MONTGOMERY
& ASSOCIATES
Water Resource Consultants

Demand Management Stages and Triggers:

Methods and Initial Stage Recommendations

MONTGOMERY & ASSOCIATES

1 OVERVIEW OF STAGES

The Demand Management (DM) Framework outlines 10 DM measures that could potentially be developed and activated to help the Salinas Valley manage groundwater sustainably. The DM Framework includes stages to help account for differences in subbasin and aquifer conditions, and to identify where and when DM may be a useful tool or may be needed to reach sustainability, depending on other projects and management actions underway. Stages are established for both long-term trends in groundwater conditions and identification of short-term groundwater level declines associated with droughts or disruptions in supply.

Stages—similar to levels of supply shortage—indicate the severity of groundwater conditions in each subbasin and classify groundwater level conditions relative to each subbasin's Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC). Although stages are defined at the subbasin scale to align with SGMA compliance requirements, DM measures may be applied to areas that are larger or smaller than a subbasin. Additional considerations may include land use, impact on beneficial uses and users, aquifer extents and connectivity, and the location of low groundwater levels. This structure allows the Framework to be applied across the Salinas Valley while accommodating the unique characteristics of individual subbasins or localized areas. Potential DM measures and recommended implementation areas will be evaluated and recommended to the SVBGSA Board in coordination with partner agencies, where appliable

Stages may be defined for long-term or short-term groundwater conditions. Long-term stages corresponding are assigned on a numerical scale from 0 to 4, with 0 indicating sustainable conditions now through the SGMA implementation period and 4 indicating a subbasin is at risk of being put on probation by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Consistent with the Groundwater Level SMC, an undesirable result (UR) in 1 aquifer constitutes an UR for the entire subbasin. However, the GSA may activate DM measures within a single aquifer or in areas that do not correspond to subbasin boundaries. Long-term stages are defined relative to SGMA sustainability goals for 2040 in the 180/400 Subbasin and 2042 in all other subbasins:

- Stage 0: Sustainable – No groundwater level URs; groundwater levels are consistently at measurable objectives (MOs)
- Stage 1: Close to sustainable, not at MO goals – UR in 0 or 1 out of 5 consecutive years; groundwater levels are not consistently at MOs
- Stage 2: URs in some years – URs in 2 out of 5 consecutive years
- Stage 3: At risk of being put on probation – URs in 3 or 4 out of 5 consecutive years
- Stage 4: Likely to be put on probation; consistent URs – URs in 5 out of 5 consecutive years

Short-term stages are only assessed if subbasins that are not already in Stage 3 or Stage 4 based on long-term conditions, since higher stages indicate a consistent effort is needed. These short-term assessments do not eliminate the potential need for lower-level DM measures associated with Stages 1 and 2. Instead, they help identify when short-term actions may be warranted to mitigate temporary declines in groundwater levels caused by short-term events, such as droughts, reduced reservoir releases, or interruptions in alternative water supplies.

Stages are determined based on an evaluation of triggers—long-term and short-term benchmarks—that help determine the appropriate stage for each subbasin. Once a stage is established, corresponding DM measures will consider geographic scale, economic implications, and expected groundwater benefits. Lower stages reflecting more sustainable conditions generally require less intensive measures. Higher stages indicating unsustainable conditions may necessitate more stringent or mandatory actions.

2 TRIGGERS

Assessment of subbasin stages is based on a set of 7 long-term and short-term triggers that serve as quantifiable thresholds to guide stage designation and identify when specific DM measures may be warranted. Three long-term triggers are generally evaluated every 5 years—such as during GSP periodic updates— to help identify aquifers and subbasins that will likely not meet their SGMA groundwater level SMC goals if no additional project or management actions (PMAs) are pursued. Four short-term triggers are evaluated annually to capture temporary conditions. These short-term triggers identify current or likely deterioration in groundwater conditions, and any associated measures are intended to be activated and rescinded quickly.

