

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
1. Alvin York (P) "Nova City"	10/68		1971	Dropped	100	11,300	17.5	Nova City Corporation; Fentress Co., Tennessee	FS	1. Lack of developer follow-through. 2. Original proposal, various free-standing communities.
2. Basin City (P)	1971		Unknown	Unknown	12	2,640	24	Nostaw Development Co.; Washington State	FS	Unknown
3. Anne Arundel (P)	10/68		1970 E*	Unknown	Unknown	2,000		R.G. Green Development Co; Anne Arundel Co, Md.	S	1. Lack of developer follow-through.
4. Atrisco (P)	2/70		1970 E	Dropped	Unknown	35,000		Westland Development Co.; Bernalillo Co., New Mexico	S	1. Lack of developer capability & liquidity; inability to gain agreement by descendants of land grant owner. (Original Spanish land grant.)
5. Battery Park City (PA)	4/71		4/72	Withdrawn	55	91	50	Battery Park City Authority; Manhattan, New York	NTIT	1. Inability to guarantee public bonds @ market rate; lack of grants. 2. Feature: On landfill from World Trade Ctr. under development.
6. Beautiful City (P)	12/68		1969	Rejected	16	500		Beautiful City holding Co. (Conrad Reed); 9 miles west of L.A.		1. Primarily a rental project for senior citizens; no balance of land uses; environmental problems.
7. Belinda City (PA)	6/71		8/73	Withdrawn	10	1,400	9	Nat'l Land Development Company; Wilson County Tennessee	S	1. No water system; lack of developer capability; other financing found.

Abbreviations: P--Proposal; PA--Pre-application; AI--Application invited; FS--Freestanding; S--Satellite; NTIT--New-Town-In-Town; GC--Growth Center;
E--Estimated

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
1. Bell Creek (P)	12/68		1969	Rejected	5	1,000		Sam Gary Oil Company; Powder River Co., Wyo.	GC	1. Plan lacked features of new town.
2. Belle Terre (PA)	4/72		3/74	Rejected	80	12,500	20	Landmark Land Company; 25 W. of New Orleans, La.	S	1. Concern about economic feasibility and environmental problems. 2. Feature: Existing community started by Zechendorf.
3. Boardman (PA)	9/72		8/73	Rejected				Boeing Company; Oregon	FS	1. Boeing withdrew from project.
4. Brier Hill (P, PA, AI)	5/70 8/71	2/72 *	8/73	Rejected	20	2,500		Redstone Central R.R. Company; Fayette Co., Pennsylvania	GC	1. Depressed area new town 45 miles from Pittsburgh; problems with site conditions economic feasibility. 2. Strong political support.
2. Churchill Town (P)	5/69		1970 E	Dropped	30	2,500	15	Churchill Investments & Germantown Investment; Germantown, Pennsylvania	S	1. Lack of developer follow-through. 2. Feature: Part of innovative "Germantown" approach by county to build a new town w/o land ownership by single developer.
3. Cibola (PA)	8/71		8/73	Rejected	100	9,800	25	Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; 14 miles from San Juan, P.R.	S	1. Agency could not issue taxable bonds.
4. Charleston East (PA)	1968		1971	Dropped			10.8	Fraser Properties Berkeley County, South Carolina	S	1. Lack of documentation; concern about splitting black & white existing communities by freeway.

