COVID-19 Vaccination in California: Are We Equitable Yet?

Alec J. Schmidt *[1], Maria L. Daza–Torres[1], Yury E. García[1], Joan L. Ashby[1], Bradley H. Pollock[1], James Sharpnack[2], and Miriam Nuño[1]

[1]Department of Public Health Sciences, University of California Davis, CA, USA

[2]Department of Statistics, University of California Davis, CA, USA

Abstract

Background. By March 2021, California had one of the least equitable COVID-19 vaccine distribution programs in the US. To rectify this, Governor Newsom ordered 4 million vaccine doses be reserved for the census tracts in the lowest quartile of the Healthy Places Index (HPI). California plans to lift state-wide restrictions on June 15th, 2021, as long as test positivity and vaccine equity thresholds are met in the state's most vulnerable neighborhoods. This short investigation examines current vaccine equity and forecasts where California can expect to be when the economy fully reopens.

Methods. Current vaccine equity was investigated with simple linear regression between the county mean HPI and both single and full-dose vaccination rate. Future vaccination coverage per county were predicted using a compartmental mathematical model based on the average rate over the previous 30 days with four different rate-change scenarios.

Results. County mean HPI had a strong positive association with both single and full dose vaccination rates (R^2: 0.716 and 0.737, respectively). We predict the overall state rate will exceed 50% fully vaccinated by June 15th if the current rates are maintained; however, the bulk of this coverage comes from the top 18 counties while the remaining 40 counties lag behind.

Discussion. The clear association between county HPI and current vaccination rates shows that California is not initiating opening plans from an equitable foundation, despite previous equity programs. If nothing changes, many of the most vulnerable counties will not be prepared to open without consequences come June 15th.

*E-mail: aljschmidt@ucdavis.edu; mnuno@ucdavis.edu.

Background

California's *Blueprint for a Safer Economy Plan* implemented an outbreak severity tier framework for risk management informed by COVID-19 case rates, positive test rates, and hospitalization rates. A health equity revision on October, 2020 required counties with a population above 106,000 (n=36) to ensure that census tracts in the lowest quartile of the Healthy Places Index (HPI), an aggregation of 25 health vulnerability indicators, were not reporting significantly higher positive testing rates than the county average to move to a lower severity tier [1]. Limited vaccination programs began in December 2020, but by March 2021, the CDC listed California's vaccine distribution as one of the five least equitable programs in the United States [6]. On March 4, 2021 governor Gavin Newsom prioritized 40% of California's vaccine supply to be administered among the census tracts in the lowest HPI quartile. Updated guidance from the *Blueprint*, which included higher case rate and test positivity thresholds for the most severe tiers, was issued when 2 million and 4 million equity-reserved doses were distributed as an effort to encourage increased testing rates for continued monitoring.

On June 15, 2021, California plans to "fully open" by lifting most business restrictions. Four primary indicators will be used to assess readiness: county-wide adjusted daily case rates and test positivity rates, and both a health and a vaccine equity measurement based on test positivity rates and total vaccinations in the lowest-quartile HPI tracts, respectively. With less than a month to go before widespread protections are lifted, this is a critical time to reassess how equitable California's vaccine distribution has been. In this short investigation, we examined the current relationship between county-aggregated HPI and vaccination rates, and followed up with simple forecasts of COVID-19 vaccine coverage in California by June 15, 2020 across multiple scenarios to highlight disparities in vaccine uptake across the state.

Methods

HPI data for individual census tracts were obtained from the Public Health Alliance of California [5]. Single dose and full vaccination rates for each county were obtained from the California Department of Public Health [2]. To assess whether broader patterns of inequity still exist, a linear model was constructed in which the county mean HPI ($\bar{H}$) was the predictor for the number of vaccinated individuals per 1,000 population ($\hat{I}$) as of May 16th, according to equation 1. Alpine and Sierra counties had extremely small populations and were excluded from this analysis. Regression analysis was executed with R 4.1.0 (R Core Team 2021).

$$\hat{I} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \bar{H} \tag{1}$$

To model future vaccination coverage, we constructed a compartmental model that includes the dynamics between the unvaccinated population, those who got the first vaccine dose and those who are fully vaccinated. Let W be the unvaccinated population at time t. We assume that no vaccines have been administered at $t = 0$, which implies $W(0) = N$. Then, by assuming that we vaccinate individuals at a constant rate for both first dose and second dose proportional to the actual population, we have $W(t)$, $V_1(t)$ and $V_2(t)$ that satisfy the

following system,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{W} &= -\lambda_{v_1} W \\
\dot{V_1} &= \lambda_{v_1} W - \lambda_{v_2} V_1 \\
\dot{V_2} &= \lambda_{v_2} V_1
\end{aligned}
$$

where $W(0) = N$, $V_1(0) = 0$, and $V_2(0) = 0$. We stored the cumulative vaccinated population as:

$$\dot{A} = \lambda_1 W$$

Since real-world vaccination rates have changed since the start of the vaccination, we used the prior 30 days of real-world vaccination data to adjust our model rates. Beginning May 4th, we estimated the growth of single-dose and full vaccination coverage through June 15th for four future scenarios: maintaining the 30-day average rate, a 30% increase in the current average rate, and both a 30% and 60% decrease in the current average rate. Modeling was implemented in python.