The 3 long-term triggers are:

- **Projected 2040/2042 SGMA Compliance**: SGMA requires each subbasin to achieve sustainability by 2040 (180/400 Subbasin) or 2042 (all other subbasins). Repeated URs by these deadlines may result in the SWRCB putting the subbasin on probation. To account for hydrologic variation, triggers are based on the number of URs within a consecutive 5-year period. Groundwater modeling—the primary tool for demonstrating progress toward sustainability under SGMA—is used to assess the severity of future groundwater conditions if current extraction continues.
- **Observed Data Compared to SMC**: Observed groundwater levels show whether experienced conditions align with conditions anticipated in projected groundwater modeling. Modeling may include PMAs that are underway, so the stage reflects the remaining effort needed.
- **Projected Inter-subbasin Impacts**: SGMA requires that implementation of a GSP in 1 subbasin does not adversely affect another subbasin's ability to achieve or maintain its sustainability goal. This trigger identifies situations where increased pumping in 1 subbasin contributes to URs in another, ensuring that responsibility for addressing those impacts does not fall solely on the affected subbasin.

Table 1 sets forth the criteria for each stage according to the 3 triggers. Evaluation of long-term triggers results in a single recommended stage for each subbasin. If triggers indicate different stages, staff and consultants will review the data, consider the intent of each stage, and recommend 1 stage to the Board. These recommendations do not directly activate any DM measures; rather, they are intended to help guide GSA decision making regarding which measures may be appropriate and where they should be applied. Recommendations may also include additional context such as aquifer-specific conditions, effect of hydrologic variability, or results that do not align with subbasin boundaries. The evaluation will also document data limitations and any spatial clustering of groundwater levels below minimum thresholds (MTs).

If long-term triggers place a subbasin in Stage 3 or 4, substantial measures are likely needed unless other PMAs are being pursued to improve conditions, and these measures are expected to be applied for multiple years. In such cases, short-term triggers are generally not evaluated unless a significant short-term event occurs—like an alternative supply shortage—prompting additional assessment.

For subbasins in long-term Stages 0 through 2, short-term triggers are evaluated each April following submission of annual reports. These triggers provide early identification of conditions that may warrant activation of DM measures. The design of DM measures must therefore account for the need to activate the measures quickly and de-activate them once conditions improve. Only the triggers applicable to a given subbasin will be considered:

- **Reservoir Releases**: For the Forebay and Upper Valley Subbasins, if MCWRA's Drought Technical Advisory Committee (D-TAC) convenes to recommend a schedule and if storage has not met the combined or individual MTs by March 31.
- **Groundwater Levels**: In the Upper Valley or Forebay Subbasin, if 30% or more of RMS wells observed the previous fall have levels lower than 755 of the vertical distance from the MT to the measurable objective.
- **Precipitation in Rural Residential Areas**: For the northern 180/400 and Langley Subbasins (Watsonville gage) and El Toro (Salinas Airport gage), if April through March precipitation is at least 20 percent below the historical average for 2 consecutive years.
- **Alternative Supplies**: If alternative supplies are projected to be reduced or unavailable.

Table 1 summarizes the short- and long-term triggers for each stage. The stages and triggers establish a flexible, phased, and adaptive approach to DM that can prioritize lower-cost measures early.

Table 1. DM Framework Triggers

Stage:	(0) Sustainable	(1) Close to sustainable, not at MO goals	(2) URs in some years	(3) At risk of being put on probation	(4) Likely probation - consistent URs
Long-Term Triggers					
Projected 2040/2042 SGMA Compliance	No URs, consistently at MOs	UR in 0 or 1 out of 5 years, not consistently at MOs	UR in 2 out of 5 years	UR in 3 or 4 out of 5 years	UR in 5 out of 5 years
Observed Conditions Compared to SMC	No URs, consistently at MOs	UR in 0 or 1 out of 5 years, not consistently at MOs	UR in 2 of the last 5 years [unless project under development]	UR in 3 or 4 of the last 5 years [unless project under development]	UR in 5 of the last 5 years [unless project under development]
Projected Inter-subbasin Impact			If increase in pumping causes an UR in another subbasin in 1 out of 5 years	If increase in pumping causes URs in another subbasin in 2 out of 5 years	If increase in pumping causes URs in another subbasin in 3+ out of 5 years
Short-Term Triggers					
Reservoir Releases				D-TAC convened	Second year after D-TAC convened
Groundwater Levels				Groundwater levels are lower than 75% of the vertical distance from the MT to MO for >30% RMS wells	
Precipitation (rural residential)				Precipitation at 20% below historical average by April 1st for 2+ consecutive years	
Areas with Alternative Supply			Alternative supply projected to be reduced	Alternative supply projected to be not available	

2.1 Trigger Evaluation Methods

2.1.1 Long-term Trigger Evaluation Method

Long-term triggers are evaluated every 5 years or sooner if conditions warrant it, such as significant land use or cropping changes that indicate pumping may increase significantly.

