

1 **COVID-19 Pandemic Response in a Migrant Farmworker Community: Excess Mortality,**
2 **Testing Access and Contact Tracing in Immokalee, Florida**

3

4 Neha Limaye MD^{1,2*}, Brennan Ninesling MPH^{1,2,3*}, Frantzso Marcelin^{1,4}, Cody Nolan MD^{1,2},
5 Walter Sobba⁵, Matthew Hing^{6,7}, Emily Ptaszek PsyD MBA FACHE⁸, Fernet Léandre MD,
6 MMSc-GHD⁷, Daniel Palazuelos MD MPH^{1,7,9,10}

7 ¹ Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA.

8 ² Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA.

9 ³ University of South Florida Morsani College of Medicine, Tampa, FL, USA..

10 ⁴ Department of History, Steven J. Green School of International & Public Affairs, Florida International
11 University, Miami, FL, USA.

12 ⁵ New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA.

13 ⁶ David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

14 ⁷ Partners In Health, Boston, MA, USA.

15 ⁸ Healthcare Network of Southwest Florida, Immokalee, FL, USA.

16 ⁹ Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA.

17 ¹⁰ Division of Global Health Equity, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA.

18

19

20 **Correspondence:**

21 Corresponding Author

22 Neha Limaye

23 nlimaye@bwh.harvard.edu

24 **Abstract:**

25 Introduction: We aim to estimate the impact of COVID-19 in Immokalee, FL and assess
26 community experiences with workplace conditions, access to testing, sources of information, and
27 contact tracing to inform and strengthen local public health sector efforts in reaching and
28 providing high-quality care to the community.

29 Methods: We conducted a descriptive analysis of data on COVID-19 deaths for Collier County
30 from May-August 2020. We surveyed a cross-sectional, randomized representative sample of
31 318 adults living in Immokalee from March-November 2020 to assess socio-demographics,
32 sources of information, ability to follow guidelines, and experiences with local programs. Results
33 were compared across language groups.

34 Results: Average excess mortality in Collier County was 108%. The majority surveyed in
35 Immokalee had socio-demographic factors associated with higher COVID risk. Non-English
36 speakers had higher workplace risk due to less ability to work from home. Haitian Creole
37 speakers were less likely to be tested, though all participants were willing to get symptomatic
38 testing and quarantine. Those participants who tested positive or had COVID-19 exposures had
39 low engagement with the contact tracing program, and Spanish-speakers reported lower quality
40 of contact tracing than English speakers.

41 Conclusions: The community of Immokalee, FL is a vulnerable population that suffered
42 disproportionate deaths from COVID-19. This study reveals language inequities in COVID
43 testing and contact tracing should be targeted in future pandemic response in Immokalee and
44 other migrant farmworker communities.

45 **Keywords:** COVID-19, farmworker, health disparity, Haitian, Latinx

46 **1. Introduction**

47 **1.1. Background**

48 Migrant and seasonal farmworkers (MSFW) face enormous structural barriers to health,
49 including poverty, food insecurity, poor working conditions, high occupational hazard, and
50 limited access to healthcare.¹ Although data are lacking, those available suggest that MSFW
51 experience inequities in multiple health outcomes.²⁻⁴ At work they face challenging
52 environmental conditions including heat, sun, pesticide exposure, and dust and particle
53 inhalation.¹ Additionally, most MSFW are uninsured and must overcome language barriers, long
54 work hours, and lack of transportation to attend health appointments, with care often only
55 available at Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHC).⁵ Consequently, the majority of MSFW
56 do not have primary care physicians.⁶

57
58 The COVID-19 pandemic has only deepened pre-existing health inequities. Data demonstrate
59 disproportionate rates of COVID-19 morbidity and mortality among Black, Latinx and
60 immigrant populations, who make up the majority of MSFW in the U.S.⁷⁻⁹ MSFW are at
61 especially high risk for COVID-19 exposure and subsequent infection due to high density
62 housing and ‘essential worker’ status, which has exempted them from the protection of working
63 from home enjoyed by other industries.^{10,11} Typical working conditions are not conducive to
64 distancing, as many MSFW work side-by-side and share transportation to and from work.¹² Once
65 infected, spread within MSFW communities is facilitated by lack of testing and contact tracing,
66 and by housing conditions which preclude distancing or effective quarantine.¹³ Finally, those
67 infected are at higher risk of severe COVID-19 disease due to underlying health conditions that
68 predispose to morbidity and mortality.

