Four Futures.

A threatcasting report on the late 2020s.

Four people. Four points along the same cascade. Each one a composite, built from public-record interviews, public filings, current research, and judgment about how the cascade unfolding in 2026 lands on a specific person at a specific address.

WILL EVANS

Founder and Chief Strategy Officer, Fugue Strategy Advisors. Creator of ForesightOps and PRISM.

A Note Before We Begin

The four people you are about to meet do not exist. The places they live in do. The forces acting on them are real. The dates are not predictions, but they are not arbitrary. Each one is anchored to a specific catalyst that, on the available evidence, is more likely than not to occur within twelve months of the date given.

The discipline at work here is threatcasting, developed by Brian David Johnson at the Threatcasting Lab at Arizona State University. The premise is straightforward. Abstract threats produce abstract plans. Abstract plans fail under pressure. To plan for an uncertain future you have to make it concrete. You have to give it a face, a street address, a time of day. You have to know what your protagonist had for dinner the night before the inciting event. You have to know whether the call came at home or on the road.

Each protagonist is a composite. The point is not to predict that Rachel Okonkwo will be the VP of data center operations who absorbs the Loudoun County capacity crunch in September 2027. The point is to understand what the role of VP of data center operations in northern Virginia will require, in detail, of whoever is sitting in that seat eighteen months from now.

Read these as you would read fiction. Notice the small details. Notice the moment where the protagonist makes a mistake that, in retrospect, was overdetermined by a structural condition rather than by personal failure. The structural conditions are the point. The mistakes are how you see them.

A protagonist is also a stand-in. When you finish reading Priya Ramachandran's seventy-two hours in Miami, ask yourself what your own version of those seventy-two hours looks like. What sits in your inbox at 2:00 AM on November 9, 2026. Who is on the other end of the conference bridge. What the regulatory letter on your desk actually says. The closer you can get to a specific answer, the more useful this report has been.

How These Four Connect

The four threat models are not independent. They sit at four points along the same cascade. The cascade is itself a single argument about how the late 2020s play out under the macro conditions of Spring 2026.

Capital → Infrastructure → Workforce → Governance → Municipal Fiscal

It begins with capital allocation. Hyperscalers in 2026 are spending six hundred to seven hundred and seventy billion dollars on AI infrastructure, three quarters of which is AI

compute. That capital becomes physical infrastructure. Data centers, transmission lines, substations, water rights. The infrastructure has to land somewhere. It is currently landing in northern Virginia, central Texas, central Washington, and a small number of other places where power is cheap enough and zoning is permissive enough.

Rachel Okonkwo lives at the leading edge of that cascade. She runs the data center operation that the capital needs to consume. When the capital cannot consume it fast enough, the cascade kinks at her seat first.

The capital, when it does deploy, produces capability. The capability lands on knowledge workers. The Tufts Digital Planet research published in March 2026 named the geography of that landing the Wired Belt. San Jose, Washington DC, Durham, San Francisco, Seattle, Austin, Boston, Raleigh. Writers, programmers, and digital designers are the most exposed occupations in the country.

Kim Nakamura works at that landing. When the capability becomes commercially viable enough that her firm can replace her team, she absorbs the cascade.

The same capability that displaces Kim creates governance risk for any firm using it. Agentic AI systems acting autonomously can take actions with material financial and regulatory consequence. The EU AI Act becomes fully applicable on August 2, 2026. State laws are proliferating. Federal preemption is contested in court. Any CISO running enterprise AI in a regulated industry sits on a stack of dependencies, any one of which can trigger a seventy-two-hour crisis.

Priya Ramachandran is that CISO. She holds the cascade at the moment it becomes a personal failure event for her firm. Governance is the leading edge of the cascade, not the trailing one, which is why her seventy-two hours arrive earliest.

Behind all of it is the fiscal layer. Knowledge workers who lose income pay less property tax, less sales tax, less hotel and restaurant tax. The displaced cluster in the same metros where municipal governments depend most heavily on those revenue streams. Pension obligations grow at the same time the tax base shrinks. The municipal layer absorbs the cascade as a structural fiscal squeeze.

David Chen lives there. He has to write a balanced budget while the ground moves under his feet.

Four people. Four points. One cascade.

THREAT MODEL ONE

The Capacity Crunch

Rachel Okonkwo · VP, Data Center Operations

Ashburn, Loudoun County, Virginia · September 14, 2027 · 6:42 AM

I. Rachel

Rachel Okonkwo wakes at 5:30 AM the way she has every weekday for the last six years, without an alarm. The body learned the schedule. Her husband Kwame is still asleep beside her. Their daughter Adaeze, twelve, will not be up for another forty-five minutes. The dog, an aging chocolate lab named Milo, follows her down the carpeted stairs of the colonial in Ashburn Farm with the quiet resignation of an animal who has been doing this longer than the daughter has been alive.

She makes coffee in a quiet kitchen, opens her laptop on the breakfast island, and begins triaging email before the sun is up. This is the part of her day she likes. The house is hers. The stakes are not yet present in the room.

Rachel is forty-seven. Howard for electrical engineering, Georgia Tech for operations research, ten years at Northrop Grumman, then a colocation provider in Reston, then her current firm. A top-five hyperscaler whose name appears in some fashion on most data center buildings in Loudoun County. She has been there eleven years. She came in as Director of Site Reliability and worked her way up. She runs operations across thirty-eight buildings in the Loudoun-Prince William-Fairfax corridor, north of two thousand four hundred megawatts of installed capacity. More electrical demand than several US states.

She is not a household name. There are perhaps six hundred people in the United States who do what she does at her scale. They mostly know each other. They mostly do not give interviews. Their LinkedIn profiles are deliberately vague.

Kwame is a partner at a mid-size law firm in DC, focused on energy regulation. They are comfortable, not wealthy. One daughter, late and after some difficulty, plus the active phase of saving for college and the sandwich-generation reality of his mother's worsening dementia in Silver Spring.

Rachel's professional concerns this morning are these. She is two days into a heat-related load curtailment event. PJM Interconnection issued a Maximum Generation Alert at 3:47 PM

Wednesday and called for two percent voluntary load reduction across the region. Her firm is participating, which means each building is running at 98 percent of contracted demand instead of the typical 99.7 percent. She has a quarterly review with her senior vice president on Friday. She is trying to recruit two senior site reliability engineers from a competitor and the second one keeps slow-rolling the offer. And the General Counsel sent her, at 11:47 PM the night before, a forwarded note from the Virginia State Corporation Commission about the GS-5 rate class implementation that effectively means her firm is locked into fourteen-year contracts at 85 percent minimum transmission demand and 60 percent minimum generation demand on every new megawatt.

That last item is what is going to ruin her week.

II. The Place

Ashburn is not a place. Ashburn is a postal designation that covers a wide swath of eastern Loudoun County. If you fly into Dulles and look out the right side of the plane on landing, you will see what Ashburn is. A checkerboard of windowless concrete buildings, each between three hundred thousand and one million square feet, separated by service roads, transmission lines, electrical substations, and the occasional surviving farm field. The buildings have no signs. The buildings have no architectural features. They have armored fences and closed-circuit cameras every fifty feet. Inside is the largest concentration of internet infrastructure on the planet. About seventy percent of all internet traffic passes through Loudoun County at some point.

The county absorbs about forty-five percent of its general fund revenue from data center personal property taxes. The school district is one of the wealthiest in the country and one of the highest performing because of it. The Board of Supervisors knows this. The Board also knows that the residents in the new subdivisions to the south and west are increasingly upset about the noise from cooling fans, the substations going up in their viewsheds, and the transmission lines proposed across what used to be horse pasture.

In December 2026 the Board adopted Phase 2 of the Data Center Standards. Enhanced setbacks. Noise mitigation. A new water-use disclosure regime. No moratorium. But any new data center over two hundred fifty thousand square feet now requires a special exception use permit, which means a Planning Commission vote, which means a public hearing, which means the development timeline lengthens by an average of nine months. This is what is happening above Rachel's head while she is trying to keep the existing fleet operational.

III. The Inciting Event

At 6:42 AM, on her second cup of coffee, Rachel's phone buzzes with a Slack notification from her boss's boss. Two sentences. "Need fifteen on your calendar at 8:30. PJM and SCC blocking, plus Q4 capex re-base. Sorry."

She does not need to read it twice. She knows what it means.

