<u>Sociodemographics</u>

<u>*Age*</u>
The sample included participants from six of the seven 10-year age ranges that were eligible options in the survey. As seen in Table 1, the two most common age ranges for participants were 30-39 years and 50-59 years, with 5 participants, or one third of all participants, falling into each age range.

Age (years)	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80 and older
Frequency	1	5	1	5	1	2	0
Percentage	6.67%	33.33%	6.67%	33.33%	6.67%	13.33%	0.00%

Table 1: Sociodemographic statistics on the ages of participants.

<u>*Language*</u>
As seen in Table 2, almost all (14 out of 15) survey participants entered English as the sole primary language they use, with one participant leaving the question blank.

Language	English	No answer
Frequency	14	1
Percentage	93.33%	6.67%

Table 2: Sociodemographic statistics on the primary language(s) used by participants.

<u>*Occupation/Job*</u>
While all participants included in this sample were purposefully chosen because of their affiliation with Street Roots, participants varied in their self-reported answers to this question about their occupation(s) or job(s), if any. As seen in Table 3, the plurality, 7 out of 15 or about 45%, of participants reported their occupation as "Street Roots vendor," with one additional participant reporting their occupation as "Street Roots vendor" and "Caregiver." So, about 53% of participants reported "Street Roots vendor" as one of their occupations. Three participants, or 20%, recorded occupations other than "Street Roots vendor"--these were "Canning," "Self-employed," and "Artist." Three participants, or 20%, recorded some version of no occupation--these were "Retired," "Homeless," and "Unemployed." One participant left the question blank.

Occupation	Street Roots Vendor	Retired	Homeless	Unemployed	Canning	Self-employed	Artist	Street Roots Vendor/ Caregiver	No answer
Frequency	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Percentage	46.67%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%	6.67%

Table 3: Sociodemographic statistics on the self-entered occupation(s)/job(s) of participants.

Highest grade level

As seen in Table 4, the most common highest grade level of participants was a high school diploma, GED, or alternative credential, with 6 participants, or 40%, choosing that option. The next most common was the choice "Grades 1-12, no diploma received," with 4 participants or about 27% choosing that option. Three participants, or 20%, reported having attended vocational school, some college, or having an associate degree. No participants reported having a bachelor's or advanced college degree. One participant reported completing no schooling, and one participant chose not to say.

Highest Grade Level	No schooling completed	Grades 1-12, no diploma received	High school diploma, GED, or alternative credential	Vocational school, some college, or associate degree	Bachelor's Degree	Advanced College Degree	Prefer not to say
Frequency	1	4	6	3	0	0	1
Percentage	6.67%	26.67%	40.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%

Table 4: Sociodemographic statistics on the highest grade level achieved by participants.

Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish origin

No participants reported having Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origins, and three participants, or 20%, left the question blank, as seen in Table 5.

Hispanic/Latinx/ Spanish origin	Yes	No	No answer
Frequency	0	12	3
Percentage	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%

Table 5: Sociodemographic statistics on the Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish origin of participants.

Race

Because participants could choose all of the race(s) they identified with, the totals for the frequencies and percentages do not total to 15 or 100%, as seen in Table 6. The majority of

participants, 9 people or almost two thirds of participants, chose "White" as their only race, and one participant chose "White" as well as "American Indian/Alaska Native." Two participants chose "American Indian/Alaska Native" as well as one other option ("White" and "Other"), and the tribal nation affiliations they listed were "Cherokee and Blackfoot" and "Cherokee / Mohawk." One participant selected "Other" and specified their race identity as "Mixed," and one participant selected "Other" and specified their race identity as "American." Two participants chose not to say what race(s) they identified with. No participants identified with "Asian," "Black or African American," "Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander," or "South Asian."

Race(s) identified with	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	South Asian	White only	White and another race	Prefer not to say	Other
Frequency	2	0	0	0	0	10	1	2	3
Percentage	13.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	6.67%	13.33%	20.00%

Table 6: Sociodemographic statistics on the race(s) participants identified with.

Gender
As seen in Table 7, the majority of participants, 10 people or two thirds of participants, identified with "Male" as their gender. Three participants, or 20%, identified with "Female," and one participant identified with "Non-binary, Third gender, Two spirit." One participant chose not to say.

Gender	Female	Male	Non-binary, Third gender, Two-spirit	Prefer not to say
Frequency	3	10	1	1
Percentage	20.00%	66.67%	6.67%	6.67%

Table 7: Sociodemographic statistics on the gender participants identified with.

Q-Sort Statements: Frequencies and Percentages

Within the responses to the Q-sort by the 15 participants from Street Roots a few patterns emerge around the statements participants placed in the "most agree" and "most disagree" slots on the Q-sort grid. The most pronounced commonality, as seen in Figure 1, is the placement of statement 19 in the "most disagree" slot (refer to Appendix I for the full text of statements). This statement had to do with industries polluting water but creating jobs, and 6 participants put this statement into the "most disagree" slot. This was the highest percentage of convergence on statement placement out of all the most agree/most disagree placements, with 40% of participants putting statement 19 in the most disagree position, as seen in Table 8. Three

participants most disagreed with statement 1, which asked if participants cared about water health because of religious or spiritual beliefs.

The largest number of participants who most agreed with the same statement was 4, or about 27%, who all placed statement 7, which had to do with income and equal drinking water access, in the "most agree" slot. Statements 2, 3, and 4 were each ranked "most agree" by two people, or 13.3% of participants; these statements dealt with keeping water bodies in the natural state, prioritizing public water supplies, and climate change impacts on water supplies.