Evaluation for each long-term trigger includes the following:

- **Projected 2040/2042 SGMA Compliance**: The groundwater level SMC will be evaluated based on a projected baseline groundwater modeling simulation. The baseline simulates current conditions into the future to understand if land use—and therefore agricultural pumping—were to remain at steady rates and how groundwater levels would compare to the SMC. Groundwater levels below MTs will be assessed in each simulated year and adjusted to better match observed if needed, and the number of URs out of 5 consecutive years will be assessed on a rolling basis from 2040 to 2050 to assess projected SGMA compliance over years with unknown hydrologic variability.
- **Observed Data Compared to SMC**: Similar to the projected conditions, observed conditions will be assessed based on the URs over a consecutive 5-year period at Representative Monitoring Site (RMS) wells. As SGMA advances into implementation, these will be done on a similar rolling 5-year basis to account for hydrologic variability.
- **Projected Inter-subbasin Impacts**: To evaluate if increases in pumping in a subbasin are likely to cause additional URs in another subbasin, if there are indications of pumping increases or land use changes that would increase pumping, those increases will be simulated in the model. The URs will be assessed in the same way as in the Projected SGMA Compliance trigger and compared to those baseline results to determine if the pumping caused additional URs.

Each long-term trigger is assessed separately. If triggers point to different stages, the underlying data and percentage of groundwater levels below MTs will be reviewed and a recommendation will be made based on the stage that best matches the intent of the stages. The evaluation should:

1. Confirm data availability and check for data uncertainty and/or lack of sufficient data; for example, if few wells were able to be monitored in a particular year.
2. Asses the groundwater model calibration at individual wells that are projected to have groundwater levels near the MTs.
3. Consider hydrologic conditions for long-term trigger with observed data by reviewing if the 5-year period was representative of average hydrologic conditions and comparing to other 5-year periods.

4. Check for clustering of groundwater levels below MTs in a part of the subbasin. Review of wells should consider stratigraphy and hydrographs of monitoring wells.

2.1.2 Short-term Trigger Evaluation Method

If a subbasin is not in stages 3 or 4 according to the long-term trigger evaluation, short-term triggers will be assessed. Applicable short-term triggers vary by subbasin.

For the Forebay and Upper Valley Subbasins, each year in April after annual reports have been completed, evaluate if either of the following are true, which would trigger actions to address short-term groundwater elevation declines:

- **Reservoir releases:** MCWRA convened the Drought Technical Advisory Committee (D-TAC) to develop and recommend a reservoir release schedule for the upcoming conservation release season, and if at any time prior to March 31st the actual reservoir storage volumes have not equaled or exceeded the D-TAC combined or individual minimum storage thresholds.
- **Groundwater levels:** 30 percent or more of RMS wells in either the Upper Valley or Forebay Subbasin had water levels the previous fall (November/December) that were lower than 75 percent of the vertical distance from the MT to the measurable objective for that well.

If either of these triggers is met, the evaluation should:

1. Confirm data availability.
2. Check groundwater elevations in alternative RMS wells to confirm if similar groundwater elevation patterns are observed in those wells, too.
3. Evaluate whether the low water levels are distributed throughout the subbasin or are concentrated in a cluster of wells. The evaluation of clustering is subjective and will consider stratigraphy and include a review of the hydrographs of each well in the potential cluster to look for common patterns. The cluster evaluation will inform the recommendation: if low water levels appear to be a local problem, then management measures might also be local.

For the Langley Subbasin, which is primarily dependent on precipitation to replenish the groundwater basin, the following short-term trigger will be evaluated in April, after completion of the annual reports:

- **Precipitation:** Precipitation at 20% below historical average by April 1 for 2+ consecutive years

If that trigger is met, similar to the other short-term triggers, data availability and hydrographs of the RMS should be reviewed.

The short-term trigger for areas with an alternative supply is intended to acknowledge that short-term supply shortages may cause an increase in extraction and decline in groundwater levels that would require quick action to address, similar to the other short-term triggers. While important to include this trigger, further work is needed to consider how areas with an alternative supply are addressed with respect to DM. Therefore, at this time, the short-term trigger for areas with an alternative supply is a placeholder.