PJM has been signaling for eighteen months that the Mid-Atlantic generation queue is binding. The 2024 Reliability Pricing Auction cleared at $269.92 per megawatt-day, up from $28.92 the year prior. A ten-fold jump. The 2025 auction cleared at $329.17. The 2026 auction is forecast to clear in the $400 range. PJM has stated publicly that it cannot reliably interconnect new large-load customers in northern Virginia at the historical pace. It has asked for legislative help. It has not received it.

The State Corporation Commission's GS-5 rate class, effective January 2027, is the regulatory response. It applies to data center customers above 25 megawatts of demand. Fourteen-year contracts. 85 percent minimum transmission demand, billed monthly regardless of actual use. 60 percent minimum generation demand. Special exit fees if the customer terminates early. According to Commission staff comments, the intent is to ensure the cost of grid expansion to serve hyperscaler load is recovered from hyperscalers rather than from residential ratepayers, and to disincentivize speculative capacity reservations.

Rachel's firm has approximately forty-eight gigawatts of pipeline capacity globally that was scheduled to land in Virginia between 2027 and 2030. The Q4 2027 capex plan, presented to the board in July, assumed continued ability to interconnect at historical rates with traditional rate structures. Nine billion dollars in calendar 2027 alone, of which six and a half billion was Loudoun County. The plan did not assume GS-5 terms.

The 8:30 AM call is going to ask Rachel for a revised forecast that her senior leadership can take to the CFO by end of week. The CFO will take it to the board the following Wednesday. The board will ask whether the original capex plan can hold. The honest answer is no. The honest answer is that her firm will have to either pay GS-5 prices on every new megawatt or pull the plan, and either choice has consequences that ripple through public guidance, signed vendor contracts, employee hiring plans already in motion, and at some point in the next six months, the stock price.

She has six hours and eighteen minutes to prepare for the call.

IV. The Seventy-Two Hours

She joins the 8:30 AM call from the breakfast island, having sent Adaeze off to school with Kwame and not yet showered. Five people on the line. Her boss. His boss. The SVP of Network and Power. The General Counsel. The head of Investor Relations. The General Counsel speaks first. He has spent the night with outside counsel reviewing the GS-5 tariff. The Commission's order is final and effective. There is no realistic path to challenge it inside the Q4 timeline. Litigation would take twelve to eighteen months minimum. The options are to sign GS-5 at the new terms, to delay the Virginia build, or to relocate planned capacity to other markets.

The SVP runs the relocation analysis for ninety seconds. Four US markets can absorb hyperscale capacity at the firm's pace. Northern Virginia. Central Ohio. Central Texas. The Pacific Northwest. Ohio is constrained on transmission. ERCOT's fast-track interconnection process has been suspended pending litigation on a separate matter. The Pacific Northwest is constrained on water rights and hydro allocation. None of the alternatives can absorb six and a half billion dollars of 2027 build without timeline slippage of at least eighteen months and TCO increases of fifteen to thirty percent. There is no clean substitute. The firm either pays GS-5 in Virginia or it ships less product.

Rachel is asked for the operational view. She gives it. The existing Loudoun fleet is at 96 percent contracted utilization with no headroom for the announced 2027 product launches. The current heat curtailment event is straining cooling systems already operating at design margin. The recruiting environment for site reliability engineers in the region has tightened to the point where she is paying signing bonuses that would have been unthinkable two years ago. The Phase 2 special exception use permit process is currently adding nine to fourteen months to any new building. Even at GS-5 prices, the firm cannot land the originally planned 2027 capacity inside calendar 2027. The build pace is constrained by physical infrastructure, not by capital availability.

This is, she realizes as she says it, the moment her professional life shifts. She is the person in the room delivering the news that the original plan was never feasible. She delivers it.

The SVP thanks her and asks for the analysis in writing by 4:00 PM Friday with a recommendation. The General Counsel will have outside counsel review the public disclosure language by Monday. The head of Investor Relations is silent throughout the call, which is itself information.

The call ends at 9:14 AM. She has thirty hours and forty-six minutes. She has not eaten breakfast.

Tuesday afternoon she pulls together her direct staff at the regional ops center and asks for a fresh, honest read on capacity headroom and recruitment pipeline. She does not tell them about the capex re-base. She gets the read. The numbers are as bad as she suspected. Two of her best site reliability engineers have informed their managers, separately, in the past ninety days that they are taking offers elsewhere. Both cited work pace and the impossibility of taking a real vacation. The recruiting funnel has slowed to a trickle. Her preferred internal promotion candidate for a Director role declined the role in May.

Tuesday evening Kwame is at a client dinner. Rachel reheats leftover pasta for Adaeze and herself. Adaeze talks about a school project on water cycles. Rachel listens and asks the right questions, and the part of her that is twelve years old and standing in a kitchen with her own mother thinks she will remember this conversation as one where her mother was distracted. She tries harder. After Adaeze goes upstairs, Rachel sits at the breakfast island with her laptop and writes a first draft of the Friday memo. It is bad. She rewrites it twice. By midnight she has a draft that is honest, bounded, and gives leadership three options with TCO ranges and timeline implications. She sends it to her boss for review and goes to bed.

Wednesday the heat curtailment event continues. PJM has the alert at Maximum Emergency level. A cooling tower at one of the Pacific Boulevard sites trips offline at 2:47 PM and the team manually sheds five megawatts of load to prevent thermal runaway in two compute halls. They get it back online at 3:31 PM. No customer-visible impact. The PJM alert is lifted at 6:00 PM.

Wednesday evening her boss calls. He has read the draft. He asks her to soften the language about pipeline infeasibility. She says she will not. He says he understands but the SVP needs the option to recommend a continued build at GS-5 terms without the memo undercutting the recommendation. She offers to include the GS-5 option as recommended-with-cautions but cannot soften the operational reality. Her boss says he will think about it. They hang up.

Thursday she goes into the office. She rarely does anymore. She wants to be visible to her team. She also wants to be physically away from her kitchen breakfast island while she finishes the memo. She sends a final draft to her boss at 4:11 PM with the language unchanged. He acknowledges receipt at 5:48 PM. He does not comment on the language.

Thursday evening she takes Adaeze and Milo to a soft-serve place in Brambleton. Adaeze does not mention the school project again, which Rachel reads as forgiveness for Tuesday's distraction. They stop at the playground on the way home. Adaeze, twelve and ambivalent about playgrounds, indulges her mother's request to push her on the swings for ten minutes. The sun sets. They go home.

Friday morning the SVP review goes for ninety minutes. The conversation is technical, occasionally contentious, ultimately professional. The SVP asks Rachel directly whether she stands by the operational read. She does. The recommendation will be that the firm slips the 2027 plan by twelve months and announces revised guidance to investors at the November earnings call. The General Counsel will draft the disclosure. Rachel will be the named operational lead on the revised plan. The CFO call happens Friday afternoon. Rachel is on the line but not asked to speak. The decision is taken. Investor Relations begins drafting the November language. The board call is scheduled for Wednesday.

V. The Consequences

The immediate consequence is a delayed earnings cycle. The November call discloses a deferred 2027 capex of approximately three billion dollars, the difference between the original Loudoun-centric plan and the revised plan that distributes a portion of the build to alternative markets at higher TCO. The stock takes a 4.7 percent hit on the morning of the call and recovers about half of it by close.

The intermediate consequence is a year of operational tension. Rachel's team carries the existing fleet at 96 percent utilization through a year of constrained build. The recruiting environment does not improve. Two more senior site reliability engineers leave. The internal promotion pipeline thins. By summer 2028 Rachel is wearing a director-level operations role on top of her VP duties because the firm has not been able to backfill below her.

The long-term consequence is harder to see and more important. The cascade hits Rachel because the cascade hits Rachel's role, in any firm operating at that scale in northern Virginia, in the second half of 2027. The names change. The structure does not. By the time the late 2020s play out, the question of who owns the data center capacity decision in northern Virginia has been resolved in favor of the State Corporation Commission and Loudoun County's Phase 2 standards. The hyperscalers can spend the money. They cannot accelerate the build past the point where physical and regulatory infrastructure permits. Capex guidance compresses across the industry. Equity multiples compress with it. The narrative of unlimited AI infrastructure expansion meets, for the first time, a hard cap.

VI. What Could Have Helped

Move 05 in the Spring 2026 Quarterly read: model energy and power as binding constraints, not compute. Rachel's firm modeled them as variable inputs. They were wrong. By the time they figured out they were wrong, the GS-5 contracts were live and the capex was committed.