69
70 Although the plight of MSFW during the COVID-19 pandemic has gained media attention, there
71 is minimal data around its true impact. Access to COVID-19 testing in this population is
72 unknown, and the true burden of death due to COVID-19 in these communities remains unclear.
73 Contact tracing is a key aspect of controlling COVID-19 spread and is especially important for
74 MSFW, who move around frequently for work. However, no studies have examined the success
75 or quality of contact tracing programs in an MSFW population. Data around COVID-19's
76 specific impact on MSFW communities in Florida are lacking, despite Florida housing one of the
77 largest populations of MSFW in the country.

78

79 **1.2. Study Site: Immokalee, Florida**

80 Immokalee is a rural community located in southwest Florida's Collier County, the center of the
81 nation's tomato growing industry. Much of the population, from 20,000 to 27,000 residents,
82 works in agriculture as MSFWs or packing house workers, with 37.4% living below the poverty
83 line. Residents are primarily from Mexico, Central America, and Haiti; 68% of the population
84 speak Spanish at home and 13% speak Haitian Creole.⁶ Occupational, economic, and linguistic
85 factors confer substantial vulnerability to COVID-19 infection in Immokalee; despite its small
86 size, Immokalee was the Florida zip code with the highest number of COVID-19 cases in the
87 state in June 2020.¹⁴ Positivity rates at the time were as high as 36% compared to 5.6% in the
88 state.¹⁵ After observing disease burden and difficulties in accessing COVID-19 testing and
89 contract tracing among MSFWs, the Coalition of Immokalee Workers (CIW) — a local human
90 rights organization — facilitated partnerships between the Collier County Department of Health
91 (DOH), Partners in Health (PIH), Doctors Without Borders (Medicins Sans Frontieres - MSF),

92 and a local FQHC (Collier Health Services, Inc., d/b/a Healthcare Network (HCN)). The DOH
93 led all contract tracing efforts in Immokalee, and offered nasal PCR testing by appointment until
94 November 2020, with results given via an English-language online portal which asked for a
95 social security number. Starting in November 2020, HCN began offering walk-up rapid testing in
96 Immokalee, with results given within an hour by Spanish- and Haitian Creole-speaking staff.
97 Both HCN and DOH created community health worker programs for COVID-19 outreach, but
98 all positive results from HCN's testing were forwarded to the DOH's contact tracing system (see
99 Appendix A, Figure 1 for timeline).

100

101 In this study, we first aimed to estimate the impact of COVID-19 on Immokalee, FL by
102 calculating excess mortality from publicly available data. Then, we conducted a household
103 survey to collect sociodemographic information and assess community experiences with
104 workplace conditions, access to testing, sources of information, and the DOH contact tracing
105 program.

106

107 **2. Methods**

108 **2.1. Descriptive Analysis**

109 We collated data from the Florida Department of Health and Medical Examiners Offices for
110 Collier, Lee, Hendry, Glades and Orange Counties. First, we tabulated the total deaths from
111 COVID-19 for residents of Collier County. Data for the Immokalee zip code alone were not
112 available. We then compared deaths for Collier County during May-August 2015-2019 with
113 deaths from May-August 2020. Excess mortality was calculated in accordance with CDC
114 guidelines, where death data were grouped weekly to account for temporal effects. Excess

115 mortality was calculated for each week and then summed together to find excess mortality for
116 the period beginning 4/27/20 and ending 8/16/20. Data were disaggregated by age (under 60 or
117 ≥ 60 years) and sex.

