463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Proposal Review Advisory Team (5128).

Date & Time: Tuesday, December 17, 1996—10:15 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Wednesday, December 18, 1996—9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: Room 1295, NSF, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, Va.

Type of Meeting: Open.

Contact Person: Mr. Charles Herz, Office of Policy Support, NSF, Room 1285, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, Va. 22230. (703) 306–1090.

Purpose of Meeting. (1) Inventory and evaluate current stresses on NSF's peer review process, as perceived in the research community, (2) develop a short list of the most feasible options for addressing the most important strains, (3) present pros and cons of the options, from the perspectives of proposers and reviewers and from the perspective of overall goals and functions of the system.

Agenda: Greetings and introduction, Operational and policy context, Current strains on the review system, Main options for improvement; pros and cons, Other issues, Plans for further work and second meeting (if needed).

Dated: November 21, 1996.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–30410 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

Special Emphasis Panel in Science and Technology Infrastructure; Notice of Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Special Emphasis Panel in Science and Technology Infrastructure.

Date and Time: December 16–17, 1996 8:00 a.m.–5:30 p.m.

Place: Room 375, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact Person: Dr. Nathaniel G. Pitts, Director, Office of Science and Technology Infrastructure, Room 1270, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230; Telephone (703) 306–1040.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to NSF for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate full applications submitted to the Recognition Awards for the Integration of Research and Education activity.

Reason for Closing: The meeting is closed to the public because the Panel is reviewing proposal actions that will include privileged intellectual property and personal information that could harm individuals if they were disclosed. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 552B(c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: November 22, 1996.

M. Rebeca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 96–30409 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 70–3091]

DOE Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System; Local Public Document Room

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) announces the location of the local public document room (LPDR) for records pertaining to the DOE Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System, Richland, Washington.

Members of the public may now inspect and copy these documents at the Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Drive, Richland, Washington 99352, telephone (509) 943–7446. The library is open on the following schedule: Monday through Friday 10:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.; Saturday 10:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.; and Sunday 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Interested parties outside the service area of the LPDR may address their requests for records to the NRC's Public Document Room, Washington, DC 20555, telephone number (202) 634–3273.

Questions concerning the NRC's local public document room program or the availability of documents should be addressed to Ms. Jona Souder, LPDR Program Manager, Freedom of Information/Local Public Document Room Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone number (301) 415–7170 or toll-free 1–800–638–8081.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22d day of November 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carlton Kammerer,

Director, Divison of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–30445 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–361, 50–362, And 50–206]

Southern California Edison Company, et al. San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station; Receipt of Petition For Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that by request dated September 22, 1996, Stephen Dwyer (Petitioner) requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission) shut down the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station ''as soon as possible'' pending a complete review of the ''new seismic risk.'' This request is being considered as a Petition under 10 CFR 2.206.

As a basis for the request, the Petition asserts that a design criterion for the plant, which was ''0.75 G's acceleration,'' is ''fatally flawed'' on the basis of the new information gathered at the Landers and Northridge quakes. The Petitioner asserts (1) that the accelerations recorded at Northridge exceeded ''1.8 G's and it was only a Richter 7+ quake,'' (2) that there were horizontal offsets of up to 20 feet in the Landers quake, and (3) that the Northridge fault was a ''Blind Thrust and not mapped or assessed.''

The request is being treated pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. By letter dated November 22, 1996, Petitioner's request that the Commission immediately shut down San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station was denied. As provided by Section 2.206, appropriate action will be taken on this request within a reasonable time.

A copy of the Petition is available for inspection in the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 22nd day of November 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Frank J. Miraglia, Jr.,

Acting Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–30446 Filed 11–27–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 500–1]

Order of Suspension of Securities Trading

November 25, 1996.

In the Matter of Alliance Industries, Inc.

It appears to the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') that there is a lack of adequate and accurate information about Alliance

Industries, Inc. (''Alliance''), with respect to the company's financial projections available through its internet home page and as distributed to potential investors as well as other information contained in various press releases and other documents.

The Commission is of the opinion that the public interest and the protection of investors require a suspension of trading in the securities of the aforementioned company.

Therefore, it is ordered, pursuant to Section 12(k) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, that the trading in the securities of Alliance be suspended for the period from 9:30 A.M. (EDT) on November 26, 1996 through 11:59 P.M. midnight (EDT) on December 10, 1996.

By the Commission.

Jonathan G. Katz,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–30615 Filed 11–26–96; 1:11 pm]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Release No. 34–37969; File No. SR–NYSE–96–21]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; New York Stock Exchange, Inc.; Order Granting Approval to Proposed Rule Change Relating to the Entry of Limit-at-the-Close Orders

November 20, 1996.

On July 31, 1996, the New York Stock Exchange, Inc. (''NYSE'' or ''Exchange'') submitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'' or ''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act'')[1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] a proposed rule change to permit limit-at-the-close (''LOC'') orders to be entered in any stock at any time during the trading day up to 3:40 p.m. on expiration days and 3:50 on non-expiration days. On October 2, 1996, the Exchange submitted Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change.[3]

The proposed rule change, including Amendment No. 1, was published for comment in Securities Exchange Act Release No. 37786 (Oct. 4, 1996), 61 FR 53473 (Oct. 10, 1996). No comments were received on the proposal.

