

DEPARTMENT OF CRYPTID CONTROL  
FIELD OPERATIONS DIVISION

INCIDENT REPORT (SUPPLEMENTAL)

FILE ID: GEO-[REDACTED]-88-B

LOCATION: SUBLVEL [REDACTED], FACILITY [REDACTED]

DATE: [REDACTED] / [REDACTED] / 1988

REPORTING AGENT: [REDACTED] (FIELD AGENT, LEVEL 3)

DOCUMENT STATUS: INTERNAL / REVIEWED

SUPPLEMENTAL FIELD ASSESSMENT

This report is submitted to clarify several inaccuracies and speculative conclusions present in earlier documentation related to the above incident.

I was present for the entirety of the response window and do not concur with the characterization of events

---

ON ALLEGED "ENTITY" PRESENCE

No discrete entity was observed.

There was no arrival, manifestation, or movement consistent with autonomous behavior. The environment exhibited localized material stress responses, consistent with prolonged exposure to vibration, temperature fluctuation, and structural fatigue.

Descriptions involving "geometry," "planes," or "surfaces" appear to be interpretive rather than observational.

I did not observe anything that could reasonably be described as "looking back."

RESTRICTED  
INTERNAL USE ONLY

---

#### ON MATERIAL ALTERATION

Claims of total crystallization are exaggerated.

Concrete showed surface microfracturing typical of aging infrastructure. When illuminated at low angles, these fractures may present reflective artifacts that resemble faceted surfaces. This is a known phenomenon and does not imply conversion of material state.

Metal deformation was limited to pre-existing stress points. No lattice structures were observed beyond standard fatigue cracking.

No evidence suggests transmutation or phase conversion.

---

#### ON ORGANIC MATERIALS

The laboratory animal referenced in prior documentation was deceased prior to deployment due to equipment failure unrelated to the incident.

Any observed rigidity or surface sheen is attributable to post-mortem changes and environmental exposure.

There was no evidence of biological crystallization.


---

#### ON OBSERVATION CONDITIONS

Lighting was inconsistent.

Personnel were operating under suboptimal visibility due to power fluctuation and emergency protocols. Under such conditions, depth perception and surface interpretation are unreliable.

The assertion that observation itself influenced environmental response is speculative and unsupported.



**CONFIDENTIAL**

AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL ONLY

---

#### ON AGENT CONDUCT

Several team members displayed signs of acute stress response, including fixation on visual anomalies and pattern interpretation under duress.

This is not unusual during prolonged subterranean operations.

Interpretive drift is a known risk factor in confined environments.

---

#### ON TERMINOLOGY AND CLASSIFICATION

The use of terms such as "entity," "process," or "correction" introduces unnecessary ambiguity.

No anomalous intelligence, intent, or agency was detected.

Attributing systemic intent to environmental degradation risks escalation of containment response without justification.

---

#### CONTAINMENT STATUS

No active containment was required.

The affected area was secured due to structural instability, not anomalous threat.

Subsequent inspection teams reported no ongoing changes after standard isolation.

---

#### PERSONAL NOTE (FOR RECORD)

I am aware that certain narratives gain traction due to their coherence.

This does not make them accurate.

The environment did not become "ordered." It degraded in predictable ways under predictable stressors.

Anything beyond that reflects interpretation, not observation.

---

END OF REPORT

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MERGE WITH INCIDENT SUMMARY

REMOVE SPECULATIVE LANGUAGE

LIMIT FURTHER ANALYSIS

REVIEWED BY:

AGENT

DATE:

/198