

(2-17)

1. Submitted by: HQ AFSPA/SPSS, Kirtland AFB NM
2. Operation/event name: Unauthorized Entry/Vandalism to an F-111E at RAF Upper Heyford, UK, Mar 90
3. Keywords: Security/Unauthorized Entry/Vandalism
4. Title: Unauthorized Entry/Vandalism to an F-111E at RAF Upper Heyford, UK
5. Observation: At approximately 0330 hours, 21 March 1990, two British males illegally entered RAF Upper Heyford and damaged an F-111E aircraft (approximately \$550,000) which was parked on a hardstand inside a restricted area. These members of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) approached the base perimeter, cut a hole in the perimeter fence at a remote location, and surreptitiously entered the restricted area. They ran up to an F-111E parked in front of Hardened Aircraft Shelter (HAS) 39, where one of the subjects climbed into the cockpit and with a hammer in each hand, began striking the inside of the cockpit. The individual on the ground attached antiwar signs to the aircraft. This individual then produced a hammer and began striking the wingtip fuel tank. The alarm response team (ART), located approximately 150 meters away, responded to the scene, challenged the two subjects, and placed them under apprehension. The two subjects were turned over to Ministry of Defense (MOD) police. This was a marked departure from previous nonviolent Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) activities.
6. Discussion: Maintenance personnel had just completed preflighting the aircraft and departed the area approximately one minute prior to the incident. The intruders, who had been observing the maintenance activities on base, seized the opportunity. The intruders were detected by the entry controller manning a post 300 meters away. Immediately after the incident, additional security measures were employed in the hardstand area; night vision devices were issued to mobile patrols; and additional walking patrols, patrol dogs, and static posts were added.
7. Lessons Learned: The 3 AF/CC dispatched a message to HQ USAF/CC detailing additional security measures and policy changes involving the handoff of security responsibilities when leaving an aircraft parked outside a shelter. The 3 AF/SP dispatched a letter outlining three pages of "lessons learned". The letter stated that, although all regulatory requirements and local procedures were adhered to, the following lessons were to be learned and shared: 1) do not assume the environment is secure because areas are fenced and lighted, because maintenance has security for the area, because personnel are working in the area, or because a security presence is in place, 2) skilled penetrators can regularly penetrate a base perimeter during the hours of darkness, and 3) security procedures and operations require continual review and emphasis. The aircraft sustained more damage than it might have if it had been properly secured. According to the after-action report, it had been left out of the hardened aircraft shelter and left open for convenience.
8. Recommended Action: Since all aircraft cannot be sheltered, all units were advised to review procedures, assess their most vulnerable areas and take appropriate actions to correct deficiencies.
9. OPR Comments: None