There is no version of this story where Rachel personally averts the cascade. Her seat is not high enough in the org. There is a version where her firm, two years earlier, ran a serious

scenario analysis on Virginia regulatory risk and pre-positioned alternatives. That work would have been done in 2024 and 2025, when GS-5 was a docket filing rather than a tariff. The firms that did that work in those years are the firms that absorb the cascade in 2027 with three-year build plans for Ohio and Texas and Iceland already in the ground. The firms that did not are the firms that announce capex revisions in November 2027.

The Six Moves are not designed to make Rachel's life easier in September 2027. They are designed to make sure that, in 2025 and 2026, the leadership above Rachel asks the right questions early enough that her September 2027 looks different. The cost of doing that work in 2025 is low. The cost of not doing it lands on her, and on six hundred people like her, in 2027.

THREAT MODEL TWO

The Wired Belt Realized

Kim Nakamura · Senior Content Strategist

East Austin, Texas · June 22, 2028 · 11:14 AM

I. Kim

Kim Nakamura is thirty-four years old on the day her job is eliminated. She does not know yet that her job is going to be eliminated. She is at her standing desk in her apartment in East Austin, drinking the second of her three daily Topo Chicos, fact-checking a deck for a B2B SaaS client that is, she suspects, going to ask for a fourth round of revisions that will, again, fail to acknowledge the second round of revisions.

Kim grew up in Cupertino. Her father is a structural engineer at one of the major firms in San Jose. Her mom taught middle school math in the Cupertino Union School District for thirty-one years and retired in 2022. Kim is the older of two daughters. Her sister Naomi is a pediatric oncologist at UCSF and has been since 2019.

Kim went to UC Berkeley, majored in English with a double minor in design and Asian American studies, and graduated in 2012 into a job market that had not entirely recovered from the 2008 crisis. She worked in content strategy and marketing at three startups in San Francisco between 2012 and 2018, joined a mid-size B2B SaaS firm in 2018, and was laid off in the first wave of the 2022 cuts. She moved to Austin in late 2022 because her boyfriend Felipe got an engineering offer at one of the platform firms, because she was tired of paying $3,400 in rent for a one-bedroom in the Mission, and because Austin in late 2022 still felt like an act of optimism rather than a hedge.

Felipe and Kim broke up in 2024. The breakup was mostly about whether to have kids. He wanted to start trying within the year. She wanted to wait three more years. The conversation revealed that they had been having different conversations for some time. He moved back to the Bay Area. She kept the apartment, which she could afford on her own because she had moved up to Senior Content Strategist at the same B2B firm, and because Austin rent had not yet caught up to where her apartment, north of the river and east of I-35, would have been priced in San Francisco.

Her actual job is a sequence of overlapping responsibilities that, taken together, function as the connective tissue between her firm's product team and its customer-facing surfaces. She

runs the blog, three long-form pieces a week, roughly fourteen percent of marketing-attributed pipeline. She partners with demand generation on whitepaper production. She has built and maintained, since 2023, the firm's customer story program, forty-seven full case studies and a substantial library of social-format quote graphics. She manages two writers and one designer. She makes $148,000 base, with $22,000 target bonus, of which she has hit roughly 80 percent in each of the last three years.

Her parents do not entirely understand what she does. Her mother thinks Kim is a writer, which is not wrong but is incomplete. Her father, who builds bridges, has on three separate occasions asked her whether she has considered going back to school for something more durable. Each time the conversation has gone poorly. She does not bring it up.

She has a 2:00 PM meeting today with her director and the VP of Marketing. The calendar invite came in at 8:14 AM. The subject is "Quick sync, Q3 planning context." There is no agenda.

II. The Place

East Austin is a neighborhood that has, in the span of fifteen years, transitioned from a primarily Black and Latinx working-class community to one of the most expensive zip codes in the city. The transition is incomplete and contested. Kim's apartment is on East 7th, in a building that went up in 2019 on a lot that previously held a small auto-body shop. The auto-body shop's signage, in faded blue paint, is still visible on the brick wall of the property next door, preserved by the developer of Kim's building as an authentic touch.

The neighborhood is woven through with these juxtapositions. A taqueria on East 6th since 1973, two blocks from a wine bar that opened in 2024 and serves natural orange wine in stemless glassware. A community garden run by neighbors whose grandparents bought the surrounding lots in the 1950s, two blocks from a coworking space whose membership skews white, female, and remote. By the 2020 census the neighborhood was 36 percent Hispanic, 38 percent non-Hispanic white, 18 percent Black, with the white share growing each year and the Black share contracting.

Kim has lived here five and a half years. She knows her coffee shop, run by a couple who moved here from Chicago in 2017 and named the place after their dog. She knows the East Austin Studio Tour, which she attends every November. She knows the bartender at the wine bar. She does not know her neighbors in her building, who turn over every two years.

She does not, on June 22, know that the demographics of her neighborhood are a leading indicator. The white share grew because of in-migration of knowledge workers in roughly Kim's professional category. If the in-migration reverses, the rents in her building reverse.

The coffee shop, the wine bar, the orange wine, all of them are economic functions of the same in-migration that brought Kim to East 7th.

> *This is not a thing Kim has thought about. It will be a thing Kim thinks about by Christmas.*

III. The Inciting Event

The 2:00 PM meeting starts on time, which Kim notices because her VP of Marketing is rarely on time. The director is on the call. The VP is on the call. There is a third person on the call, a woman named Sandra from the People team whom Kim has met twice in the last four years.

The VP says: "Kim, thank you for joining. I want to be respectful of your time, so I am going to be direct. As part of the company's strategic realignment, we have made the decision to restructure the Content function. Effective today, your position has been eliminated. This is not a reflection of your performance or your contributions, both of which have been excellent. The change is structural. Sandra is here to walk you through your separation package, which I think you will find generous."

Kim hears the words. She does not hear them in the order they were delivered. The first thing she fully registers is that there is a woman named Sandra on the call, and Sandra is here to walk her through a separation package, which means the decision was made before Kim received the calendar invite at 8:14 AM. The decision was made at least a week ago, probably longer. The "Quick sync" subject line was a fiction.

She nods. She says, calmly, "Can you tell me what the structural change is."

The director answers. "We are consolidating Content into the new AI-Augmented Marketing function. Two of your functional responsibilities, blog and customer stories, are moving into the new function under a single Director of AI-Augmented Content. The whitepaper work is moving into demand gen directly. The team will report into the new Director."

Kim asks, "Was the role posted. Did I have an opportunity to apply."

The VP answers. "The role was filled by an internal candidate from our technology partner team in May. We were not able to consider external or lateral applicants for that role due to the technology integration requirements."

Kim asks, "Who is the new Director."

The VP says a name. The name is a man named Connor whom Kim has met once, briefly, at a company offsite in Scottsdale in 2026. Connor is twenty-eight years old. Kim remembers him as friendly but vacant, the kind of person who used the phrase "directionally accurate" more

than once in a single conversation. She remembers thinking, at the time, that he was going to be fine in his career.

Sandra walks through the separation package. Six months base salary, biweekly. COBRA through end of year, employer-paid for four months. Outplacement support through a third-party firm whose name Kim does not catch. Accelerated vesting of her remaining equity grant, worth about $11,000 net. A non-disparagement clause. Twenty-one days to sign and seven to revoke. Last day is today. Laptop access through 5:00 PM Pacific to download personal files.

The call ends at 2:33 PM. Kim sits at her standing desk with the rejected B2B client deck still on her screen and the camera still on, for what she later remembers as either two or twenty minutes. She does not cry. She does not call anyone. She walks to the window and looks at the auto-body shop's faded blue sign on the property next door.

She thinks, in this order. I should call Naomi. I cannot call Naomi yet. I should call my mother. I cannot call my mother yet. I should call Marcus. I cannot call Marcus yet.

She closes her laptop. She walks downstairs. She walks the four blocks to her coffee shop. She orders a black coffee. She sits at the same table she sits at every Saturday morning. She drinks the coffee. She walks back to her apartment. By the time she gets home, the laptop has finished its automated logout. She is locked out of email, Slack, the Google Drive that contains six years of her work, the customer story library she built single-handedly, the blog CMS, the design tools.

It is 4:17 PM. Her job took six years to build and forty-three minutes to end.

