

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-7012

June 18, 2013

Ms. Rebecca Schmidt
Director
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Ms. Schmidt:

Enclosed is a letter I have received from Mr. Alfredo Hannenberg.

I would appreciate your reviewing this situation and providing answers to my constituent's concern. Please send your reply directly to the constituent and send a copy of your response to me.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

My best wishes to you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Harry Reid". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Harry" and last name "Reid" clearly distinguishable.

HARRY REID
United States Senator

HR:kt

Correspondence Snapshot for Activity #12555912

Created By ccadmin on 6/5/2013 12:11:00 AM
Modified By SamanthaS on 6/18/2013 12:02:00 PM

INCOMING

received by ccadmin
received date 6/5/2013
in type EML
assigned staff SamanthaS
interest code ENGY
reference #
owner ccadmin
file location

CONSTITUENT INFORMATION

Hannenberg, Alfredo (1285610)
6150 Echo Cave Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89131-2501
(702) 515-0326
ajhannenberg@informativepeople.com

description

message

I recall post-2011 Japan tsunami hearings were held to review challenges and recommended changes to our nuclear power plants, to mitigate any possible serious storm damage to America's nuclear reactors.

Given the rising levels of the Missouri and Mississippi rivers, timed with the upcoming hurricane season, I'm concerned that reactors like the Fort Calhoun could be threatened from two fronts: Heavy flooding north of Nebraska, with a possible hurricane raising river levels to the south (extending flood-stage conditions to the north, as the river cannot drain fast enough to the south). Could this dual-threat result in river level rise above the plant's barrier walls?

Was the above referenced scenario covered by the NRC? I realize they were under considerable pressure to release recommended improvements back in 2011. Unfortunately, as you must have seen in your years in Washington, expedited remedial action to address a complex problem does not necessarily render thorough investigation and effective, comprehensive action.

Taking a nuclear plant off-line doesn't in itself eliminate the problem, as on-site operating generators must provide the power to operate the plant. If the generators are compromised, or fail, due to water incursion onto the site, we could have a disaster on our hands, that would have severe regional and national consequences.

I appreciate any response back to me, via the email address provided. Note we do not answer our home phone, as we get too many marketing calls.

OUTGOING

group code NUCLEAR
out type Email
response type Quick
letter code INFORM_BUCK

due date 8/28/2013
response date
closed date

» [show incoming message](#)