Statements 1 and 15 are interesting cases because different participants placed them in both the "most agree" and "most disagree" slots. As mentioned, statement 1 is about the connection between religious or spiritual beliefs and water health, and statement 15 is about cutting costs on stream restoration by limiting public comments. These results indicate that these participants feel strongly about these statements, and that they are potential points of divergence.

In general, these results allow us to theorize that this group of Street Roots vendors or affiliates cares about issues related to access to drinking water, the health of water resources and systems, and who is in charge of protecting those resources and systems and how.

Figure 1: The Q-statements that each participant most agreed with (green stars) and most disagreed with (red stars). Refer to Appendix I for full text of Q-statements.

Statement #	Frequency		Percentage	
	Most disagree	Most agree	Most disagree	Most agree
1	3	1	20.00%	6.67%
2	0	2	0.00%	13.33%
3	0	2	0.00%	13.33%
4	0	2	0.00%	13.33%
5	2	0	13.33%	0.00%
6	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
7	0	4	0.00%	26.67%

8	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
9	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
10	**1**	0	**6.67%**	0.00%
11	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
12	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
13	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
14	**1**	0	**6.67%**	0.00%
15	**2**	**1**	**13.33%**	**6.67%**
16	0	**1**	0.00%	**6.67%**
17	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
18	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
19	**6**	0	**40.00%**	0.00%
20	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
21	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
22	0	**1**	0.00%	**6.67%**
23	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
24	0	**1**	0.00%	**6.67%**

Table 8: Frequencies and percentages of statements placed in the "Most agree" and "Most disagree" slots by participants in the Q-sort.

Within-Group Participant Q-Sort Clusters

The Q-sort analysis tool (Q-Perspectives) found three significant factors, or clusters of participants, based on how participants sorted statements. The first cluster, Group 1, included 8 of the 15 participants, and is distinguished by group members' tendencies to most agree with statement 7, about equal access to drinking water regardless of income, and to most disagree with statement 19, about industries polluting water but creating jobs. This group is also set apart by their generally high ranking of statement 22, about making water affordable for all, indicating overall agreement with that statement. On the flip side, this group is unique in their generally low rankings of, or overall disagreement with, statements 8 and 14, about citizens being responsible for getting water filters and cities raising taxes to protect water safety. While participants in Group 1 did not create identical Q-sorts, they clustered together significantly around their agreement with statements about water accessibility, and around their disagreement with statements about not holding businesses or governments accountable for water health and safety.

The second cluster, Group 2, included 3 of the 15 participants, and is distinguished by group members' tendencies to most agree on their placement of statement 3, about prioritizing public

water supplies in a crisis, and to most disagree with statement 9, about environmental regulations doing more harm than good. This group's perspective is set apart by its strong agreement with statement 3, which the other groups felt neutrally about or disagreed with. Additionally, this group's tendency to agree with statement 2, about lakes being kept in their natural states, and to disagree with statement 15, about limiting public comment to cut stream restoration costs, is unique across the three groups. Overall, this group's perspective can be characterized by their concern for protecting public water supplies, both drinking water and access to natural water bodies, and by their support for the environmental regulatory process to protect water.

The final cluster, Group 3, included 4 of the 15 participants, and is unique because it includes 2 participants whose Q-sorts represent the "mirror-image" of the other two group members' Q-sorts. This means that this group shares some water concerns, but may diverge on whether they feel negatively or positively towards those statements. The two group members who represent the positive orientation towards this group's perspective in general most agreed with statement 24, about saving money by making current water systems better, and generally most disagreed with statement 1, about the connection between their religious or spiritual beliefs and their concern for water health. Therefore, the two group members who represent the negative orientation towards this perspective tended to disagree more with statement 24 and agree more with statement 1. The positively-oriented perspective of this group represents strong agreement with statements about saving money on water projects such as water infrastructure and stream restoration, and represents disagreement with the statement that asks about their religious or spiritual connection to water health. This group's negatively-oriented perspectives can be characterized by strong agreement with the statement about religious or spiritual connection to water health, and by disagreement with the statements about saving money in water projects.

Appendix I: Oregon Water Stories Project Q Statements

1. I care about the health of our water because of my religious or spiritual beliefs.

2. Lakes should be maintained in their natural state for the good of all.

3. The government should make sure public water supplies come first in a crisis.

4. The impacts of climate change on access to water for all people concerns me.

5. Landowners are capable of keeping water healthy on their own land.

6. Cities should invest in better infrastructure to keep all homes safe during floods.

7. All people, no matter their income, should have equal access to drinking water.

8. If you aren't sure about the health of your water, it is your responsibility to get a water filter.

9. Environmental regulations do more harm than good.

10. It is more important to protect water for farmers than for fish.

11. Private owners are better at regulating fishing than the government.

12. Having reliable access to clean water is worth paying for.

13. Tribal nations have sovereign rights to protect the health of rivers.

14. Cities should raise taxes to protect their water safety.

15. It's okay to limit public comment for stream restoration projects if it keeps costs down.

16. I shouldn't have to pay the government for my water.

17. We should invest in water systems that keep people healthy.

18. Businesses need to focus on keeping river systems clean for the good of all.

19. It is worth it for industries to pollute water sometimes if they provide good jobs.

20. I should be able to control my water use to keep me safe during a drought.

21. A good use of rivers is having large dams to create electricity.

22. We should make sure water is affordable for everyone.

23. Government money should not be spent on flood aid.

24. We should save money by making current water systems better instead of building new ones.