IV. The Seventy-Two Hours

She calls Naomi first. Naomi is in clinic and cannot pick up. Kim leaves a voicemail that is calm and short. She asks Naomi to call back when she has a chance. She calls Marcus, the public defender she has been seeing for six months. He picks up. He listens. He says he is coming over. She says do not, she wants to think. He says, tonight, then. I will bring food. She says okay. She does not call her mother.

She opens her personal laptop. She begins, in a state of unusual mental clarity, the work of triaging.

The first triage is financial. Six months of severance, approximately $74,000 gross, $52,000 net. Her F-you fund is $31,000. Her credit-card debt is $14,000. Her monthly fixed costs are about $4,800 with rent, utilities, car, and minimums on the cards. She can run with no income for approximately seventeen months before depleting the 401(k). With

unemployment benefits, perhaps nineteen. This is information she did not previously have at this resolution. She writes it on a yellow legal pad.

The second triage is professional. She updates her LinkedIn while still logged in to the company laptop, which is technically a violation of her separation agreement. She does it anyway. She removes the company name and writes “Open to opportunities” in the headline. She begins composing a list of every person she has worked with in the last ten years who might know about a role. The list is long. It is also, she realizes as she works through it, oddly thin in the categories she would have considered most active a year ago. The B2B content world has compressed. The friends still in it are increasingly the senior people. The mid-level she would have natural peers among has thinned out.

She thinks about Connor, twenty-eight, in his new role. She thinks about whether the new role is actually a headcount of one. She thinks about the chance that, in nine months, the new function will be re-org’d again and Connor will be eliminated too, having served as the transitional human required to convert Kim’s six years of context into prompts. She thinks this is more likely than not.

The third triage is identity. She is a senior content strategist. That has been the answer to “what do you do” for six years. By Sunday she has to figure out what the new answer is. She can fudge it for a month. She cannot fudge it indefinitely. The fudging is its own corrosive process.

Marcus arrives at 7:30 PM with takeout from a Vietnamese place on East 11th. He does not ask her how she is feeling. He sets the food on the table and asks her what she had for lunch. She had not eaten since breakfast. They eat together. After, he tells her he is going to stay over. She says he does not have to. He says he knows. He wants to. She is grateful in a way that surprises her.

She wakes at 4:14 AM and cannot fall back asleep. She moves to the living room. She looks at the auto-body shop sign. She thinks about her mother, retired three years now, who would not understand how the work that had been the structure of her adult life could vanish in forty-three minutes. She thinks about her father, who would understand exactly how it could vanish, and would, in the gentlest possible terms, suggest that this had always been the risk.

Naomi calls her back at 6:45 AM. Naomi listens. Naomi does not say I am sorry. Naomi says, tell me what you need. Kim says she does not know yet. Naomi says, call mom. Do not put it off. She is going to find out from someone and you need it to be from you. Kim calls her mother at 8:30 AM. Her mother takes it better than Kim expected. Her mother says, honey, this is hard, but you have always landed on your feet. Her father is not home. Kim does not know if this is fortunate.

The seventy-two hours of clarity ends, as it usually does, in a longer fog. By Friday evening Kim has applied to seven roles. By Monday, one polite rejection. By the following Friday, twenty-one applications and three responses. The job market for senior content strategists in B2B SaaS in mid-2028 is, as she had begun to suspect during the triage, structurally smaller than it had been twelve months earlier.

V. The Consequences

The immediate consequence is six months of severance and a search.

The intermediate consequence is the realization, over the course of those six months, that the search itself has changed. Roles she would have been the natural candidate for in 2026 have either been eliminated or restructured into roles that require either a substantial pay cut or a substantial title cut, often both. The roles that pay what she was paid require what is variously labeled "AI fluency" or "AI-augmented experience." The roles that prioritize that fluency are increasingly being filled by candidates ten to fifteen years her junior. The Anthropic Economic Index research published in March 2026 identified that pattern in the 22 to 25 cohort. By 2028 the cohort effect has broadened.

Kim is not hostile to AI tools. She has used them for routine tasks since 2023. The issue is not technical capability. The issue is structural. The firms hiring in 2028 are pricing her experience as a liability rather than an asset, on the theory that a younger candidate with strong AI fluency can produce equivalent output at a lower salary.

By Christmas 2028, six months in, she has had two final-round interviews and zero offers. Her F-you fund is at $19,000. Her severance is approaching its end. She has begun, quietly, to consider whether the answer is to leave content marketing entirely. She has begun, equally quietly, to consider whether the answer is to leave Austin.

In late January 2029 she takes a contract role at sixty percent of her previous total compensation, with no benefits and no path to permanent. The work is fine. The pay is not. By April she has started the process of breaking her lease on East 7th. By June she has moved back to Cupertino, into the bedroom she grew up in, with the understanding that this is for six months while she figures out her next step.

The economy of East Austin notices. The wine bar Kim used to visit closes in March 2029, citing rising rents and softening demand. The coffee shop is sold to a regional chain in September 2029. The apartment at 1742 East 7th, which had asked $2,395 for a one-bedroom in early 2028, is asking $2,050 by late 2029. None of these data points individually reflect Kim. All of them collectively are the trace.

The long-term consequence is harder to see and less personal. The Wired Belt cohort that Tufts identified in March 2026, the writers, programmers, and digital designers concentrated in eight metros, does not relocate uniformly. Some return to family homes in less expensive geographies. Some retrain. Some leave the workforce. Some take roles below their previous pay and status and remain. The aggregate effect on the Wired Belt cities is a slow demographic and economic re-sort. By 2030 the Census data shows it. By 2032 the property tax base shows it. By 2034 the school districts show it.

> *This is the moment the cascade hits the fiscal layer. David Chen, in 2029, will be its first municipal protagonist.*

VI. What Could Have Helped

Move 04 in the Spring 2026 Quarterly read: redesign the rollout so the incentive structure changes. Kim's firm did not. Connor was hired. Kim was not given a chance to apply. The new function reports up through a different leadership chain. The writers and designers who remain have learned, by watching, what the firm rewards and what it does not.

There is no version of Move 04 that saves Kim's specific seat. The role was eliminated. There is a version of Move 04 that creates, within Kim's firm, a structural commitment to redeploy displaced workers into AI-fluent roles with a real reskilling pathway, rather than separating them with a generous severance and replacing them with younger hires at lower cost. That commitment is expensive. It is also defensive. It protects against the secondary effect, which is that the workers who remain stop trusting the firm's stated values. By 2030 the firms that did Move 04 in 2026 and 2027 retain the institutional knowledge of their senior content, design, and engineering staff. The firms that did not are competing for that talent in a market where it has, mostly, left.

The math does not work in 2028 in Kim's favor. It might, in some cases, in 2030. That is the difference Move 04 makes.

THREAT MODEL THREE

The CISO Under Siege

Priya Ramachandran · Chief Information Security Officer

Brickell, Miami, Florida · November 8, 2026 · 10:47 PM

I. Priya

Priya Ramachandran is fifty-one years old, the Chief Information Security Officer of a Miami-based fintech firm with $14 billion in assets under management and roughly eight hundred employees. On the night of November 8, 2026 she is hosting a dinner party for nine people at her condo on the 27th floor of a building on Brickell Bay Drive.

She did not want to host a dinner party. Her wife Elena, an attorney specializing in corporate immigration, did. Elena's argument, persuasive as ever, was that Priya had not seen most of these people in eighteen months and that the marriage required, occasionally, that Priya make her social life real rather than aspirational. Priya had agreed in October. By the morning of November 8 she had reconsidered three times. By 7:30 PM she was in her kitchen searing scallops.

The guests are Elena's law school roommate Carmen and her wife Rosa, who flew in from Atlanta. Two couples from the building. A widower named Bertrand whom Elena had befriended at a charity event in March. And a colleague of Priya's from an earlier life. Aditi, who had been her manager at a consulting firm in 2008 and was now, herself, the Chief Information Security Officer at a Boston-based health insurance company. Aditi was the reason Priya had agreed to the dinner. Aditi was the closest thing Priya had to a peer she could speak to candidly, and Priya had not seen her since RSA in San Francisco in May.

Priya was born in Mumbai. She came to the United States at age eleven when her father, a chemical engineer, took a position at a refining firm in Houston. She graduated from MIT with a master's in electrical engineering and a focus on cryptography in 1999. Defense contractor work in Northern Virginia for four years. Consulting between 2003 and 2014. Industry CISO roles since 2014. Her current role since January 2023.