Results

There was a clear, positive association between the county mean HPI and the current proportion of people vaccinated. Regression coefficients were 298.2 (95% CI: 248.1-348.2) for single-dose rate and 248.8 (95% CI: 209.2-288.5) for fully vaccinated rates, with R^2 values of 0.716 and 0.737, respectively. Counties in the San Joaquin Valley region had consistently low values for both HPI and vaccination rates (Figure 1). Compartmental model results are shown in Figure 2. The current trajectory predicts that 66.2% of the population will have at least one dose of the vaccine, and 53.8% will be fully vaccinated. If rates were to increase by 30%, the model predicts that 70.2% of the population will have at least one dose, and 59.0% will be fully vaccinated by June 15th.



Figure 1: Simple linear regression of vaccination rates in California counties. A: Single dose vaccination rate vs. HPI. B: Full dose vaccination rate vs. HPI.



Figure 2: Statewide predictions from the simple compartmental model.

When the model predictions are broken down by county, however, it becomes clear that the state-level results hide some disparities. At current vaccination rates, only 18 out of 58 counties are projected to reach or exceed a fully vaccinated rate of 50%. Even a 30% increase in the current average rate predicts that only 21 out of 58 will reach that threshold (Table 1).

Table 1: Percentage of people vaccinated by May 17, 2021 and estimated vaccine coverage by June 15, 2021 in California counties. Vaccine data from [2], updated on May 16, 2021. County population from [3].

		Percentage of people vaccinated (May 17, 2021)		Estimated Vaccine Coverage by June 15, 2021						Percentage of people vaccinated (May 17, 2021)		Estimated Vaccine Coverage by June 15, 2021			
County	Population	At least one dose	Fully vaccinated	Current rate	30% reduction	60% reduction	30% increase	County	Population	At least one dose	Fully vaccinated	Current rate	30% reduction	60% reduction	30% increase
Alpine	1,129	73	59	81	77	72	85	Imperial	181,215	44	30	43	40	37	46
Marin	258,826	71	60	73	70	66	76	Nevada	99,755	46	36	42	39	37	44
Santa Clara	1,927,852	64	50	69	64	59	73	San Joaquin	762,148	40	28	41	38	35	43
San Francisco	881,549	67	53	67	63	58	71	Colusa	21,547	38	27	40	37	34	42
Alameda	1,671,329	61	49	63	59	55	66	Amador	39,752	46	30	37	35	33	39
Contra Costa	1,153,526	59	50	62	59	56	65	Sutter	96,971	39	31	37	35	33	39
San Mateo	766,573	65	50	62	58	55	65	Tuolumne	54,478	41	34	37	36	34	39
Napa	137,744	63	50	61	57	54	64	Calaveras	45,905	41	32	36	34	32	38
Santa Cruz	273,213	61	45	61	58	53	65	Fresno	999,101	41	31	36	34	33	38
Sonoma	494,336	60	47	59	56	52	62	Lake	64,386	39	32	36	35	33	38
San Diego	3,338,330	62	42	55	51	48	58	Riverside	2,470,546	40	31	36	34	31	38
Mono	14,444	55	46	54	52	50	55	Stanislaus	550,660	41	29	36	34	32	39
Santa Barbara	446,499	52	42	54	51	47	56	Butte	219,186	38	32	35	34	32	37
Ventura	846,006	52	41	54	51	47	57	Glenn	28,393	36	30	35	33	31	37
Orange	3,175,692	52	41	53	49	46	56	San Bernardino	2,180,085	37	29	35	32	30	37
San Benito	62,808	46	35	51	47	43	55	Mariposa	17,203	41	24	33	30	28	35
Yolo	220,500	53	40	51	48	44	54	Madera	157,327	37	29	32	30	29	34
Los Angeles	10,039,107	51	39	50	47	43	53	Tulare	466,195	35	28	32	30	29	33
Mendocino	86,749	51	40	49	47	45	52	Siskiyou	43,539	36	28	31	30	29	32
Placer	398,329	48	39	49	46	43	51	Trinity	12,285	35	27	31	29	28	32
Inyo	18,039	47	40	48	45	43	50	Kern	900 202	34	27	30	28	26	31
Sierra	3,005	46	43	48	47	46	49	Merced	277,680	33	22	30	28	26	32
Humboldt	135,558	47	38	47	45	42	49	Modoc	8,841	30	27	29	28	27	30
Monterey	434,061	49	38	47	44	40	49	Shasta	180,080	34	26	29	27	26	30
San Luis Obispo	283,111	50	40	47	44	41	50	Del Norte	27,812	33	27	28	26	25	29
Sacramento	1,552,058	45	35	46	43	40	49	Yuba	78,668	28	22	27	26	24	29
El Dorado	192,843	45	34	45	42	39	47	Kings	152,940	27	20	23	22	21	24
Plumas	18,807	42	36	44	43	41	46	Tehama	65,084	25	21	23	22	21	24
Solano	447,643	48	35	44	42	39	47	Lassen	30,573	22	19	21	20	19	21

