TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1318
Wednesday, July 16, 1980, 1:30 p.m.
Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT
Avey
Eller
Gardner
Holliday
Keleher, 2nd Vice Chairman
Parmele, Chairman
Petty
C. Young, 1st Vice Chairman

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Inhofe
Keith
Kempe
T. Young

STAFF PRESENT
Alberty
Crowley
Gardner
Howell
Wilmoth

OTHERS PRESENT
Jackere, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, July 15, 1980, at 10:25 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the TMAPC Offices.

Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

MINUTES:
On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Avey, Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to approve the Minutes of July 2, 1980 (No. 1316).

REPORTS:
TMAPC Claims:
On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Avey, Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to approve the 1979-1980 and 1980-1981 TMAPC Claims (attached).

Report of Receipts and Deposits:
On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Avey, Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to accept the Report of Receipts and Deposits for the Month ended June 30, 1980 (Exhibit "A-1").

DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Personnel Actions:
On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Avey, Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to approve the Personnel Actions (Exhibit "B-1") submitted this date.
CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Z-5412  John Sublett (Bob Mitchell)  SW corner of East 49th Street and South Harvard Avenue  RS-3 & RM-1 to CH

The Staff advised that the PUD for the subject tract had been continued previously to July 23, 1980. The applicant requested that the zoning application and the PUD be considered at the same meeting.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Avey, Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to continue Z-5412 to July 23, 1980, 1:30 p.m., Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

SUBDIVISIONS:

The Tulsa Mountains (19 & 3003)  North 56th West Avenue and West Apache St.  (AG)

The Staff presented the plat with the applicants, Monte Box and Noel Eden and the engineer Ted Sack present.

Mr. Wilmoth advised that although this tract is far beyond City Services, it has been annexed. (It was annexed about 14 years ago when most cities put up their "annexation fences"). Due to the terrain and distances from the urbanized portions of the City, the applicants will be requesting waiver of the paying standards of the City of Tulsa (curb/gutter) to permit a county type paving and drainage system. This will require waiver of the City Engineering standards and may need to be approved by the City Commission eventually. The property is zoned AG and the lot sizes do not present any problems, since all are well over the minimum 2 acres and 300' frontage required. Drainage would be left in its natural state as much as possible. Utilities would serve from the front since the lots are extremely deep in some cases.

There was considerable discussion regarding the status of the street system. The T.A.C. and Staff felt that since this tract was well beyond the City services, that it would be better to provide private streets rather than dedicated because of the topography and uniqueness of the subdivision. Streets should comply with the proper layout, including 90° intersections and elimination of 4-way corners. (Copy of State Statute 11-47-118, was made available, and the Staff advised that this Statute sets forth the criteria to permit private streets in certain subdivisions.)

It was also suggested the tract be disannexed, but this may not be possible, so the private street system would not conflict with City standards. Some modification of the drainage ordinances might be necessary. Also, one of the east-west streets may line up with Apache and would eventually be part of the arterial street system. There were general comments and more detailed recommendations would be made on preliminary plat. There was no objection to the concept.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Sketch Plat of The Tulsa Mountains, subject to conditions.
The Tulsa Mountains (continued)

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to grant Sketch Plat approval of The Tulsa Mountains, permitting a private street system, subject to the waiver of length of cul-de-sac and block lengths and the following listed conditions:

1. A private street system is recommended at this time due to the nature of the subdivision. (Board of Adjustment approval will be necessary to allow frontages on a private road.)

2. Drainage plans shall be approved by the City Engineer, including storm drainage and/or detention design, if required, and Earth Change Permit where applicable, subject to criteria approved by the City Commission. (Waiver of drainage standards may be requested through City Commission.)

3. Waiver of length of cul-de-sac, and block lengths is also recommended. The Staff sees no objection to this request due to the low-density development and the topography.

4. Show statutory easements along section lines where applicable. (Where not a part of a road, indicate "Not Open").

5. Street names shall be approved by City Engineer, and should coincide with remainder of Tulsa City Street System.

6. Utility easements shall meet the approval of utilities. Show additional easements as needed.

7. All curve data shall be shown on final plat where applicable.

8. Bearings, or true north-south, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by City and/or County Engineer.

9. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Traffic Engineering during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase, and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)

10. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited. (Health Department)

11. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefore, shall be approved by the Tulsa City-County Health Department.

12. The owner or owners shall provide the following information on sewage disposal system if it is to be privately operated on each lot; type, size and general location. (This information to be included in covenants.) (Health Department)
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13. The method of water supply and plans therefore, shall be approved by the Tulsa City-County Health Department.

14. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.

15. A Corporation Commission letter (or certificate of nondevelopment) shall be submitted concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. (A 150' building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged.) (Staff)

16. The restrictive covenants and deed of dedication shall be submitted for review with final plat. (Include subsurface provisions, dedications for storm water facilities, as applicable.)

17. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of the Subdivision Regulations.)

18. All other Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat. (Staff)

Madison Park One (192)  700 Block South Madison Avenue

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Ted Sack, engineer. A lengthy review of the T.A.C. proceedings was included in the agenda including the concerns of the various T.A.C. members and the problems with development of the tract. The main problem with the plat was its access by way of an alley. If the alley could be improved to provide better access, then the main objection to this plat could be eliminated. Both Traffic Engineering and City Engineering Departments objected to the concept of using the alley for the primary means of access to a development. It is entirely too narrow (20' on part) to allow for emergency and service vehicles. If the alley was vacated and turned into a private street, then there would be a question of how much went back to each side and how it could be used. Utility rights would have to be retained as is. (The developer at the T.A.C. meeting indicated he could not use the concept of a private driveway and must have the public access, which in this case is the alley.)

The Staff is also concerned about the 12' building line. There is no way to park a car in 12' without a portion of the vehicle hanging out over the public right-of-way. A minimum of 20' is needed for a vehicle and this has been the policy of both the Board of Adjustment and the Planning Commission regarding setbacks for garages. Therefore, provide adequate parking OFF THE STREET and on the lot, which would require a minimum of 20' between the property line and the structure.

Building setbacks on the sides and rear or where there is no parking are of no great concern and the Staff sees no objection to a Board of Adjustment waiver of those setbacks. The T.A.C. also had no objections to the side and rear setbacks. Sanitary sewer is available, but water line must be extended.
After much discussion at the T.A.C. meeting, the general conclusion of the T.A.C. and Staff was that a preliminary approval could not be recommended, and at the most, only a sketch plat approval could be made, subject to the applicant and his engineer meeting with the Traffic and City Engineering Departments to work out some solution to the access problem. If the alley could be improved to provide better access, then the main objection to the plat could be eliminated.

Mr. Sack advised the Commission that regarding the 12' building line, the actual structure could be redesigned to permit some parking under a portion of the building and provide the clearances needed. Mr. Sack advised the Commission that the owner has been meeting with the City Engineer concerning the access along the south property line. Mr. Sack pointed out that a normal type of driveway entrance could not be built because of the narrowness of the lots and the continually sloping ramp of the sidewalks. (The Staff checked with Engineering just prior to the Commission meeting and nothing had been resolved as of this time.)

Commissioner Keleher was opposed to the application due to the problems of access on the tract. He made a motion to deny the application, which was seconded by Commissioner Eller. Other Commission members felt it would be best to allow the applicant more time to try to work out the problems concerned with the plat.

On MOTION of PETTY, the Planning Commission voted 6-2-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; Eller, Keleher "nay"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to continue Madison Park One to August 6, 1980, 1:30 p.m., Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center, this time to be used for the applicant to meet with Engineering to work out the access problems.

Riverwood Park (2083) SW corner of 96th Street and South Delaware Avenue (OM, FD)

and

Gilcrease Hills Financial Center (392) SW corner of North 25th West Avenue and West Edison Street (OL)

The Staff advised that all letters were in the file and recommended release of these two plats.

On MOTION of KELEHER, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") for final approval and release of Riverwood Park and Gilcrease Hills Financial Center.

Garnett Meadows (794) 17th Place and South Garnett (RD, OL)

Mr. Wilmoth advised that he was still lacking one letter of approval for this plat and recommended the item be tabled.

The Chair, without objection, tabled Garnett Meadows.
The applicant, Bob Brase was present and the Staff advised the Commission that this is to request waiver on the north-half of Lot 2 and south 117.6' of Lot 1, Block 3, Villa Grove Park. The applicant has submitted a plot plan showing one building and one access point, which is in keeping with the "Harvard Plan" previously approved by the Planning Commission. Right-of-way on Harvard meets the Major Street Plan requirements and improvements are in place.

The Engineering Department indicated that some on-site detention will be required, since the residential area adjacent to the site is sensitive to drainage from this development.

The Traffic Engineering Department had no objections, provided only the one point of access is permitted as shown on the plot plan.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of waiver of plat on Z-4639 and Z-4721, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to approve the waiver on the north-half of Lot 2 and south 117.6' of Lot 1, Block 3 Villa Grove Park, Z-4639 and Z-4721, subject to the following two conditions:

(a) Grading and drainage plan approval by City Engineer.

