Page 1, Lines 15-20: I think the "should" in "stakeholders should accept the risk…" should be changed to "could." This implies a possible choice in a more neutral way.

Page 2, line 5: Do the authors really mean "underutilization" here? This implies that there are good reasons to use GCM projections more, but practitioners choose not to use them despite this. I suggest rephrasing to "less utilization of GCM-led strategies" unless I have misunderstood.

Introduction is much clearer and makes sense. I'm still not sold on whether logistic regression is actually makes sense given their argument that a stochastic metric would be too computationally expensive to evaluate across the response surface.

Page 6: Is "instreamflows" the correct spelling here? Perhaps "instream flows"?

Page 6, line 14-17: Could also be interesting to perturb demand across a wider range of uncertainty, but I understand there are limits.

Page 7, line 15 - Page 8, line 6: So only one stochastic series was really generated, then it was perturbed in 539 flavors of precipitation CV, mean, and mean temperature? The explanation of the logistic model on Page 8 lines 4-6 is jarringly brief- perhaps mention that the model is described in more detail further on. This section also needs clearer explanation of exactly what the weather generator simulations were here (i.e., there was only one sampled time series) for those who are not already familiar with it.

Page 7, line 29-Page 8, line 6: Please say from the beginning how long each simulated weather series is. Based on Page 9, it looks like each weather series is 20 years long. The phrasing on page 7- "three bidecadal properties"- is confusing. The reader may interpret that to mean that the time series is longer than a decade, and each of the properties is calculated twice a decade- or the series is even longer and the property is calculated every 20 years, or for 20 random years within a longer time series. Please state clearly that the stochastic simulation was 20 years long, and that the properties are calculated based on the entire perturbed series.

Page 7, line 29-Page 8, line 6: The range of climate change evaluated here is VERY wide, to the point that it might be preferable to refine the change increments (e.g. 5% change instead of 10% change) to get a better idea of the response surface.

Page 8, line 29: Please change "539 stochastic weather sets" to "539 climate-altered versions of the stochastic weather simulation" if that accurately describes the set.

Page 9, line 30: "20-year" is much clearer than "bidecadal" (Page 7)

Page 14, lines 1-19: This strengthens the paper, but belongs in the "Results" section with more detail about the analysis. For example, were there really 300 stochastic simulations, or 100 stochastic simulations that were perturbed to match each of the three climate perturbation examples? What was the range of deviation between the logistic model's prediction and risk evaluated through the 100 simulations? Did the logistic model's skill vary substantially among the three climate perturbation examples? This analysis is what convinces the reader that the

paper's main technical contribution could be worthwhile, so I suggest the authors elaborate on the results of this analysis as suggested above.

I also suggest that the authors replace this space with a discussion of the analysis. What are the implications of the logistic model's predictive skill relative to that evaluated through the stochastic simulations for water management? What would a water manager think about this-when would a computationally efficient logistic model be worthwhile despite the less rigorous exploration of internal climate variability? What would the authors say to a water manager about applying the results of this analysis to the water manager's work? How would the authors advise other practitioners applying this logistic model- would they suggest a similar validation of the logistic results against an in-depth exploration of a few scenarios?

Figure 9: There were 100 simulations at three locations- shouldn't there be 300 points on this plot? It does not look like there are. Please add more information to the caption- the readers should understand what they are being shown here. The caption should include the three climate perturbations the points come from and list the number of points.