Discussion

When observed in the aggregate as an entire state, it is tempting to say that California is in an optimistic position for a general easing of restrictions come June 2021. However, the successes in large, urban centers have not been similarly realized across the state. As of the writing of this paper, there is a strong correlation between the average HPI of a county and current vaccination rates. The counties that are least vaccinated and least likely to reach acceptable immunization thresholds by June 15th are also those with the most vulnerable populations.

Hesitancy is frequently cited as a stumbling block for achieving high vaccination rates. Vaccine hesitancy is complex and often driven by social and demographic determinants that evolve over time. The temporary pause of the Janssen COVID-19 vaccine on April 13, 2021, for instance, changed the minds of 39% unvaccinated Hispanic women according to a Kaiser Family Foundation vaccine hesitancy survey. In California, the most vaccine-hesitant counties are estimated to have 16.1% of residents responding as "hesitant or unsure" [4]. Few counties are projected to reach the point where more unvaccinated people are hesitant or unsure than not, leading us to believe that the challenge remains one of inequitable distribution rather than differences in vaccine uptake.

The San Joaquin Valley region stands out as particularly unprepared. Of the eight counties (San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings, Tulare, and Kern), seven are in the lowest quartile for county mean HPI, and Fresno currently leads the fully vaccinated rate among them at 31%. These counties are home to 3.97 million people, which is more than one-tenth of the population of California and a greater total population than 23 other states. The San Joaquin Valley is home to large numbers of Latino agricultural workers, who face systemic socioeconomic and environmental inequities, and who have been shown to be at high risk from COVID-19 [8] [7]. Low vaccination rates and a highly vulnerable population are a recipe for continued outbreaks of COVID-19 well beyond June. This is not limited to the San Joaquin Valley, either; the majority of counties were predicted to lag significantly behind the state rate.

This simple study's use of an aggregate vulnerability index likely obscures how different aspects of vulnerability have lead to inequities across the state. Closer, more sophisticated examinations are warranted to characterize the factors that lead to the larger-scale inequities described here. What lessons can we learn for future pandemics? What infrastructure and trust are we building now that should be nourished beyond COVID-19 to enable more effective and equitable interventions for daily life and the next health crisis?

References

[1] California Department of Public Health. Blueprint For a Safer Economy: Equity Focus. `https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/CaliforniaHealthEquityMetric.aspx`. (Accessed 5/50/21).

[2] California Open Data Portal. COVID-19 Vaccine Progress Dashboard Data. `https://data.ca.gov/dataset/covid-19-vaccine-progress-dashboard-data`. (Accessed on 05/17/2021).

[3] Census Bureau. County Population Totals: 2010-2019. `https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-counties-total.html#par_textimage_739801612`. (Accessed on 05/17/2021).

[4] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Estimates of Vaccine Hesitancy for COVID-19. `https://data.cdc.gov/stories/s/Vaccine-Hesitancy-for-COVID-19/cnd2-a6zw/`. (Accessed 5/20/21).

[5] Public Health Alliance of Southern California. California Healthy Places Index. `https://map.healthyplacesindex.org/#`. (Accessed on 05/17/2021).

[6] MM Hughes, A Wang, MK Grossman, and et al. County-Level COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage and Social Vulnerability — United States, december 14, 2020–march 1, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, 70:431–436, 2021.

[7] Miriam Nuño, Yury García, Ganesh Rajasekar, Diego Pinheiro, and Alec J. Schmidt. COVID-19 Hospitalizations in Five California Hospitals. *medRxiv*, 2021.

[8] Carlos E. Rodriguez-Diaz, Vincent Guilamo-Ramos, Leandro Mena, Eric Hall, Brian Honermann, Jeffrey S. Crowley, Stefan Baral, Guillermo J. Prado, Melissa Marzan-Rodriguez, Chris Beyrer, Patrick S. Sullivan, and Gregorio A. Millett. Risk for COVID-19 infection and death among Latinos in the United States: examining heterogeneity in transmission dynamics. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 52:46–53.e2, 2020.