*Conditional

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
15. City View (PA)	7/71		8/73	Rejected	31	500		First National City Bank, Equitable; Queens, New York City	NTIT	1. Lack of support from NYC on job location; sponsors withdrew.
16. Collier West (PA)	8/71		9/73	Rejected	10	1,400	11.2	Broyhill Industries; North Carolina	S	1. Too small; lack of follow through by developers.
17. Columbia (P)	1971 8/71		1972	Dropped	120	14,000	40	Columbia Association; Rouse; Howard Co., Md.	S	1. Existing new communities not given guarantees.
18. Ciudad Bravo (P, PA)	8/71		9/73	Rejected	25	2,500	25	United Housing Corp. & Shareholders Cap. Corp.; San Diego Co., California	S	1. Lack of follow-through by developer; too small. Weak market. (Geothermal energy). 2. Feature: Paired town with Mexico; use of geothermal energy.
19. Peekskill - on Hudson (PA)	4/72		7/72	Rejected					GC	1. Deficient pre-application.
20. Deer Hills (PA, AI)	4/71	1972	5/72	Withdrew	45	1,572	22	Levik Development Co.; Deer Field Beach, Fla.	STGC	1. More profitable to sell off in parcels.
21. Deer Run (PA, AI)	5/71	2/73	8/73	Rejected	40	5,608	6	James W. Fair; Tyler, Texas	S	1. Options expired; failed to submit application in 6 months.
22. Fort Lincoln (PA)	1971	1971	1974	Withdrew (Declared inactive)	16	335		Westinghouse BSI/Hagans Washington, D.C.	NTIT	2. Feature: Grants from urban renewal; use of surplus Fed. property.
23. Fountain Hills (P)	1968		1972	Dropped	78	11,420	11	McCulloch Oil; Near Phoenix, Arizona	S	1. Use of lot sale technique; lawsuit on use of irrigation district. Questionable commitment to low & moderate housing.

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
23.a Franklin Town (P)	7/71			Rejected	15	50	24	Franklin Town Corp.; Philadelphia, Pa.	NTIT	1. Project too small.
24. Granada (AI)	1971	1973	1974	Rejected	103	18,000		Arizona Newcom Development Corp.	S	1. Problems w/developer management, security for loan, marketing land leases. 2. Feature: In part, on Gila Indian Reservation.
25. Greenwood (P)	1970		1971	Rejected	25	4,000	30	Arkansas Best Corp.; Fort Smith, Arkansas	S	1. Problems w/economic feasibility.
26. Grandview (PA)	11/72		11/73	Rejected	36	7,000	45	Ouray Co. Land Co. 16 miles from Montrose, Colorado.	FS	1. Economic feasibility.
27. Grant Park (P)	1968		1971	Dropped	40	5,608	6	Claremont Industrial Park, Inc.; Claremont County, Ohio	S	1. Options expired; failed to submit application in 6 months.
28. Hackensack Meadowlands (PA)	1971		1973	Rejected	200	20,000	50	Hackensack Meadowlands Commission; North N.J.	S	1. Legal impediments to development. An innovative, expensive & high risk project; environmental problems; many local governments to deal with.
29. Hamilton (P, AI)	1968	1969	1970	Rejected	100	11,500		Castle & Cook; Santa Clara Co., California	S	1. Attractive site, but expensive to build upon, hard to get to; astride San Andreas Earthquake Fault.
30. Highlands (PA)	1971		1973	Withdrawn; Rejected	13	2,000	30	Rensselaer Poly. Institute & UDC; near Rensselaer, New York	S	1. Lack of solid developer commitment; lack of follow-through.

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
31. Honolulu (PA)	1971		1973	Rejected	125	35,000	20		S	1. Lack of information on pre-application. 2. Feature: To be built on Bishop Estate using land leases.
32. Joaquin (PA)	1971		1974	Rejected	75	20,000	25	Dea ^h Olsen; 18 miles from Stockton, Calif.	FS	1. Problems with water supply, financial backing control of land.
33. Kaiparowitz (PA)	1972		1974	Rejected	20	2,100		Kane Co. Developer; Kane County, Utah	FS	1. Lack of certainty that power plant will be built forming job base. 2. Note: Power plant was not built. Was to have used western coal.
34. Kansas City West (AI)	2/72	8/72	8/73	Rejected	50	12,755	25	Kansas City West, Inc.; 11 miles from Kansas City, Kansas	S	1. 2nd extension denied. Developer failed to submit application materials after 12 month delay. Delays in achieving state legislation.
35. Kingwood (P)	6/69		Unknown	Dropped				Humble Oil, Friendswood Development Corporation; Houston, Texas	S	1. Lack of follow-through by developer; no record of rejection. 2. Feature: Currently successful community.
36. Kingston (PA)	11/71		3/74	Rejected	87	24,900	18	Comprehensive Community Development, Inc.; Near Pascagoula, Mississippi.	S	1. Overoptimism on market; lack of local support. Environmental issues.