2.2 Initial Evaluation of Triggers and Recommendation of Stages

2.2.1 Stages According to Long-term Triggers

Long-term Trigger: Projected 2040/2042 SGMA Compliance

Projected SGMA compliance is evaluated based on the projected baseline model simulation conducted with the Salinas Valley Operational Model (SVOM). The projected baseline model continues current land use into the future—and therefore approximately the same amount of agricultural water use—and includes urban extraction corresponding with projections by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). It repeats the historical hydrology and does not add climate change projections. The SVOM simulates precipitation and surface water inflows with a watershed model and simulates reservoir releases according to MCWRA operational rules for the reservoirs. More details on the SVOM will be made available in a forthcoming technical memorandum.

Table 2 shows the RMS wells with groundwater levels below MTs, by subbasin and aquifer, from the baseline scenario. Groundwater levels are calculated as the simulated November 30 groundwater level compared to the MT. Only wells that were able to reproduce water level trends in the historical model and are screened in the appropriate aquifer are included in this analysis. Table 3 shows a 5-year rolling average of percentage of wells below MTs based on projected modeling. URs occur when 15% or more of the wells in a given year drop below their respective MT, or 20% in the El Toro Primary Aquifer System.

By 2040, the 180/400 Subbasin is projected to have URs in all years due to all 3 aquifers, with the Deep Aquifers groundwater levels below MTs for all RMS wells. Projected model results show URs occurring in the Eastside Subbasin every year after 2035. In Forebay, URs only occur in drier years but groundwater levels are generally above MTs in non-dry years. All wells in the Monterey Subbasin's El Toro Primary Aquifer System are projected to be below their MTs. The long-term projected conditions for the El Toro Primary Aquifer System will also be reevaluated with the forthcoming updated version of the Seawater Intrusion Model, which is anticipated to

have better calibration than the SVIHM and previous version of the SWIM in that area. Projected model results in the Langley Subbasin are still under review and are excluded from this analysis due to irregulate groundwater level trends due to the fractured granite bedrock in this area.

Table 2. Projected Percentage of RMS Wells Below MT based on Baseline Simulation

Subbasin	Percent of RMS Wells Below MT						
	Green cells indicate no UR			*Green cells indicate no UR*			
	180/400			Eastside	Forebay	Upper Valley	Monterey
Aquifer	180-Foot Aquifer	400-Foot Aquifer	Deep Aquifers	Basin Fill	Basin Fill	Basin Fill	El Toro Primary Aquifer System
2036	52%	57%	100%	48%	3%	7%	100%
2037	8%	23%	100%	24%	0%	7%	100%
2038	4%	17%	100%	17%	0%	7%	100%
2039	12%	23%	100%	34%	0%	7%	100%
2040	60%	60%	100%	55%	3%	7%	100%
2041	92%	71%	100%	72%	32%	13%	100%
2042	100%	86%	100%	86%	35%	13%	100%
2043	92%	80%	100%	93%	47%	13%	100%
2044	40%	46%	100%	79%	3%	7%	100%
2045	60%	54%	100%	83%	6%	7%	100%
2046	72%	63%	100%	83%	12%	7%	100%
2047	80%	77%	100%	100%	15%	7%	100%
2048	44%	51%	100%	72%	3%	7%	100%
2049	28%	51%	100%	72%	3%	7%	100%
2050	12%	26%	100%	45%	0%	7%	100%

Table 3. Five-year Rolling Average of Percentage of Wells Below MTs Based on Baseline Simulation

Subbasin	Number of URs in 5-year Period						
	180/400			Eastside	Forebay	Upper Valley	Monterey
Aquifer	180-Foot Aquifer	400-Foot Aquifer	Deep Aquifers	Basin Fill	Basin Fill	Basin Fill	El Toro Primary Aquifer System
2036-2040	2	5	5	5	0	0	5
2037-2041	2	5	5	5	1	0	5
2038-2042	3	5	5	5	2	0	5
2039-2043	4	5	5	5	3	0	5
2040-2044	5	5	5	5	3	0	5
2041-2045	5	5	5	5	3	0	5
2042-2046	5	5	5	5	2	0	5
2043-2047	5	5	5	5	1	0	5
2044-2048	5	5	5	5	0	0	5
2045-2049	5	5	5	5	0	0	5
2046-2050	4	5	5	5	0	0	5

Long-term Trigger: Observed Data Compared to SMC

Long-term triggers are evaluated based on data through Water Year 2024. Table 4 shows the percentage of RMS wells below MTs from 2018 through 2024 by subbasin aquifer. Values use wells in the current monitoring networks, which provides a clearer picture of current stage classification. Percentages are based only on wells sampled in a given year. Because new wells have been added since earlier annual reports, results here will differ from those reports. Groundwater levels compared to MTs were back-dated to 2018 to show how results vary over different 5-year periods.

