

## Taylor, Bob (Thune)

---

**From:** Taylor, Bob (Thune)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 19, 2005 9:56 AM  
**To:** 'Beauchamp Arthur Lt. Col AF/ILGM'; 'Arthur.Beauchamp@wso.whs.mil'  
**Subject:** RE: Melrose Range

Yeah, it didn't make sense to us either when we heard him say it. However, if you find out that it should be true, we would be concerned if it were still being factored as available by the AF in their scoring. Thanks.

Bob

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Beauchamp Arthur Lt. Col AF/ILGM [mailto:Arthur.Beauchamp@pentagon.af.mil]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 19, 2005 8:53 AM  
**To:** Taylor, Bob (Thune)  
**Subject:** RE: Melrose Range

Bob,

It's unlikely that the Air Force would give up Melrose. Melrose might get used less, but the airspace about the range is valuable. It's restricted allowing the Air Force to conduct valuable training. If the Air Force were to give up the Melrose Range they risk the FAA taking the airspace above the range back. In any case, the commission most likely won't consider Melrose one way or the another as it relates to Dyess or Ellsworth.

Art

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Taylor, Bob (Thune) [mailto:Bob\_Taylor@thune.senate.gov]  
**Sent:** Mon 7/18/2005 5:28 PM  
**To:** Beauchamp Arthur Lt. Col AF/ILGM; art.beauchamp@wso.whs.mil  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Melrose Range

Art, I don't f you were watching today's hearing but General Moseley was asked about the fate of Melrose range if Cannon AFB were to close. His answer appeared to be that if Cannon closed, Melrose would close as well. Melrose is, of course, listed (including on the maps we looked at during last Tuesday's meeting) as one of Dyess' Air-to-Ground ranges. Will the BRAC commission calculate the loss of this range under the DoD recommendations?