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
37. Latigo, (PA)	9/72		4/74	Rejected	41	14,800	50	Godwin Bevers Company; 11 miles northwest Colorado Springs.	S	1. Environmental concerns; water supply problems; capture rate too high.
38. Liberty Harbor (P, PA, AI)	1/73	5/73	3/74	Rejected	60	2,409	50	Jersey City & National Kinney Corp; Jersey City, New Jersey	NTIT	1. Lack of response to questions on cost and nature of development entity; delays in filing application.
39. Los Alamitos (PA)	3/71		1972	Unknown	22	1,100	25	City initiated project; Ray Watt possible developer; Los Alamitos, California	NTIT	1. Land was Naval Air Station; not declared surplus. 2. Note: Considered as a PROJECT BREAKTHROUGH site.
40. Major Center (P)	1969		Unknown	Unknown	112	2,800	50	Major Realty Corp.; Orlando City, Fla.	NTIT	1. Project cut into four parts by intersecting freeways. 2. Four miles from Disney World.
41. Manorville (PA, AI)	12/70	10/71	3/73	Unknown	84	7,195	25	Manorville Development Corp.; Long Island, New York	S	1. Lack of follow-through by developer; resistance by investors to spending money on application; zoning problems.
42. Marincello (P, AI)	1968	1968	1970	Rejected	22	2,100	24	Frouge County, Marin County, California	S	1. Major environmental problems; access to site difficult; community opposition; cost of development high.

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
0. New Duval (PA)	11/72		8/73	Withdrew; Rejected	75	5,168		New America Development Corporation; 20 miles from Jacksonville, Fla.	S	1. Impact of noise pollution; impact of nearby military operations.
51. New Franconia "Hosanna" (PA, AI)	6/71	4/72	2/74	Withdrew	30	1,400	45	Nilsen Group (Gerald Finn); Fairfax County, Virginia	S	1. Inability to obtain local approval; political & citizen opposition. 2. Feature: High density, innovative people move; tied to regional transit.
52. New Hartford (PA)	8/72		Unknown	Unknown	12+	100	50	City of Hartford with private developer as partner; Hartford, Conn.	NTIT	2. Part of "Hartford Process"
53. N. Manchester Village (PA)	8/71		8/73	Withdrew	63	4,600	25	Carabetta Brothers; North Manchester, Massachusetts	GC	1. Problem with economic feasibility and site location.
54. Nouville (PA, AI)	10/71	5/73	2/74	Rejected			10	Gulf Union Corporation; East Baton Rouge, La.	S	1. Lack of economic feasibility; flood plain problems.
55. Olympia Heights (PA)	9/71			Unknown	66	9,000	50	Perez and Company; Cochise Co., Arizona	GC	1. Lack of strong market area; lack of developer follow-through.
56. Old River (PA)	12/68		1970	Discouraged	120	24,216	45	Old River Realty, Inc. Chambers & Lib County, Texas	S	1. Problems: Swampy area. 2. Feature: Oil & gas on site; interstate access.
57. Orangewood (P, AI)	10/70	1971	7/72	Withdrew	35	4,565	8	Florida Gas Company; near Orlando, Florida	S	1. Developer could not afford full application in light of previous commitments.

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
58. Oak Openings (P, AI)	7/71	6/72	1975	Moratorium	50	4,789	30	Lucas Co. Renewal and Community Development Department	S	1. Problems with economic feasibility and relocation of suburban black community. 2. Feature: Unique "Over-spill New Town" by governmental agency.
59. Orion Hills (PA)	6/71		1972	Withdrew	50	5,000	48	Chrysler Realty Corp.; Oakland County, near Pontiac, Michigan	S	1. Unable to prepare full application because local developer did not cooperate as anticipated.
60. Pamlico, Inc. (PA)	7/71		8/73	Rejected	20+	7,800	10-20	Pamlico, Inc.; Hyde Co., North Carolina	FS	1. Economic feasibility problems.
61. Painaire (P)	4/69		1969	Discouraged	5	300	20	Panaire Investments; Graham Co., Arizona	FS	
62. Park Central (PA)	12/73		1974	Rejected for guarantee*		729	7.5	Hayes, Inc.; Port Arthur, Texas	NTIT	1. Environmental problems, particularly with flooding.
63. Patcom (PA)	7/72		8/73	Rejected				Patterson, New Jersey	NTIT	1. Urban renewal type funding needed, but not available.
64. Pattonsburgh (P, PA, AI)	4/70 6/72	1/73	8/73	Rejected	25	6,158		Andes and Robert Construction Company; Davies Co., Missouri	GC	1. 6 month period expired for application; Dam project which would relocate old city vetoed by President; some local opposition to project.

