

Dear Dr. Christa Kelleher,

We sincerely appreciate the time and effort you and the reviewers have dedicated to evaluating our manuscript. Below is our response to the minor change requested by Reviewer 1.

Sincerely,

Response to Reviewer 1

Overall, the authors addressed the reviewers' concerns sufficiently and I believe that the manuscript is much stronger and clearer as a result.

While I agree that having a downstream gage would add to the paper (I also mentioned that in my initial comments), I don't think that the work here should necessarily be discounted. I feel that the revised manuscript provides sufficient framing of their (limited) available data and objectives to justify the scope of their work and approach. I would encourage the authors to put the ET comparisons seen in the Author Response in the supplemental materials, and refer to them in the manuscript as they would be helpful in supporting the validity of the model.

[A supplemental file is uploaded which includes the ET results at OJP and FEN.](#)

- *The figures are referenced in the paper on Line 258.*