## 1 Supplemental material

## People and water: Exploring the social-ecological condition of watersheds of the United States

- 4 Murray W. Scown<sup>1,\*</sup>, Joseph E. Flotemersch<sup>2</sup>, Trisha L. Spanbauer<sup>3</sup>, Tarsha Eason<sup>4</sup>, Ahjond
- 5 Garmestani<sup>4</sup>, and Brian C. Chaffin<sup>5</sup>
- <sup>6</sup> <sup>1</sup>Formerly, ORISE Participant Research Program, U.S. EPA, Cincinnati, Ohio, US; currently, Lund
- 7 University Centre for Sustainability Studies, Lund, Sweden
- 8 <sup>2</sup>National Exposure Research Laboratory, U.S. EPA, Cincinnati, Ohio, US
- 9 <sup>3</sup>NRC Research Associate, U.S. EPA, Cincinnati, Ohio, US
- <sup>4</sup>National Risk Management Research Laboratory, U.S. EPA, Cincinnati, Ohio, US
- <sup>5</sup>College of Forestry & Conservation, University of Montana, Missoula, Montana, US
- 12 \*Corresponding author: <u>murray.scown@lucsus.lu.se</u>
- 13
- 14
- 15





18 Figure S1A. Scree plot of variance in mean county IWI (adjusted r squared) explained by each

19 Moran's Eigenvector Map (MEM). Vertical line indicates inflection point chosen as maximum





21

22 Figure S1B. Scree plot of variance in county HWBI (adjusted r squared) explained by each Moran's



24 MEMs to include in further analysis.



27 Figure S2A. Boxplot of mean county IWI scores within each level II ecoregion ordered by median.

28 Shading indicates a significant effect in the spatial regression model. Dark line represents the median,

29 box represents the first and third quartile, the whiskers represent +/- 1.58 times the quotient of

30 interquartile range divided by  $\sqrt{n}$ , and the dots are values outside of this range. Also refer to Figure

31 S2D for map of significant ecoregions.





33 Figure S2B. Boxplot of mean county IWI scores within each industry-dependence category ordered by

34 median. Shading indicates a significant effect in the spatial regression model. Dark line represents the

35 median, box represents the first and third quartile, the whiskers represent +/- 1.58 times the quotient of

36 interquartile range divided by  $\sqrt{n}$ , and the dots are values outside of this range. Also refer to Figure

37 S2E for map of significant industry-dependence classes.



39 Figure S2C. Boxplot of mean county IWI scores within each state ordered by median. Shading

40 indicates a significant effect in the spatial regression model. Dark line represents the median, box

41 represents the first and third quartile, the whiskers represent +/- 1.58 times the quotient of interquartile

42 range divided by  $\sqrt{n}$ , and the dots are values outside of this range.



- 45 Figure S2D. Map highlighting the nine ecoregions that had a significant negative effect on mean IWI
- 46 in the spatial regression models. Shading from dark to light based on lowest to highest median IWI
- 47 among counties in these nine ecoregions.



- 50 Figure S2E. Map highlighting the four industries that had a significant effect on mean IWI in the
- 51 spatial regression models. Shading from red to blue based on lowest to highest median IWI among
- 52 counties in these industry-dependence classes.



55 Figure S3A. Boxplot of county HWBI scores within each level II ecoregion ordered by median.

56 Shading indicates a significant effect in the spatial regression model. Dark line represents the median,

57 box represents the first and third quartile, the whiskers represent +/- 1.58 times the quotient of

interquartile range divided by  $\sqrt{n}$ , and the dots are values outside of this range.





Figure S3B. Boxplot of county HWBI scores within each industry-dependence category ordered by median. Shading indicates a significant effect in the spatial regression model. Dark line represents the median, box represents the first and third quartile, the whiskers represent +/- 1.58 times the quotient of interquartile range divided by  $\sqrt{n}$ , and the dots are values outside of this range.





Figure S3C. Boxplot of county HWBI scores within each state ordered by median. Shading indicates a significant effect in the spatial regression model. Dark line represents the median, box represents the first and third quartile, the whiskers represent +/- 1.58 times the quotient of interquartile range divided by  $\sqrt{n}$ , and the dots are values outside of this range.

73



76 Figure S4. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (rho) for mean county IWI against county HWBI

and subindex scores for the conterminous U.S. Subindex names from left to right are activism, air

78 quality, capital investment, communication, community and faith-based initiatives, consumption,

reducation services, emergency preparedness, employment, family services, finance, food and fiber

80 provisioning, greenspace, healthcare, innovation, justice, labor, production, public works,

81 redistribution, water quality, and water quantity (see Summers et al., 2014 for details on HWBI

82 subindices). Positive correlation coefficients indicate a positive relationship, negative coefficients

83 indicate a negative relationship.

84

75

85

86





89 Figure S5. Shannon's Diversity Index of county industry-dependence within each state (left axis) and







- 93 Figure 3 and discussed in the text. Subindex names from left to right are capital investment,
- 94 consumption, education services, employment, finance, innovation, production, and redistribution (see
- 95 Summers et al., 2014 for details on HWBI subindices).



97 Figure S6B. HWBI social service subindex scores for counties of particular regions highlighted in

98 Figure 3 and discussed in the text. Subindex names from left to right are activism, communication,

99 community and faith-based initiatives, education services, emergency preparedness, family services,

100 healthcare, justice, labor, and public works (see Summers et al., 2014 for details on HWBI

101 subindices).



102

Figure S6C. HWBI ecosystem service subindex scores for counties of particular regions highlighted in
 Figure 3 and discussed in the text. Subindex names from left to right are air quality, food and fiber

105 provisioning, greenspace, water quality, and water quantity (see Summers et al., 2014 for details on

<sup>106</sup> HWBI subindices).