* In 1978 given certification of eligibility under Brooks amendment (grants only).

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
72. Reston (N) (P)	1971		1971	Dropped	25	7,500	20	Gulf Reston; Fairfax County, Virginia	S	1. Lack of developer follow-through; inability to offer guarantees to existing new communities.
73. St. George (FA)	1972		8/73	Rejected				Vermont	TGC	1. Too small.
74. Sacramento New Town in Town (FA)	4/71		10/72	Rejected	8	139	5	Sacramento New Town Developers (Campbell Construction Company); Sacramento, Calif.	NTIT	1. Deficiencies in pre-application; developer changed in mid-stream. 2. Feature: BREAKTHROUGH SITE.
75. San Antonio New Town in Town (AI)	8/72	12/72	1/74	Rejected			20	San Antonio New Town Ltd.; San Antonio, Texas	NTIT	1. Failure to change state law to enable private developer to act as sole developer; lack of assurance of renewal funds.
76. San Louis Obispo (P)	1969		1970	Dropped		10,000	50	Karl Jaeger; San Louis Obispo Co., California	S	1. Lack of developer follow-through.
77. Santa Cruz, Juan (P, AI)	3/72	6/72	12/72	Rejected Withdrew				Watt Industries; New Mexico	GC	1. Developer w/drew, but letter lost; rejected.
78. Satellite City (P)	12/68		1970	Dropped	16.5	3,000		Carl Ray Robinson; Morgan County, Alabama near Huntsville	S	1. Problem: Lack of follow through by developer. 2. Feature: Strong minority orientation.
79. Scioto (P, PA)	10/68 2/71		4/72	Rejected	25	3,500	10.4	Associated Planners, Inc.; Scioto County, Ohio	GC	1. Problem: Failed to submit additional material requested. Applied to Title X. 2. To be built around state penitentiary and technical training school.

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
80. Swards Success (PA)	1/71		1/74	Rejected	58	3,200	50	Great Northern Corp.; Near Anchorage, Ala.	S	1. Problem: Lack of economic feasibility; dependent upon access across river. 2. Feature: Climate controlled community.
81. Shelby Farms (P) "Hopewood" (PA)	12/68 3/72	1/73	8/73	Rejected	60	5,000		Shelby County; Shelby County, Tennessee	S	1. Problems: Concern about racial discrimination & environmental issues. 2. Feature: County owned penal farm.
82. "S.W. Atlanta" (PA)	10/71		8/73	Withdrew				Chrysler Realty; South Fulton County, Georgia	S	2. Considered to be strong application by some HUD staff members.
83. Spartanburg (PA)	10/72		1974	Rejected				Spartanburg, South Carolina	NTIT	1. Renewal type project; needed renewal type funding.
84. Stansbury Park (P, PA)	9/69 1/71	10/71	8/73	Withdrew	20	1,300	24	Terracore; 25 miles from Salt Lake City	S	1. Problem: unwilling to meet equity requirements; HUD concern on costs & low & moderate income housing.
85. Sterling Forest (PA, AI)	4/71	1971	1973	Withdrew	80	22,000	20	City Investing Company 35 miles from New York City	S	1. Problem: Lack of developer follow through two applicant extensions. 2. Feature: 50% open space, strong environmentally.
86. Strawberry Hill (PA, AI)	2/71 2/71	1972	11/72	Rejected	15	863	14	Co-Build Homes; St. Croix, Virginia Island	GC	1. Developer delay in responding w/applicant. Problems w/water supply & market for townhouses