She is, by the standards of the profession, well respected and not particularly well known. She speaks at conferences twice a year. She publishes occasionally. She declined, in 2024, an invitation to apply for a federal CISO role because Elena's law practice could not relocate. She does not regret the decision but she thinks about it more often than she would like.

Her professional concerns this evening are these. The firm is six weeks into the production rollout of an agentic AI customer service system that handles routine account inquiries, dispute initiation, and limited transaction guidance. The system has tool-use scope that includes the ability to execute certain customer-authorized actions. Dispute submissions. Fee adjustments under $500. Statement requests. Limited account changes. The deployment was approved over Priya's documented objections in August. She had requested, in writing, a phased rollout with mandatory human-in-the-loop gates for any action above $100. The Chief Operating Officer pushed back. The compromise was a $500 ceiling and a quarterly review of incident data. The first quarterly review is scheduled for December 15.

In the firm's PRISM scoring, the agentic system sits at D6 = 50, D7 = 45, D8 = 65. None has crossed 70. Priya has been arguing for two months that D8 should be 70 or higher. The data architect has been pushing back on her assessment of PII masking maturity. The argument is unresolved.

> *She has been thinking about all of this while searing the scallops. The scallops, despite the distraction, are correctly seared.*

II. The Place

Brickell is a vertical neighborhood. Fifteen years ago it was an extension of downtown Miami's financial district with a few residential towers. Today it is its own dense city. Fifty thousand residents living in towers ranging from twenty to seventy floors, along a corridor of about ten blocks bordered by Biscayne Bay to the east and the Miami River to the north. It is hot and it is loud and it is full of money.

The building Priya and Elena live in is a 2014-vintage tower of forty stories, designed by a Spanish firm whose work is identifiable from a distance by its preference for cantilevered balconies and its skepticism of right angles. The lobby has a thirty-foot ceiling and a doorman who has been there longer than they have. The pool deck on 9 is a small, tasteful infinity pool with views over the bay. The HOA is administered competently.

Priya bicycles to work most mornings. Twenty-two minutes through the financial district to her building near the cruise terminal. The route runs along the bay path until it cuts west, and on most mornings she sees the same dozen joggers and the same handful of homeless men sleeping under the I-395 overpass. The contrast is part of Miami. She has stopped registering it consciously, which she is occasionally embarrassed by.

The firm's SOC is a windowless room in the interior of the leased fifteen floors, a wall of monitors and four people on shift at any given time. Priya, on this November evening, is in her own kitchen. The SOC is being run by her senior manager, Nikhil, who is good. The on-

call escalation rotation is functioning. Priya does not, in the ordinary course, expect to be paged on a Sunday evening.

III. The Inciting Event

The dinner is, against Priya's expectations, going well. The scallops were correctly seared. Aditi has just told a story about an industry conference panel that ran long because the moderator could not get a participant to stop discussing supply chain risk. Priya is laughing. Elena is on her second glass of wine and is, visibly, glad to be hosting people in her own home.

At 10:47 PM Priya's work phone, on the kitchen island where she has been bringing courses out, lights up. The first message is a Slack page from Nikhil. "P1. Need you on bridge. Calling now." Fifteen seconds later a text. "Priya: pick up." Her phone rings. Aditi sees Priya's face and immediately stands up. Aditi knows what this is. Elena, who has been laughing at something Bertrand said, sees Aditi standing up and turns to look at Priya, and her face changes.

Priya excuses herself and walks to the bedroom. She closes the door. She picks up.

Nikhil is talking quickly but precisely. The summary, in the first ninety seconds, is this. At 9:22 PM the agentic AI customer service system processed a sequence of seventeen related customer service interactions originating from what appeared to be a single end-user session, but was, on subsequent review, a coordinated set of interactions designed to exploit a chained tool-use vulnerability. The user, masquerading as the legitimate account holder of a private banking customer, was able to initiate a sequence of actions that, in aggregate, transferred approximately $2.3 million from the customer's investment account to an external account at a small Caribbean bank, in five tranches each below the $500 individual transaction ceiling.

The actions were, individually, all within the agentic system's authorized tool-use scope. The system reviewed each customer's stated intent against the rule set, confirmed that the requested action was within scope, and executed the transaction. The system did not, because it was not designed to, detect that the seventeen interactions in aggregate represented a pattern that no legitimate customer would ever execute.

The breach was discovered at 10:31 PM by an automated transaction monitoring rule that flagged the cumulative outbound wire to a single external destination over a 90-minute window. The rule was not part of the agentic system. It was part of the firm's pre-existing AML and fraud detection layer. The rule fired correctly. The on-call team in the SOC had spent the next sixteen minutes confirming the transactions were anomalous, identifying the customer, and confirming the pattern indicated either fraud or a security breach.

The funds had cleared at 10:42 PM. They were now sitting in a Caribbean correspondent account belonging to a counterparty the firm had no relationship with.

Priya asks two questions. Has the agentic AI system been taken offline. Yes. Manual kill switch executed at 10:38 PM. All agentic actions disabled. Read-only state. Who else knows. SOC team. The duty officer at the AML team. "I called you first because I wanted to brief you before I escalate further."

Priya thinks for four seconds. Escalate immediately to the General Counsel and the COO. Bridge in fifteen minutes. She will be there in ten.

She walks back to the dining room. Elena is already standing. Aditi is gathering coats. Carmen and Rosa look confused but compliant. Bertrand the widower is, with admirable poise, refilling his own wine glass. Priya says, simply: "I am sorry. I have to go to work. There is an incident. Elena, I love you, and I am so sorry." Elena nods. Aditi catches Priya's eye and mouths: "Call me tomorrow." Priya nods. She kisses Elena. She picks up her work bag. She is in the firm's lobby at 11:01 PM and on the bridge at 11:04 PM.

The seventy-two hours have begun.

IV. The Seventy-Two Hours

Sunday 11:04 PM to Monday 5:00 AM. The first six hours are crisis management. Priya assembles, on the bridge, the full incident response team. General Counsel. COO. Head of Customer Operations. Head of Compliance. The data architect. The AI system vendor's emergency support contact. Outside breach counsel. She also dials in the firm's cyber insurance carrier's incident hotline.

The first decision is whether the incident is a cybersecurity event, a fraud event, or both. The General Counsel argues the legal characterization matters because it determines disclosure obligations. Priya argues the practical work is the same regardless. Stop the bleed. Preserve evidence. Identify the customer. Recover what can be recovered. Prepare disclosures. The COO sides with Priya. The General Counsel agrees to characterize internally as both, and to defer external legal characterization until breach counsel has reviewed.

Outside breach counsel, a partner at a Washington DC firm Priya has worked with twice before, joins the bridge at 11:38 PM. The incident has multiple regulatory dimensions. Domestically, New York DFS Part 500. Florida state cybersecurity disclosure. SEC for any material event. Internationally, GDPR for any EU customer data implicated, plus the EU AI Act, fully applicable since August 2, 2026. The agentic system's Annex III classification is the first thing breach counsel asks about.

The data architect confirms. The system is classified as high-risk under the EU AI Act because it makes consequential financial decisions on customer behalf. The firm completed conformity assessment in July 2026 and is registered with the EU AI Office. The conformity assessment did not, in its risk evaluation, identify chained tool-use as a specific attack vector.

At 12:14 AM Priya asks the data architect a question she has been holding for two months. Has the agentic system, at any point in production, processed customer Personal Identifiable Information through the underlying language model API without masking. The data architect hesitates. The masking is partial. Names and account numbers are masked. Transaction amounts, timestamps, and counterparty names are not.

Priya: “So the LLM has been seeing the actual amounts and counterparties of customer transactions, in the clear, since rollout.” Data architect: “Correct.” Priya: “And the LLM provider’s data policy.” Data architect: “Their standard policy. They retain query data for thirty days for safety review.”

Breach counsel, who has been silent for sixty seconds, says: “We have an Article 28 problem.”

She does not need to elaborate. Article 28 of the GDPR governs processor obligations. If the LLM provider has been processing customer transaction data, in identifiable form, for thirty-day retention windows, and the firm has not properly disclosed this to customers, there is a separate disclosure regime that applies on top of the breach disclosure regime that is already running.

By 2:00 AM the bridge has identified the contours of the problem. The breach itself is bounded. $2.3 million, one customer, recovery effort initiated. The regulatory exposure is much larger. The agentic incident is going to surface a series of questions about the firm’s AI governance posture that, if answered honestly, will reveal the D8 PII masking gap, the partial conformity assessment, and the operational pattern of deployment-over-objection that produced the system in its current form.

