Meeting Purpose:
Collaboratively develop topics, storylines and content for describing the consequences of little to no future investment over the next two decades. Meeting materials can be found here:
http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm

Welcome and Introductions:
Paul Massera and Lisa Beutler led the welcome and introductions.

Overview and Framing of Topic
Megan Fidell provided the overview and framing of the topic.

A stakeholder asked whether completely avoiding to invest in IWM at all is a realistic choice.
- Another stakeholder noted that because of Proposition 218 restrictions, not investing in IWM has become a choice because local agencies can’t fund what they want to accomplish.
- Another stakeholder noted that even in a worst-case scenario, water users will still pay rates and suggested a baseline of 80% of existing IWM investment.
- Paul Massera noted that the foregone investment scenario is intended to help educate the public about what we would avoid if we invested in IWM.
- Lisa Beutler noted that the main message is that “choosing not to investment in IWM is a choice, and it’s not free. Lisa Beutler recommended participants to imagine their own personal worst-case scenario.

Group Discussion
Plenary participants broke out into separate teams and identified risks, impacts, and other trade-offs, associated costs, and key drivers.
Flood Management
- Infrastructure reliability would suffer
- Increased risk of flooding, public health and safety
- Inefficiencies in dealing with public health
- Inability to deal with urgent safety issues
- Long term negative impacts to quality of life (flood recovery)
- Loss of economic growth and business vitality
- Decreased agricultural production
- Decreased agricultural recovery
- Inability to manage floodprone ecosystems

Built Infrastructure Water Supply and Quality
- More water supply crises and the need to respond to these crises
- Increased risk of fire, which would have impacts on flood management and public safety
- Possible water rationing
- Loss of businesses
- Loss of productivity
- Loss of species and habitat
- Difficulty in meeting regulatory requirements (if lack innovation)
- Annual costs will continue to increase (if lack innovation)
- Inability to deal with PCP’s or emergency constituents (if lack innovation)
- Out-of-State immigration (people would move out of State)
- Lack of holistic integration (everyone would be trying to put out their own fires individually, leading to overall loss of efficiency)

Climate Change Adaptation
- Sea-level rise (Potential references on this topic include the Bay Area Council and California Ocean Protection Council)
- Reduced water supply
- Loss of business vitality (e.g., salmon industry)
- Loss of coastal legacy communities
- Reduced recreational opportunities (e.g., skiing)
- Higher cost of doing business
- Missed opportunities for recruiting technology businesses
- Loss of cultural heritage (e.g., tribes)
- Increased likelihood for infectious disease outbreak
- Increased heat-related incidents
- Less water management flexibility between groundwater and reservoir storage

Ecosystems
- Greater disease outbreak
- Water quality declines
- Increased toxicity and bioaccumulation
- Geomorphic issues (e.g., trees on levees)
- Decreased quality of life (e.g., declining recreational values)
- Environmental justice issues (wealthy will continue to make investments, but non-wealthy will lack the resources)
- Micro vs. macroeconomics
- Loss of business vitality
- Loss of ecotourism
- Increases in invasive species occurrence
- Declines in habitat quantity and quality