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Reviewer Comment - This paper is generally well-organized and well written, despite a smattering of grammatical errors that should be corrected fairly easily in the revision process. The analysis is sufficiently convincing and the insights are worthwhile. Moreover, the case for sociohydrology is well-made in light of what actually seems to be driving the loss of reservoir inflows.

Author Response: We thank the reviewer for his positive comments.

Reviewer Comment - However, this paper is simply too long. It is commendable the quantity of work that the authors have undertaken, but it does strain a reader to consume the quantity of verbiage presented.
Author Response We accept the reviewers’ critique. The reviewer follows this with specific recommendations to simplify the structure as follows: 1. A quick bullet-point of the hypothesis 2. A quick description of the data used to assess it 3. A brief description of the analytical technique chosen

We will restructure the paper as suggested.

Reviewer Comment - Page 28, 1st Paragraph. The authors are making a fair point regarding the flaws of assuming stationarity, but seem to be painting the literature as having uniformly ignored non-stationary hydrologic systems. Recent work has discussed changing hydro-climatic regimes in the US and elsewhere. Acknowledging these efforts would be appropriate.

Author Response: This is a fair critique. We will cite more of the recent work along these lines.

In addition the reviewer has suggested a number of specific edits and pointed out some typos. These will be addressed. We will address these individually when resubmitting after the changes to the structure have been made as this will involve rewriting parts of the paper.
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