In 1994, the Commission approved, on a pilot basis, NYSE's proposed rule change to permit entry of LOC orders to offset published imbalances of market-on-close (''MOC'')[4] orders in certain stocks.[5] A LOC order is one that is entered for execution at the closing price, provided that the closing price is at or within the limit specified. LOC orders are executed behind limit orders at the same price and behind MOC orders.

Currently, LOC orders may be entered only to offset published imbalances of MOC orders. MOC imbalances of 50,000 shares or more in (1) the so-called ''pilot'' stocks,[6] (2) stocks being added to or dropped from an index, and (3) any other stock with the approval of a Floor Official, must be published on the tape as soon as practicable after 3:40 p.m. for expiration days[7] and after 3:50 p.m. on non-expiration days. LOC orders currently must be entered only between 3:40 and 3:55 p.m. on expiration days and between 3:50 and 3:55 p.m. on non-expiration days. On expiration days, LOC orders are irrevocable once entered except in case of legitimate error. On non-expiration days, LOC orders are irrevocable after 3:55 p.m. except in case of legitimate error.

In 1995, the pilot program for LOC orders was expanded from five stocks to all stocks that have published MOC order imbalances of 50,000 shares or more in order to help stimulate use of this order type. At the present time, the NYSE proposes to expand further the use of LOC orders by allowing these orders to be entered in any stock at any time during the trading day up to 3:40 p.m. on expiration days and up to 3:50 p.m. on non-expiration days. Thereafter, consistent with current policy, LOC orders could be entered only to offset published MOC imbalances. Under the proposed rule change, LOC orders would be subject to the same type of order entry and cancellation restrictions currently imposed on MOC orders.[8]

According to the NYSE, the use of LOC orders has remained limited: The narrow order entry window, along with the requirement that LOC orders must offset published MOC imbalances, makes the opportunities for their entry too limited to justify for many member firms the programming necessary to support their use. The Exchange believes that the expansion of the LOC pilot to allow for such orders to be entered throughout the day (up until the cut-off time) would allow investors the possibility of using LOC orders in conjunction with other investment strategies. The Exchange therefore believes that this could attract additional LOC orders, thereby increasing liquidity and potentially reducing volatility at the close. According to the Exchange, increased use of LOC orders may prove to be a useful means to help address the prospect of excess market volatility that may be associated with an imbalance of MOC orders at the close.

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange, and, in particular, with the requirements of Section 6(b).[9] Specifically, the Commission believes the proposal is consistent with the Section 6(b)(5) requirements that the rules of an exchange be designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts, and, in general, to protect investors and the public interest.[10]

---

[1] 15 U.S.C. § 78s(b)(1).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4.

[3] *See* letter and Form 19b–4 from James E. Buck, Senior Vice President and Secretary, NYSE, to Ivette Lopex, Assistant Director, Division of Market Regulation, SEC, dated September 27, 1996. Amendment No. 1 expanded the purpose section of the filing to provide a more detailed explanation of the reasons the Exchange is seeking to permit limit-at-the-close (''LOC'') orders to be entered in any stock at any time during the trading day up to 3:40 p.m. on expiration days and 3:50 p.m. on non-expiration days. Thereafter, as with market-on-close (''MOC'') orders, LOC orders could be entered only to offset published imbalances. This proposed revision of the LOC pilot would subject LOC orders to the same type of order entry and cancellation restrictions currently imposed on MOC orders.

[4] A MOC order is a market order to be executed in its entirety at the closing price on the Exchange. *See* NYSEW Rule 13.

[5] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 33706 (Mar. 3, 1994), 59 FR 11093 (Mar. 9, 1994) (approving the original LOC pilot program). The latest pilot program for LOC orders expires on July 31, 1997. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 37507 (July 31, 1996) (File No. SR–NYSE–96–18 and Amendment No. 1 thereto).

[6] The term ''pilot stocks'' refers to the Expiration Friday pilot stocks plus any additional QIX Expiration Day pilot stocks. Specifically, the Expiration Friday pilot stocks consist of the 50 most highly capitalized Standard & Poors (''S&P'') 500 stocks and any component stocks of the Major Market Index (''MMI'') not included therein. The QIX Expiration Day pilot stocks consist of the 50 most highly capitalized S&P 500 stocks, any component stocks of the MMI not included therein and the 10 highest weighted S&P Midcap 400 stocks.

[7] The term ''expiration days'' refers to both (1) the trading day, usually the third Friday of the month, when some stock index options, stock index futures and options on stock index futures expire or settle concurrently (''Expiration Fridays'') and (2) the trading day on which end of calendar quarter index options expire (''QIX Expiration Days'').

[8] On expiration days, there is a 3:40 p.m. deadline for the entry, reduction, or cancellation of any MOC order. On non-expiration days, there is a 3:50 p.m. deadline for the entry, reduction, or cancellation of any MOC order. Currently, LOC orders can be canceled until 3:55 p.m. on non-expiration days. Under the proposed rule change, LOC orders will be irrevocable on non-expiration days, except in the case of legitimate error, after 3:50 p.m. Telephone conversation between Donald Siemer, Director of Market Surveillance, NYSE, and Elisa Metzger, Special Counsel, SEC, on November 19, 1996.

[9] 15 U.S.C. § 78f(b).

[10] In approving this rule, the Commission has considered the proposed rule's impact on

Continued