Priya goes home at 5:14 AM. Elena is awake. Elena does not ask. Priya showers, drinks coffee, eats two pieces of toast that Elena has already made, and is back in the office by 6:45 AM.

Monday 7:00 AM through Tuesday 5:00 PM. The second thirty hours are coordination. Parallel work streams. Incident response. Recovery. Regulatory disclosure. Customer notification. Internal investigation. AI system remediation. Board communication. Priya is in or running roughly seventy percent of the meetings. She delegates aggressively. She does not eat lunch on Monday. She does not eat dinner on Monday. She stays in the office through the night and showers in the firm’s gym at 5:30 AM Tuesday. Elena drops off a fresh shirt and clean socks.

The recovery effort partially succeeds. The Caribbean correspondent bank, contacted Sunday night through the firm's correspondent banking liaison, freezes the funds at 8:47 AM Monday. Negotiations begin for return. Outside counsel estimates a 60 to 70 percent probability of full recovery within ninety days, with the remainder at risk based on local jurisdictional dynamics.

By Tuesday afternoon the firm is preparing a coordinated disclosure to New York DFS, the Florida Office of Financial Regulation, the SEC under the four-business-day cybersecurity disclosure rule, and the EU AI Office. Customer notification is being drafted. Breach counsel has flagged that the EU AI Office disclosure will trigger a follow-up inquiry and that the firm should expect a request for the complete agentic system documentation, including the conformity assessment, within ten business days.

The internal investigation, which Priya has insisted be led by an independent third-party firm rather than internal counsel, begins Tuesday morning. First interviews scheduled for the data architect, the COO, and the Director of Customer Operations. Priya is interviewed Wednesday.

Tuesday 5:00 PM through Thursday morning. The board notification. Seven-person board, two with prior CISO or security experience. The board chair, briefed by the CEO at 11:00 AM Tuesday, has called for an emergency board call at 8:00 AM Wednesday. Priya is the principal speaker.

She prepares the briefing materials Tuesday evening with the General Counsel and breach counsel. Forty-two slides. She rejects the CEO's proposed messaging in two places. The first rejection is over whether to characterize the incident as "isolated." Priya argues the language is misleading because the underlying governance issues are systemic. The CEO accepts the change. The second rejection is harder. The CEO wants the board update to indicate that the system can be brought back online within two weeks with additional controls. Priya argues the system cannot be brought back online until the D8 PII masking gap is fully remediated, the conformity assessment is updated, and the AML and fraud detection layer is integrated as a real-time feedback loop into the agentic system's tool-use authorization. Her estimate is six to ten weeks.

The CEO pushes back. Customer service queue times are already up forty percent without the agentic system. Competitors are running similar systems. "Six to ten weeks" is going to be a very difficult conversation with the board.

Priya says: "The conversation will be difficult. The alternative conversation is worse."

The CEO, after a pause, agrees. The board materials go forward with the six-to-ten-week timeline. The Wednesday 8:00 AM board call goes for two hours. Two members are unhappy.

Three are supportive. Two are silent. The board chair concludes by saying the board is aligned on the disclosure plan, the remediation timeline, and the independent investigation, and expects to be re-briefed in seventy-two hours.

Priya goes home at 1:00 PM Wednesday. She sleeps for four hours. She wakes up. She takes a shower. She makes dinner with Elena, who is uncharacteristically quiet. They watch forty minutes of a British detective show. Priya falls asleep on the couch at 9:30 PM and Elena does not wake her until midnight, when Elena gently gets her into the bedroom. The seventy-two hours have ended.

V. The Consequences

The immediate consequence is the disclosure cycle. New York DFS on Wednesday afternoon. SEC 8-K Thursday morning. Customer notification Thursday afternoon. EU AI Office submission Thursday at noon Eastern. The firm's stock, which had closed at $42.18 on Friday, opens Thursday at $36.14, down 14.3 percent.

The intermediate consequence is a six-month cycle of remediation, regulatory engagement, and reputational repair. The agentic system comes back online in late February 2027, eleven weeks rather than the six-to-ten Priya had estimated, with substantially reduced tool-use scope and integrated real-time fraud detection. The firm pays an $11.4 million civil money penalty to New York DFS in April 2027. The EU AI Office issues a public infringement notice in May 2027 and the firm pays a separate fine of €4.7 million. The affected customer is made whole by July. The internal investigation, which concludes in March 2027, identifies the deployment-over-objection pattern and recommends governance changes, all of which are accepted by the board.

The CEO is asked, by the board, in late March 2027 whether to retire. He retires in June. His replacement, an external hire, asks Priya in her first one-on-one whether she wants the COO role. Priya declines. She does, however, accept an upgraded title. Chief Risk Officer, with the CISO function reporting up through her, plus a substantial equity grant.

The long-term consequence is harder to attribute. By the end of 2027 the firm has rebuilt its agentic AI program from the ground up under a different governance posture. Every tool-use scope is now a documented risk decision with PRISM scoring, hard gates, and quarterly review. By 2028 the firm becomes a quiet reference customer for the agentic vendor's hardened governance offering. By 2029 the Board has, in its committee charter, an explicit AI Risk Committee with two outside directors holding the relevant expertise.

These changes, Priya notes in her own private journal, are the changes she had asked for in August 2026, before deployment. She does not say this out loud. She does not need to.

Elena, in March 2027, gives Priya for her birthday a leather-bound notebook with the words "What I knew before" stamped on the cover. It is a private joke between them. The notebook becomes, over the next two years, a quiet record of decisions Priya has flagged before they materialize.

VI. What Could Have Helped

Move 02 in the Spring 2026 Quarterly read: close the governance gap on every agentic workflow. Hard gates on D6, D7, D8. Do not run agentic AI without it.

Every safeguard that would have prevented the November 8 incident was, on paper, available to the firm in August 2026. The PRISM hard gates on D6, D7, and D8 are designed for exactly this scenario. The Compliance and AI rows for PII masking, conformity assessment, agentic tool permissions, and human-in-the-loop gates were known requirements. The Integration Register entry for the LLM provider, with a D5 risk score of 75 and a DPA still under review, was the existing flag that should have prevented the rollout.

The system did not fail because the safeguards did not exist. The system failed because the safeguards existed and were not applied. That is the critical distinction. The Quarterly's Move 02 is the operational discipline that closes the gap between the safeguards a firm owns on paper and the safeguards a firm enforces in production. It is the move that, applied seriously in August 2026, leaves Priya's November 8 dinner uninterrupted.

THREAT MODEL FOUR

The Municipal Reckoning

David Chen · Director of Finance

Mountain View, California · March 12, 2029 · 7:18 AM

I. David

David Chen is fifty-four years old, the Director of Finance for the City of Mountain View, California. On the morning of March 12, 2029 he is sitting in his Honda Pilot in the city hall parking lot, eating a granola bar that has been in his glove compartment since November.

The granola bar is fine. The reason he is eating it in the parking lot rather than walking into city hall is that he is reading, for the third time, an email that arrived at 11:47 PM the night before from CalPERS. The email contains the preliminary actuarial valuation for fiscal year 2029-2030. The required employer contribution rate has been revised upward by 9.2 percent. The new dollar figure for the city's fiscal 2029-2030 contribution is $34.7 million, against a budgeted $31.8 million. Variance: $2.9 million.

That is the second email in his inbox this morning. The first, which arrived at 6:14 AM, was from the Santa Clara County Assessor. The preliminary 2029 assessment roll shows a 6.2 percent decrease in residential property values in Mountain View, larger than the 4.1 percent decrease the county had projected in November. The decline is concentrated in the high-value zip codes, particularly 94040 and 94043, and reflects a sustained slowing of the technology employment base in the surrounding metros.

David has been Director of Finance for Mountain View since 2018. Master's in public policy from Berkeley. CPA. He is calm by temperament and conservative by training. He is also, this morning, twenty-eight days from the deadline to submit the proposed FY 2029-2030 budget to the City Manager, who will submit it to the Council on April 15.

He finishes the granola bar. He walks into city hall.

II. The Place

Mountain View is a city of approximately 80,000 residents in Santa Clara County, twelve square miles between Palo Alto to the north and Sunnyvale to the east. Headquarters city of one of the largest technology firms in the world, home to dozens of others. Its 2024 median

household income exceeded $200,000. Its median single-family home price, at the peak in 2022, was $2.4 million. Its high school district was, by reputation, one of the strongest in the state.