(b) One access point as per plot plan.

The Staff advised that this is a request to waive plan on Lot 2, Block 1, Charles Teel Addition, as well as a request to change the access point to 41st to fit the actual driveway in existence. The plat was filed in 1965 and all necessary dedications and easements were shown. The CS zoning was approved in 1972, but no formal motion was ever made by the Planning Commission to waive the plat requirement. The Traffic Engineering Department has reviewed the access change and the City Engineering Department has reviewed the grading plans. The Staff recommended that the waiver be approved, and the access change also be approved. (For the record, the Staff also recommends that Lot 3 be included in the waiver of plat since it was also part of Z-4232, and already has a business in operation on it.)

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of waiver of plat on Z-4232, including the access change on East 41st Street.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to approve the waiver of plat on Lots 2 and 3, Block 1, Charles Teel Addition, Z-4232, including the access change on East 41st Street.
The Staff recommended an extension of approval for these plats to October 1, 1980.

On MOTION of KELEHER, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") for extension of approval of Del Rose Place Second and Riverwood Park to October 1, 1980.

LOT-SPLITS:

L-14967 George Barber (3692)
14968 Doug & Ronda Maness (2803)

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") for ratification of prior approval of the above-listed lot-splits.

FOR WAIVER OF CONDITIONS:

14954 Perry C. Isom (1293) 8968 East 13th Street (RS-1)

The Staff made the following report:

This is a request to split the lot into two tracts. The northerly tract has an existing house, and the southerly tract is for future development. Both tracts will have ownership handles to permit access to utilities. Applicant asks for waiver of frontage, and area requirement. The north tract has 15,200 sq. ft. and the south tract has 12,800 sq. ft. Although dedication exists on 13th Place, the handles are necessary to reach existing water and sewer lines. Approval will be subject to Board of Adjustment approval, since the lot frontages fall 10' short of the required 100', and one lot is 1,300 sq. ft. short on area. (The split-line couldn't be adjusted to permit a bigger lot on the south due to an existing structure.)

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-14954.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to approve the waiver of frontage and lot-split on 14954, subject to Board of Adjustment approval.

14955 Carl Taylor (3103) North of the NE corner of Jasper Street and Quaker Avenue (RM-1)

The Staff advised that this is a request to split Lots 9 and 10, Block 6, Capitol Hill 2nd, and other land to the west, into the W/2 and E/2. The west tract has an existing duplex and the east tract is vacant. The applicant is requesting waiver of the frontage requirement of 60'. Since most of the lots in the area have 50' fronts (made up of 25' platted lots) and most were split prior to the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission's jurisdiction, the Staff sees no objection to the request. (PSO and Water Department requested a 20-foot easement along the split-line, 10-
14955 (continued)

feet each side, to cover existing facilities.) The applicant was present at the meeting.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of 14955, subject to the Board of Adjustment's approval of the frontage.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to approve lot-splits of Lots 9 and 10, Block 6, Capitol Hill 2nd and other land to the west, into the W/2 and E/2 of 14955, subject to the Board of Adjustment approval of the frontage.

14956 April Builders (1083) 7800 Block of South Joplin Avenue (RS-3)

Mr. Wilmoth advised that this is a request to split a portion of Lot 39, Block 10, Minshall Park I into two lots. The westerly tract has frontage, and the easterly tract has access by a mutual roadway and utility easement on a "Flag Lot" concept. The Staff sees no objection other than they will need a minor variance on PUD #190 to permit the split.

On MOTION of COBB, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of L-14956, subject to approval of a minor variance to permit the "Flag Lot."

On MOTION of GARDNER, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to approve a lot-split of Lot 39, Block 10, Minshall Park I, 14956, subject to approval of a minor variance to permit the "Flag Lot."

14965 John C. Binney (3574) 17601 South 161st East Avenue

The Staff advised the Commission that this was a request to split a 679' x 117' tract into one tract 117' x 371' and one 117' x 308'. There is no zoning in this area and only the minimum Health Department requirements apply. However, the Subdivision Regulations require a minimum frontage on a dedicated road. The east tract has access by a private road only. The west tract fronts South 161st East Avenue and has adequate access. The private road furnishes access to the "Red S Airport", which is a plat approved by the Planning Commission, including the approval of a private access road and private roads within the plat. Since this split uses the same access road approved on the plat, the Staff recommends approval as submitted (Health Department has already approved the percolation tests (#80-248)). Since the Health Department and Staff were recommending approval, there was no formal vote by the Technical Advisory Committee because the split was outside the jurisdiction of most of those present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmele, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to approve a lot-split, 679' x 117' tract into one tract 117' x 371' and one 117' x 308' on L-14965.
OTHER BUSINESS:

Request by John Moody for Early Public Hearing for Z-5431 and PUD #179-F for August 13, 1980

The Staff advised that a letter from the applicant had been received requesting an early Public Hearing in order that the application can be transmitted to the City Commission prior to September 7, 1980. The Staff was in agreement with this request.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Parmelee, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Inhofe, Keith, Kempe, T. Young "absent") to grant an early Public Hearing for Z-5431 and PUD #179-F on August 13, 1980.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

Date Approved ______________

July 30, 1980

Ralph H. Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

Cherry D. Kempe
Secretary
TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS AS OF JUNE 30, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct.</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>Working Budget</th>
<th>Transfer In</th>
<th>Transfer Out</th>
<th>Final Budget Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7110</td>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>$1,028,599.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$132,241.82</td>
<td>$896,357.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7240</td>
<td>Spec. Serv. &amp; Consultants</td>
<td>133,950.00</td>
<td>709.84</td>
<td>133,240.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7260</td>
<td>Travel &amp; Training</td>
<td>19,435.00</td>
<td>6,996.45</td>
<td>12,438.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>Mtnc. &amp; Oper. Overhead</td>
<td>96,420.00</td>
<td>5,676.20</td>
<td>102,096.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8105</td>
<td>Tabulations &amp; Computer</td>
<td>32,700.00</td>
<td>9,204.43</td>
<td>23,495.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8140</td>
<td>Fuels &amp; Lubricants</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>7,072.49</td>
<td>927.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8150</td>
<td>Office &amp; Office Mach. Supplies</td>
<td>36,294.00</td>
<td>29,058.91</td>
<td>7,235.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8151</td>
<td>Photographic Supplies</td>
<td>4,545.00</td>
<td>2,049.81</td>
<td>6,594.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8190</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>475.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>471.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8225</td>
<td>Minor Tools</td>
<td>710.00</td>
<td>286.97</td>
<td>996.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8322</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>135.05</td>
<td>135.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8323</td>
<td>Mailing</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8330</td>
<td>Repairs to Equipment</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>1,100.85</td>
<td>1,750.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8340</td>
<td>Rentals &amp; Leases</td>
<td>2,530.00</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2,531.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8350</td>
<td>Adv. &amp; Public Media Costs</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
<td>1,216.32</td>
<td>1,233.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8360</td>
<td>Printing &amp; Reproduction</td>
<td>20,390.00</td>
<td>7,453.29</td>
<td>12,936.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8370</td>
<td>Other Services &amp; Fees</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>1,576.02</td>
<td>6,923.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8380</td>
<td>Tech. Pub. &amp; Subscriptions</td>
<td>2,575.00</td>
<td>324.56</td>
<td>2,250.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9200</td>
<td>Furn., Fixtures &amp; Office Equip.</td>
<td>25,513.00</td>
<td>6,135.74</td>
<td>31,648.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9300</td>
<td>Vehicular Equipment</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>5,175.00</td>
<td>5,175.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $1,417,751.00 $20,565.14 $189,857.47 *$1,248,458.67

* This figure does not include $4,414.34 of Economic Development Costs for the first quarter of Fiscal 1980 which were actually a refund of unexpended Grant funds and are not reflected in the Working Budget figures. Also, the reason for the large discrepancy between the Working Budget and the Final Budget Expenditures is the transfer of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Transportation Study to INCOG on January 1, 1980.
TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Claims: 1979-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Claim Number</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7240</td>
<td>12847</td>
<td>Aerial Photo Service, Inc.</td>
<td>12,921.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8151</td>
<td>12848</td>
<td>Varityper</td>
<td>215.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Claim Number</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6200</td>
<td>12849</td>
<td>Mary Finn</td>
<td>336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6200</td>
<td>12850</td>
<td>Robert Langenkamp</td>
<td>384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6200</td>
<td>12851</td>
<td>Sujata Pathapati</td>
<td>384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6200</td>
<td>12852</td>
<td>David Runnels</td>
<td>336.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6200</td>
<td>12853</td>
<td>Tom Sprehe</td>
<td>384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6200</td>
<td>12854</td>
<td>Patti Jo Stephens</td>
<td>364.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6200</td>
<td>12855</td>
<td>Vincent Waldman</td>
<td>384.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is to certify that the above claims are true, just and correct to the best of our knowledge.

[Signatures]

TMAPC Fiscal Officer
TMAPC Director

APC: Agenda  July 16, 1980  Meeting No. 1318