118

119 **2.2. Questionnaire**

120 The questionnaire was created using demographic and social screening tools from the National
121 Agricultural Workers Survey and various farmworker healthcare organizations.⁷⁻⁹ Spanish- and
122 Haitian Creole-speaking CIW staff reviewed the tool for understandability by the local
123 population. The questionnaire (Appendix B) assessed the following thematic areas:

- 124 ● Demographic and socioeconomic information
- 125 ● Sources of news and information on COVID-19
- 126 ● Ability to follow COVID-19 precautions
- 127 ● Experiences with contact tracing

128

129 **2.3. Sample Size**

130 Our target population was adults living in Immokalee during the months of March-November
131 2020. We estimated a population of 12,000 adults in Immokalee, a 95% confidence interval, a
132 precision of 5%, and a prevalence of 15-20% of the population meeting requirements to be
133 contacted by contact tracers (given an estimated local COVID-19 prevalence of 8%). From our
134 initial sample size of 193-241 participants, we accounted for intercorrelation in order to survey
135 multiple people per household. We used an intracluster correlation (ICC) of 0.1-0.33 and an
136 estimated household size (m) of ~ 4 to calculate a design effect of 1.3-2, giving us a final sample
137 size goal of 300-350 participants.

138
139 We used a publicly available address list from the Collier County Property Appraiser's office
140 and extracted 350 addresses using a random number generator. Study staff visited each address,
141 and after exhausting that first address list, extracted 100 further addresses at a time to reach a
142 sample size of 300-350 participants.

143

144 **2.4. Study Procedures**

145 From January 18 - March 11, 2021, study staff (FM and BN) visited addresses on weekends and
146 evenings in a predetermined fashion considering geographical location. They wore appropriate
147 personal protective equipment at all times and followed social distancing guidelines. They
148 conducted multiple surveys per household as household members may have had different
149 experiences, and it is common for multiple families in Immokalee to cohabitate.

150

151 Study staff started each visit with an initial screening to confirm each participant 1) was 18 years
152 or older, 2) lived in Immokalee, and 3) lived in Immokalee for at least 2 weeks between March-
153 November 2020. If inclusion criteria were met, study staff obtained verbal informed consent in
154 the participants' preferred language. Verbal consent was obtained due to the population's literacy
155 level and to maintain participant anonymity. If participants preferred to participate at a different
156 time or no adults were home, one follow-up visit was done at the same address. All households
157 visited received a paper pamphlet detailing available health resources in their preferred language.

158

159 Questionnaire responses were recorded in REDCap.^{16,17} The study staff entering data were
160 trained on how to use REDCap, and data were checked weekly by the co-investigators to ensure

161 internal validity. The study was reviewed by the Institutional Review Boards at Mass General
162 Brigham and the Harvard School of Public Health and met criteria for exemption.

163

164 **2.5. Data Analyses**

165 All analyses were conducted utilizing R (Version 4.0.2, The R Foundation, 2021) and RStudio
166 (Version 1.3.959, RStudio Team, 2021). Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were utilized to
167 compare variables as appropriate. Of note, data from a question on sick leave was not analyzed
168 due to participant misinterpretation of the question.

169

170 **3. Results**

171 **3.1. Descriptive Analysis**

172 An analysis of Collier County mortality data from April 27th through August 16th revealed an
173 average excess mortality of 108% (167 excess deaths). When data were disaggregated by sex
174 alone, age alone, and both sex and age, excess mortality findings were largely consistent (107%,
175 115%, and 115%, respectively, see Appendix A, Table 1).

176

177 **3.2. Study Population**

178 Of 550 households randomized, 131 did not answer the door, 140 were not interested in
179 participating, and 279 agreed to participate. From these, 318 individuals consented to participate
180 and were surveyed (Appendix A, Figure 2).

181

182 Baseline participant and household demographics are depicted in Table 1. Spanish (42.1%) was
183 the most frequent preferred language, with English (37.3%) and Haitian Creole (18.7%)

184 accounting for most other participants. Nearly one-fifth of participants reported food insecurity
185 during the past month (19.2%). The mean household size was 3.95 persons with homes
186 averaging 0.856 bedrooms per person and 0.483 bathrooms per person.
187

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of survey participants

Characteristic	Participants	
	N = 312	%
Gender		
Female	165	52.9%
Male	147	47.1%
Age group (yrs)		
18 - 24	34	10.9%
25 - 34	76	24.3%
35 - 44	73	23.3%
45 - 64	96	30.7%
65 - 80	29	9.3%
81+	5	1.6%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	10	3.2%
Black	76	24.1%
Latino/a	213	67.4%
Indigenous	1	0.3%
Bi- or Multi-racial	11	3.5%
Prefer not to answer	2	0.6%
Other	3	0.9%
Preferred language		
English	118	37.30%
Spanish	133	42.10%
Haitian Creole	59	18.70%
Mam	3	0.90%
Other	3	0.90%
Educational attainment		
No formal schooling	26	8.30%
Kindergarten - 5th grade	42	13.40%
6-8th grade	44	14.00%