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
87. Sunburst (P)	7/68		1971	Dropped	60	10,000		Solar Development Corp.; Boulder Co., Colorado	S	1. Lack of information financial feasibility; lack of developer follow-through.
88. Sunriver, Oregon (PA)	6/72		8/73	Rejected				Oregon	FS	1. Primarily resort community without balance of land uses.
89. Sun Tree "Aquarius" (PA)	9/71		4/72	Withdrew	41	3,150	6	American Community Developers, Inc.; Brevard Co., Fla.	GC	1. Obtained private <i>(moving)</i>
90. Timberlake (PA, AI)	6/72	1/73	2/74	Rejected	31	14,600	0	Tennessee Valley Authority/Boeing on Tellico Dam, Tenn.	FS	1. Environmental lawsuits on Tellico Dam; dependent on Congressional grants. Boeing withdrew participation.
91. Tree Farm (PA, AI)	5/72	1/73	1975	Moratorium			20	Tree Farm Development Corp.; Escambia County, Florida	S	1. Caught in HUD moratorium; problems w/ character & criminal record of local partner-landowner.
92. Tuskegee (P)	5/71		1972	Withdrew	42	6,000	39	Tuskee Alumni housing Foundation, Birmingham, Alabama	S	1. Strip mining damaged site.
93. Venture (P)	1969		1973	Rejected	90	10,000	32	New Cities, Inc. (William Borah) 25 miles north of Denver	S	1. Questions on management capability and equity.
94. Visitation Rancho (PA)	4/72		10/72	Withdrew				California	S	1. No help needed in land assembly; problems w/ political jurisdictions
95. Warrens Ridge (PA)	3/71		5/72	Rejected	25	865	20	Planned by Cleveland City Planning Commission. Six miles from Cleveland, Ohio	S	1. Opposed by local citizens, local government and Congressional delegation.

TABLE 4.1 - BASIC DATA ON SELECTED NEW COMMUNITY PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NEVER APPROVED (ALPHABETIZED), KEY DATES AND FINAL DISPOSITION

Project Name(s)	Date of Initial Submission	Date of Application Invitation	Date of Final Action	Action	Population (000)	Acres	Guarantee Request \$(million)	Developer & Location	Type	1. Reason for final action 2. Distinctive features
96. Warrens New Town (PA)	4/73		1/74	Rejected			16	Massachusetts Colorado	GC	1. Lack of local support; economic and environmental problems.
97. Watertown East (PA)	4/71		4/72	Dropped	5	200	10	Frank Associates; Watertown, Mass.	NTIT	1. Concern about impact of project on surrounding traffic and businesses.
98. West Valley "Kane Co" (PA, AI)	12/71	1/73	1975	Moratorium			30	Mark VII Corporation; Kane County, Illinois	GC	1. Caught in moratorium. 2. Considered to be strong project by staff.
99. W. Daytona Beach (PA)	6/71		Unknown	Unknown	20+	6,000	40	Consolidated Tomoka Land Company; Volusia County, Florida	GC	2. Feature: Site wholly owned by developer.
100. Western Cranston (P)	1969		1970	Dropped	40	4,000	15	City of Cranston, Rhode Island western part of City	NTIT	1. Problem: Lack of follow through by developer. 2. Feature: Site wholly owned by developer.
101. Woodale (PA)	4/72		3/74	Rejected	26	7,000	46	Woodale Inc.; Terrebone & Assumption Parishes; 90 miles west of New Orleans	FS	1. High cost of flood protection; policy of not approving projects in 100 year flood plains.
102. Ya-Ta-Hey (P)	6/69		1970	Dropped	10	2,600		Center of Applied Technology; McKinley County, New Mexico	FS	1. Problem: Lack of developer follow-through. 2. Feature: To serve Navahoe Indian Reservation; alcohol rehabilitation center.
TOTAL ALL PROJECTS					4,313	631,259	1,903			
TOTAL FOR APPLICATIONS INVITED					1,262	204,514	566			

SOURCE: The primary source for this table is a New Communities Administration document dated approximately in 1974 entitled "NCA Retired Applications". This contains date of pre-application submitted, date final action taken (when known) and reason for final action. Basic data on the projects was supplied from various project lists dating from 1969 to 1974 and from a review of original correspondence on 30 projects. In some cases "reasons for final action" was taken from staff recollections if nothing was found in writing. Some proposals and inquiries which were less than pre-applications are included in this list. About 50 or 60 inquiries are not included as being too substantial for inclusion here.