

The authors have done a thorough revision of the manuscript and the additional analysis has improved the database. The methods and results sections have much improved with the restructuring and the new stand-alone sections work better. However, I still think this is an unnecessarily long manuscript (51 pages versus the original 52 pages).

I only have a few minor comments:

I find Table 1 confusing. V1.0 lists a total of 22,743 dams, yet v1.1. lists GeoDAR v1.0 alone as 17,732 dams. I see that this is due to the overlap with Grand but that's not clear from the table. Perhaps add to the GeoDAR v1.0 alone (excluding Grand v1.3) or some similar note.

Line 105: nominal location is described as (i.e. descriptive information) but in line 127 this is better described as (such as the dam or reservoir address..). I think it would be better to reverse this and use this latter description at earliest use.

Line 224. "more than one record" or use "multiple records"

Line 340. Why (if possible)? Because not all of them could be found?

Line 957: if he/she uses. Use the neutral "they"