When the percentage of wells below the MT meets the definition of an UR (more than 20% in Monterey and 15% elsewhere), the cell is shaded light red. Cells are shaded light green when there was or would have been no UR.

Table 5 shows 3 periods of 5 consecutive years:

- 2018–2022, which ends in 3 consecutive dry years
- 2019–2023, which includes 3 dry years followed by a wet year
- 2020–2024, which ends in 2 wet years

The Deep Aquifers in the 180/400 Subbasin had URs in every year, and the El Toro Primary Aquifer System in the Monterey Subbasin in all but 1 year, both of which correspond with Stage 4. The 180-Foot and 400-Foot Aquifers had URs in the 2 driest years. The Eastside Subbasin had URs in either 3 or 4 out of 5 years, which corresponds with Stage 3. The Forebay and Upper Valley Subbasins had no URs during this time period; however, the Upper Valley came close in 4 years. Langley had URs every other year. Groundwater levels in this subbasin tend to be irregular due to the fractured bedrock in this area.

Table 4. Observed Percentage of RMS Wells Below MT

Subbasin	Percent of RMS Wells Below MT							
	Green cells indicate no UR			*Red cells indicate UR*				
	180/400			Eastside	Forebay	Upper Valley	Monterey	Langley
Aquifer	180-Foot Aquifer	400-Foot Aquifer	Deep Aquifers	Basin Fill	Basin Fill	Basin Fill	El Toro Primary Aquifer System	Aromas Sands
2018 (Dry)	13%	11%	86%	8%	0%	6%	20%	18%
2019 (Wet)	0%	14%	75%	6%	0%	6%	56%	0%
2020 (Dry-Normal)	10%	14%	75%	17%	0%	7%	55%	21%
2021 (Dry)	17%	25%	88%	23%	0%	13%	80%	15%
2022 (Dry-Normal)	39%	47%	79%	48%	3%	13%	75%	33%
2023 (Wet)	3%	12%	77%	24%	0%	13%	82%	8%
2024 (Wet-Normal)	7%	12%	80%	12%	0%	13%	50%	29%

Note: GSP Implementation did not begin in the Monterey, Langley, Eastside, Forebay, and Upper Valley Subbasins until WY 2021. These values do not match Annual Reports because wells have been added to the monitoring networks since development of Annual Reports, reference point elevations have been updated, and this table evaluates all wells currently in the networks and generates percentages based on only the number of wells sampled in any given year.

Table 5. Five-year Rolling Average of Percentage of RMS Wells Below MT

Subbasin	Number of URs in 5-year Period							
	180/400			Eastside	Forebay	Upper Valley	Monterey	Langley
Aquifer	180-Foot Aquifer	400-Foot Aquifer	Deep Aquifers	Basin Fill	Basin Fill	Basin Fill	El Toro Primary Aquifer System	Aromas Sands
2018-2022	2	2	5	3	0	0	4	3
2019-2023	2	2	5	4	0	0	5	2
2020-2024	2	2	5	4	0	0	5	3

Long-term Trigger: Projected Inter-subbasin Impacts

In recent years, WY 2023 and 2024, extraction has been below the historical average in all subbasins. In addition, some land has been taken out of production. Therefore, additional scenarios with higher extraction were not evaluated. This may be reconsidered at any point there is an indication that extraction in a subbasin will increase.

