in 2017. One thing we found is if the road already has snow on it, and we try putting Mag Cl on top of that, we have to put four times the amount of materials on top of the snow to get it to melt. It is much better for us to pretreat it because it allows us to save four times the materials. So that is where we have really been optimizing: in trying to figure out the best time to put the materials down on the road to prevent the snow from sticking.

Our equipment also has mobile friction sensors that allow us to really understand what is happening on the road as far as temperature and the amount of snow already down or if the road is dry; and that really allows us to optimize the application that we put down on the road.

Joe said that how we decide what material we will use on the ten mile stretch definitely depends a lot on the storm. As everyone knows, you can have sun and clear roads at the top and we're getting hammered at the bottom. If you look at the P-40 Winter Operations Plan, it reiterates the bad sections with the 7% grade and that will determine whether we will use salt, mag cl, or sand to keep traffic moving and enhance the safety of the traveling public.

- e. For an MS4 permit area we have outfall monitoring. We have also monitored Black Gore Creek and Gore Creek very closely for many years. Straight Creek was removed from the impaired list for sediment a few years ago. There is another group meeting right now to bring together all those monitoring results and try to optimize the monitoring.



We are continuing to complete research and our maintenance plan track rate does discuss how do reduce environmental impacts with our maintenance activities.

- f. CDOT has done 18 different research projects on this. Most of the Mag Cl research was done from 1995-2010.

We started doing research on deicers in 1982 and had eight studies between 1982 and 2000 and six more between 2000 and 2006 and then it slowed down. We've only had four since 2008. I think this would be a great area to come back to and try to understand more. There was one on how Mag Cl effect seeds being able to germinate and there were some early on about general impacts to the environment.

This might be really interesting for our group to get together and try to define a good topic. There is funding available from CDOT, and I would be glad to champion it if we find a good topic.

1. John said CDOT has an Applied Research and Innovation Branch (ARIB), and they have two deadlines every year, I believe it's August and February, but you can apply for your research idea at any time. I applied for a grant for a Wildlife Study that was funded. We got the money a few months after we were notified we were approved.. You need to have a champion and either I or Karen would be happy to do that for any ideas you come up with. You also need a DOT collaborative panel of experts with interest in the area. In this case if it's Mag Cl, try to involve maintenance, and someone from HQ Environmental Protection Branch with a focus on your application topic. There are different study experts that review the applications.

Karen said that is helpful information. There is a group of people who were going to advocate for a research project. We didn't know if that timeline has been pushed out. It sounds like we have a little bit of time. I'll will confirm the timeline and it would be great to hit the next one in August.

2. Melvin thanked Karen for the in-depth look at this subject. He would propose some modeling in the unsaturated zones, movement of chlorides through the soil profile, and/or you will probably need some soil profiling from that to see what is actually in the fill of the interstate. It would be very interesting to see how that would model out.

Karen said I think I'm following you, you'd like to find out where does the Mag Cl go, how long it takes to get to the stream, and does it get reduced by being absorbed in the vegetation somehow. That would be a really interesting question. And ultimately, how do you mitigate for Mag Cl? Can you put certain types of vegetation along the road that absorbs it better?

Melvin said yes, I think this would be a great project and for public safety it is needed, it's just a matter of making sure that we look at everything involved, and if we have to analyze and disclose the right things.

3. Holly said one advantage to Mag Cl is that if magnesium gets into the stream, it hardens the water where sodium softens the water. Hardening the water helps to offset impacts from things like arsenic in fish. From that perspective, magnesium than better than sodium. It doesn't address chlorides, but it is something to keep in mind.



Karen said that is very helpful and as I mentioned earlier they were originally going to put in sodium chloride and switched to Mag Cl in Glenwood Canyon, but I didn't have the description of why.

4. Larissa said she wants to reiterate the thanks to the whole team tackling this. I think it is really important to see the complete history. It would be really great if you could make this presentation and handouts available because this is such a unique topic and there are people who missed the meeting or colleagues of people who are on the call would find this interesting and useful.

The presentation and the list of previous research projects can be accessed here:
<https://drive.google.com/drive/u/2/folders/1yKfjP-fnkQbjl8whU2fbeT0e6jwzjly>