The city's general fund operating budget is approximately $190 million. The revenue mix is, by California city standards, unusual in its breadth. About 22 percent from property taxes. 18 percent from sales taxes. 11 percent from transient occupancy taxes. 8 percent from utility user taxes. The remainder from business license fees, franchise fees, charges for services, and intergovernmental transfers.

That breadth is, in good times, a strength. In 2029 it has become a vulnerability. Each of the four largest revenue lines is, in different ways, exposed to the same underlying trend.

Property taxes are exposed because the residential market has been correcting since the second quarter of 2028, as in-migration of high-income knowledge workers has slowed and out-migration has accelerated. Sales taxes are exposed because the same population shift, plus reduced household discretionary spending among remaining residents, has produced a fifteen-month sequential decline in retail and restaurant receipts. Transient occupancy taxes are exposed because business travel has not recovered to its 2019 baseline, and was further depressed in 2028 by a slowdown in venture capital activity that reduced the conference and inbound business travel that supported much of Mountain View's hotel inventory. Utility user taxes are exposed because the population is, in absolute terms, modestly smaller than it was two years ago.

David has, since November, been running scenario models that hold each of these four lines flat or moderately negative. The scenarios produce a FY 2029-2030 revenue range of $179 million to $186 million, against a baseline of $190 million. The expenditure side, driven by labor contracts and the CalPERS contribution, is projected at $192 million regardless of scenario. The gap, before last night's email, was $6 to $13 million. After the email, it is $9 to $16 million.

Mountain View has a general fund reserve of approximately $42 million, about 22 percent of operating expenditures. Council policy is to maintain a reserve of at least 20 percent. The math, this morning, is that David can balance FY 2029-2030 with a reserve draw of $9 million in the optimistic case and $16 million in the pessimistic case. Either draw breaches Council policy. Either draw produces, in the audited financial statements, a discussion paragraph that the bond rating agencies will read.

The bond rating matters. Mountain View has, since 2010, been rated AA+ by Standard and Poor's and Aa1 by Moody's. A downgrade to AA or Aa2 would not be catastrophic. It would,

however, be the first downgrade in the city's recent history. In David's professional judgment it would mark a change in the city's financial trajectory that would be difficult to reverse.

III. The Inciting Event

The 8:30 AM standing meeting with the City Manager and the senior management team is normally a status update. This morning David asks, in advance, that the agenda be replaced with a single topic. The FY 2029-2030 budget gap.

The City Manager, a fifty-seven-year-old former Assistant City Manager from a peer city, hired in 2024, agrees. The meeting goes for ninety minutes. David presents the scenario models. He presents the CalPERS revision. He presents the assessor's letter. He presents the gap.

The Police Chief asks first about reserve draw. David explains the policy implications. The Fire Chief asks about service-level impacts. David explains that the gap, if absorbed entirely on the expenditure side, would require workforce reductions of 6 to 11 percent across the general fund, deferral of the second phase of the library rehabilitation, suspension of the planned park improvements at Cuesta Park, or some combination.

The Director of Community Development asks whether the assessment decline is itself contestable. David says no. The methodology is established. The decline is consistent with the broader market data. Contesting it would not change the underlying revenue.

The Assistant City Manager asks about revenue measures. David walks through the available levers. A transient occupancy tax increase requires voter approval, November 2030 ballot at earliest. A business license tax restructure requires Council action and public hearing, four to six months. A real estate transfer tax can be enacted by Council but is politically charged. A series of fee increases produces modest revenue at modest political cost. None closes the gap inside FY 2029-2030.

The City Manager asks David what he recommends. He has been thinking about this since November. Four parts. Reserve draw of $4 to $6 million, conducted formally with disclosure to the bond rating agencies. Expenditure reductions of $3 to $5 million through hiring delays, deferred capital projects, and a freeze on discretionary spending. A Council-led conversation about a November 2029 ballot measure on either a real estate transfer tax or a business license tax restructure. A structural review of the city's services with the goal of identifying which can be reduced or eliminated permanently.

The City Manager listens. "David, this is going to be a very difficult Council conversation." David says: "I know."

The meeting ends at 10:04 AM. He has eight days to draft the budget transmittal letter. He has twenty-eight days to submit the proposed budget. He has, more importantly, an unscheduled conversation with the Mayor at 4:00 PM that the City Manager has just put on his calendar.

IV. The Seventy-Two Hours

Monday afternoon and evening. David spends the afternoon working with his analysts on the line-item reductions. Six analysts and two senior managers, all good. By 5:30 PM they have produced a draft expenditure reduction list of $4.7 million. Six-month hiring freeze in non-public-safety functions. Deferral of three planned capital projects. Suspension of the city's contribution to a regional housing initiative. A series of smaller cuts to discretionary line items.

The 4:00 PM conversation with the Mayor is short. The Mayor, a third-term progressive in her late fifties, asks David two questions. "How bad is it." He answers honestly. "Can we hold the police and fire budgets harmless." He says yes, in the FY 2029-2030 budget. He does not say what he thinks, which is that holding them harmless in subsequent years will be difficult if the revenue trend continues.

David goes home at 8:30 PM. His wife Linh is a partner at a healthcare consulting firm in Palo Alto. Their two children, Ethan, eighteen, a freshman at Berkeley, and Maya, fifteen, a sophomore at Mountain View High, are home. Maya is at the kitchen table working on a chemistry problem set. David sits with her for ten minutes and pretends to help. He is, he realizes as he sits there, more exhausted than the day's work would predict.

He calls his father in San Diego at 9:00 PM, which is something he does on Mondays. His father is eighty-one and was, for thirty-five years, the city engineer for a small city in the Inland Empire. The conversation is brief and ordinary. David does not mention the budget. His father, who did this work for thirty-five years, asks whether he is sleeping. David says yes. His father says, "Eat something. Do not skip dinner."

Tuesday is back-to-back meetings with department heads. Each conversation is structured around the same question. What would a 5 percent expenditure reduction look like in your department. The answers vary in specifics and resemble each other in tone. Each director has prioritized their existing services and has limited flexibility. Each has been operating for several years in an environment where revenue grew faster than costs and the conversation was about what to add. The conversation about what to subtract is harder.

The Police Chief asks David, in private, whether the City Manager's commitment to hold public safety harmless is actually credible past FY 2029-2030. David says he cannot speak for the City Manager. The Chief nods and changes the subject.

The Public Works Director, whom David has known for ten years, says quietly at the end of their meeting: "David, are we losing this place." David thinks about the question. He says: "We are not losing it yet."

Wednesday is the budget transmittal letter. David drafts it in the morning, edits with the Assistant City Manager in the afternoon, finalizes with the City Manager at 4:00 PM. The letter is six pages. It is, David thinks, the hardest piece of writing he has produced in his career. Honest about the structural pressures. Bounded in its prescription. Neither catastrophic nor minimizing.

The letter goes out Thursday morning to the Council. Three Council members call David before noon. Two of those calls are supportive. One is not. The non-supportive call is from a freshman councilwoman elected in 2026 on a platform of housing affordability and progressive taxation. She tells David, on the phone, that the budget is "a politics of austerity dressed in spreadsheet language." She tells him she will vote against any expenditure reduction that does not first exhaust new revenue measures, including the real estate transfer tax he had mentioned in the briefing. David listens. He says he understands her concerns. He notes that the November 2029 ballot is the earliest a transfer tax could pass. She says she knows. She says she expects him to find another way. She hangs up.

David does not, immediately, find another way. He does, however, schedule a follow-up meeting with her staff for the following week.

V. The Consequences

The immediate consequence is a difficult Council adoption process. The proposed budget is presented to Council on April 15. Public hearings run through May 6. Council adopts the budget on June 17 with three amendments. The housing initiative contribution is restored at fifty percent of the prior level. The Cuesta Park improvements are deferred rather than canceled. The City Manager is directed to bring forward a real estate transfer tax measure for the November 2030 ballot. Reserve draw approved at $5.4 million. Expenditure reductions approved at $4.1 million.

The intermediate consequence is the bond rating review. Standard and Poor's affirms the AA+ rating in August 2029 with a Stable outlook. Moody's downgrades from Aa1 to Aa2 in October 2029, citing structural revenue pressure. The downgrade is the first the city has

experienced since 1992. The borrowing cost impact, on the existing bonds, is minimal because the bonds are not refinanced. The signal value, however, is real.