Recommendation of Subbasin Stages

Table 6 summarizes the results from the evaluation of long-term triggers and the stage recommendation. Based on these evaluations of long-term triggers, it is recommended that the subbasins be in the following stages:

- **180/400 Subbasin – Stage 4 –** The 180/400 Subbasin has had URs in all years since SGMA annual reporting began due to the Deep Aquifers, and it is projected to have URs every year after 2040, which places the subbasin in Stage 4. The 180-Foot and 400-Foot Aquifers also had URs in some years and projected modeling shows increases in URs as groundwater levels decline over time, particularly in the 400-Foot Aquifer.
- **Eastside Subbasin – Stage 3 –** The Eastside Subbasin had URs in 3 or 4 out of 5 years; however, declining groundwater level trends are projected to continue and cause it to have URs every year after 2035.
- **Corral de Tierra Area of the Monterey Subbasin – Stage 4 –** The El Toro Primary Aquifer System has had URs in every year since 2019 and is projected to continue to have URs after 2042.
- **Langley Subbasin – Stage 1** – The Langley Subbasin has had 2 or 3 URs since GSP submittal, with the calculation based on number of wells monitored in a given year, not total RMS wells. Results from the projected groundwater modeling are still under review, as the fractured bedrock in the Subbasin introduces uncertainty into the groundwater modeling. Until that is complete, it is recommended that Langley be in Stage 2 according to recent groundwater conditions.
- **Forebay Subbasin – Stage 2 –** The Forebay Subbasin has not had any observed URs; however, it has had slowly declining groundwater level trends. Projected groundwater modeling shows it could have 0, 1, 2, or 3 years of URs out of 5 years; however, those only occur in or shortly after dry years and relate to the climate sequence in the projected modeling; however, the actual sequence of wet and dry years is unknown. It is recommended that the Forebay Subbasin be in Stage 1 at this point; however, if groundwater level declines are not addressed, action may be needed. Additional analyses should be conducted when considering PMAs to assess the extent to which short-term measures in dry years will likely alter the projection of URs.
- **Upper Valley Subbasin – Stage 1 –** The Upper Valley has not had any URs since GSP submittal and is not projected to have any after 2042. However, groundwater levels dip during periods of low river flow and groundwater levels are not fully at measurable objectives, which places the subbasin in Stage 1.

Next steps could include estimation of the amount of pumping reductions needed to reach sustainability in DM is pursued as the only strategy, assessment of the economic impacts of potential DM measures, and consideration of other PMA options.

Table 6. Stage Recommendations Based on Long-term Triggers

Subbasin	Long-term Trigger Stage Evaluations (URs in 5 consecutive years)			Stage Recommendation
	Projected SGMA Compliance	Observed Conditions	Projected Intersubbasin Impact	
180/400 Subbasin	4 (URs in 5/5 years)	4 (URs in 5/5 years)	N/A	4
Eastside Subbasin	4 (URs in 5/5 years)	3 (URs in 3-4/5 years)	N/A	3
Monterey Subbasin – Corral de Tierra Area	4 (URs in 5/5 years)	4 (URs in 5/5 years)	N/A	4
Langley Subbasin	Under assessment	2-3 (URs in 2-3/5 years)	N/A	2
Forebay Subbasin	1-3 (URs in 0, 1, 2, or 3/5 years)	1 (URs in 0/5 years, not consistently at MOs)	N/A	1
Upper Valley Subbasin	1 (URs in 0/5 years, not consistently at MOs)	1 (URs in 0/5 years, not consistently at MOs)	N/A	1

2.2.2 Stage Acceleration According to Short-term Triggers

The Forebay, Upper Valley, and Langley Subbasins are not in Stages 3 or 4 according to long-term triggers; therefore, short-term triggers are evaluated annually each April. While short-term triggers do not alter the long-term stage designations, which reflect multi-year trends, they may accelerate, or bump, a subbasin to a higher stage when conditions warrant. As shown in Table 7, based on the most recent year of data from WY 2024, none of the short-term triggers indicate a need for such an acceleration. In effect, short-term conditions do not indicate the need for DM measures beyond those corresponding to the stages identified based on long-term triggers.

Table 7. Stage Recommendations Based on Short-term Triggers

Subbasin	Short-term Trigger Stage Evaluations for WY 2024				Short-term Stage Acceleration
	Reservoir Releases	Groundwater Levels	Precipitation	Areas of Alternative Supply	
Forebay Subbasin	0 - DTAC not convened	0 - Threshold not exceeded	N/A	N/A	No stage accelerations
Upper Valley Subbasin	0 - DTAC not convened	0 - Threshold not exceeded	N/A	N/A	No stage accelerations
Langley Subbasin	N/A	N/A	0 - Precipitation not below 20%	N/A	No stage accelerations