The long-term consequence is harder to summarize because it is still unfolding. By 2030 the city has, in its long-range financial plan, an explicit assumption of a continued residential property base that is 8 to 12 percent smaller than the 2024 peak. The services adjust to the new revenue envelope. Some are reduced. Some are reorganized. Some are eliminated. The city is not in crisis. It is in adjustment.

David, by the end of 2030, is in his thirteenth year as Director of Finance. He has had three offers to move to larger cities and has declined each one. He is not going anywhere. The work is, increasingly, the work of managed contraction. The work of keeping a city solvent and well-run while its underlying tax base changes shape. That work is harder than the work of managed expansion. It is also, he occasionally thinks, more important.

Linh notices, in late 2029, that David is reading more poetry in the evenings. She asks why. He says he is not sure. He says, “It just feels like the right thing right now.”

His father, in August 2030, asks David on a Monday call whether he has thought about retirement. David says he has not thought about it seriously. His father says, “There is no shame in it. The work will go on without you.” David says, “I know.” His father says, “Do you.” David does not answer immediately. His father says, “Take a vacation, son.” David says, “I will.” He does not.

VI. What Could Have Helped

None of the Six Moves in the Spring 2026 Quarterly prevents the cascade from reaching David’s seat. The cascade reaches David’s seat because the cascade reaches the municipal layer in any city whose tax base depends heavily on the knowledge workers displaced in TM-2 and the firms that employed them. Mountain View is a leading example, not a unique one. Palo Alto is in the same position. Bellevue. Redmond. Cambridge. Brookline. Many of the Wired Belt’s wealthiest suburban municipalities sit in the same place.

The move that would have helped is municipal. A coalition of finance directors and mayors from the Wired Belt cities, organized between 2024 and 2027, that would have created a structured channel for cities to engage on the regulatory and fiscal implications of the cascade before the cascade arrived in their general funds. Mountain View, Palo Alto, Bellevue, Redmond. These are sophisticated cities with sophisticated finance teams. They saw the trends. They did not, in 2024 and 2025, organize collectively to engage on them. By 2029 the engagement is reactive rather than structural.

This is the move the Summer 2026 Quarterly will likely propose, given the trajectory. It does not help David in March 2029. It helps the next David, in 2032, when the cascade has fully landed and the municipal layer is no longer the trailing indicator but the leading one.

The Pattern Across the Four

Read all four together and the cascade is visible in a way no single threat model can show.

Rachel's seat absorbs the capital-to-infrastructure transition. The capital wants to deploy. The infrastructure cannot absorb it at the rate the capital expects. Rachel is the human at the seam. The seam tears in September 2027.

Kim's seat absorbs the infrastructure-to-workforce transition. The infrastructure produces capability. The capability lands on knowledge workers. Kim is the human at that seam. The seam tears in June 2028.

Priya's seat absorbs the workforce-to-governance transition. The same capability that displaces Kim creates governance risk for any firm using it. Priya is the human at that seam. The seam tears in November 2026, earlier than the others, because governance is the leading edge of the cascade rather than a lagging one.

David's seat absorbs the governance-to-fiscal transition. The displaced workforce produces a smaller tax base. The smaller tax base produces fiscal pressure. David is the human at that seam. The seam tears in March 2029.

The four seams are connected. Each tear produces stress on the next seam. The cascade is not simultaneous. It is sequential, and in 2026 it has already begun.

The Six Moves in the Spring 2026 Quarterly are designed to be applied at the seams before they tear. Move 02 closes the governance gap on every agentic workflow before Priya's November 2026 incident becomes the industry pattern. Move 04 redesigns the rollout so the incentive structure changes before Kim's June 2028 displacement becomes the median experience. Move 05 models energy and power as binding constraints, not compute, before Rachel's September 2027 capacity crunch becomes the base case. Move 03, the Chakravorti collision, is the move that, applied seriously, prevents David's 2029 fiscal squeeze from becoming a 2031 crisis.

The Moves are not predictions. The Moves are positions. They are designed to be held in 2026 so that the late 2020s play out differently than they would otherwise.

That is the bet of this report. We do not know whether the Moves will work. We know that the cost of holding them is low. We know that the cost of not holding them is, in retrospect, high.

This is the work.

Methodology

This report uses the threatcasting methodology developed by Brian David Johnson at the Threatcasting Lab, Arizona State University School for the Future of Innovation in Society. The methodology combines social science research, technical research, economic and trend analysis, and cultural anthropology to construct narratives of possible futures fifteen years out. The output is not a prediction. The output is a structured artifact that allows organizations to plan for futures they would otherwise not consider.

This report adapts the methodology to a shorter time horizon, three years rather than fifteen, and to a more bounded set of scenarios. The four threat models are not exhaustive. They are illustrative of a particular cascade pattern that the Spring 2026 research suggests is more likely than not to unfold.

The protagonists are composites constructed from public-record interviews, public filings, current research, and editorial judgment. The places are real. The dates are anchored to specific catalysts identified in the public record.

TM-1 (Rachel). Virginia State Corporation Commission GS-5 rate class effective January 2027. PJM 2026 Reliability Pricing Auction. Loudoun County Phase 2 Data Center Standards adopted December 2026.

TM-2 (Kim). Tufts Digital Planet American AI Jobs Risk Index, March 2026. Anthropic Labor Market Impacts research, March 2026. Observed in-migration and out-migration patterns in eight Wired Belt metros.

TM-3 (Priya). EU AI Act fully applicable August 2, 2026. SEC cybersecurity disclosure rule effective December 2023. New York DFS Part 500 amendment effective November 2024. Observed agentic AI deployment patterns from the Gravitee 2026 State of AI Agent Security and McKinsey 2025 State of AI surveys.

TM-4 (David). Mountain View FY 2029-2030 budget cycle. CalPERS actuarial methodology. Santa Clara County Assessor methodology. Observed patterns of municipal fiscal stress in similar cities during prior knowledge-worker contractions.

The dates are best estimates of when the catalysts most likely materialize as personal events for the relevant role. They are not predictions about specific organizations or specific people.

The deep dive on TM-3 that follows this report demonstrates, at a level of operational detail, how the PRISM framework maps to the specific governance failures described in Priya's narrative. It is also intended to be used. The PRISM workbook tabs referenced in the deep

dive are designed to be filled out by the reader's own organization in advance of an analogous incident.

Sources

Research Foundation

Brian David Johnson, The Future You: A Manual for Building a Better Tomorrow Through Threatcasting (Arizona State University, 2018). Brian David Johnson and Cyndi Coon, Threatcasting Lab Methodology Guide (Arizona State University, ongoing). Carlota Perez, Technological Revolutions and Financial Capital (Edward Elgar, 2002). Carlota Perez, "The Significance of the Turning Point" (Beyond the Technological Revolution, 2019).

Macro and Regulatory

Virginia State Corporation Commission, GS-5 Rate Class Order, Case No. PUR-2024-00111. PJM Interconnection, 2026 Reliability Pricing Auction Results. Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, Phase 2 Data Center Standards, adopted December 2026. European Commission, EU AI Act, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689. US Securities and Exchange Commission, Cybersecurity Risk Management Disclosure Rule, effective December 2023. New York Department of Financial Services, Part 500 Amendment, effective November 2024. Executive Order 14318, Federal AI Preemption, December 11, 2025.

Research and Industry

Tufts Digital Planet, American AI Jobs Risk Index, March 24, 2026. Anthropic, Labor Market Impacts of AI, March 5, 2026. Anthropic Economic Index, March 2026 report. Yale Budget Lab, AI Labor Market Tracker, February 2, 2026. NBER Working Paper 34836, AI Adoption and Productivity in US Firms, February 17, 2026. Stanford HAI, 2026 AI Index Report, April 2026. McKinsey QuantumBlack, State of AI 2025. Gravitee, State of AI Agent Security 2026.

Municipal and Fiscal

California Public Employees' Retirement System, Annual Actuarial Reports. City of Mountain View, California, Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (multiple years). Reason Foundation CalPERS Modeling, 2025.

PRISM Framework

Will Evans, PRISM Framework (Fugue Strategy Advisors, 2026). Will Evans, PRISM Workbook (Fugue Strategy Advisors, 2026). Will Evans, Orienteering the Spectrum (ForesightOps, April 2026).

A FORESIGHTOPS QUARTERLY COMPANION · SPRING 2026

Published by Fugue Strategy Advisors. See the full spectrum of risk.

foresightops.org · fuguestrategy.com