9-12th grade	161	51.30%
Beyond high school	41	13.10%
Housing situation		
No housing	2	0.60%
Housed but housing insecure	83	26.20%
Housed	230	72.60%
Other	2	0.60%
Housing characteristics (mean)		
Household members	3.95	
Bathrooms	1.52	
Bathrooms per person	0.48	
Bedrooms	2.79	
Bedrooms per person	0.86	
Food insecurity during last month		
Yes	61	19.20%
Primary occupation		
Farmworker	64	20.10%
Other	64	20.10%
Construction	25	7.90%
Landscaping	18	5.70%
Packinghouse worker	16	5.00%
Healthcare worker	13	4.10%
Food service	13	4.10%
Maintenance or custodian	9	2.80%
Driver	8	2.50%
Painter	7	2.20%
Education	7	2.20%
Agricultural supervisor	4	1.30%
Casino Employee	3	0.90%
Unemployed	53	16.70%
Retired	14	4.40%

188

189 3.3. Essential Worker Status and Workplace Policies

190 Table 2 details participants' occupational status and policies. Twenty-six percent of English

191 speakers stated they were offered the option to work from home during the pandemic. By

192 contrast, only 3% of both Spanish and Haitian Creole speakers reported being given the option to
 193 work from home ($p < 0.001$ English vs Spanish; $p = 0.0023$ English vs Haitian Creole). The
 194 majority of employed individuals in all language groups were categorized as essential workers
 195 by the state of Florida.¹⁸
 196

Table 2. Self-reported workplace policies of participants and essential worker status, stratified by primary language spoken

Survey question	Answer	Primary language spoken						Comparison	
		English		Spanish		Haitian Creole		English / Spanish (<i>p</i>)	English / Creole (<i>p</i>)
		%	No.	%	No.	%	No.		
Option to work from home?	No	74.40%	67	97.00%	96	97.10%	34		
	Yes	25.60%	23	3.00%	3	2.90%	1	<0.0000	0.0023
PPE at work?	No	15.90%	14	26.50%	26	19.40%	7		
	Yes	84.10%	74	73.50%	72	80.60%	29	0.0784	0.6388
Essential worker									
	Yes	68.60%	81	76.70%	102	66.10%	39		
	No	31.40%	37	23.30%	31	33.90%	20	0.1522	0.7329

197 Note: Boldface indicates statistical significance ($p < 0.05$).

198

199 3.4. COVID-19 Testing Experiences

200 Table 3 shows participants' testing experiences, compared by preferred language. 38.1%, 48.1%,
 201 and 57.6% of English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole speakers, respectively, reported that they had
 202 never been tested for COVID-19. Significantly fewer Haitian Creole than English speakers
 203 reported being tested ($p = 0.014$). English and Spanish speakers reported being tested at similar
 204 sites, primarily by the DOH, while Haitian Creole speakers were more likely to report being

205 tested at the HCN Immokalee Clinic or HCN-affiliated mobile testing sites ($p < .0001$). English
 206 speakers were more likely to report being tested at sites outside of Immokalee, namely Fort
 207 Myers and Naples, compared to Spanish and Haitian Creole speakers.
 208
 209 There were no differences in the length of time that lapsed before results were available, though
 210 31.5% of English and 42.6 % of Spanish speakers reported waiting one week or more before
 211 receiving their results. More positive COVID-19 test results were reported for English-speaking
 212 participants (27.4%) than Haitian Creole-speaking participants (0%), though no significant
 213 difference was reported between English and Spanish speaking (26.1%) participants.
 214 When asked whether participants would utilize testing resources if exposed to COVID-19, a
 215 large share of Spanish (89.5%), Haitian Creole (91.4%) and English speakers (87.3%) reported
 216 they would be willing to be tested. The majority of English (53.4%), Spanish (65.4%), and
 217 Haitian Creole speakers (66.7%) reported that they would be willing to isolate themselves in a
 218 temporary shelter if necessary and they were unable to do so inside their own home.
 219

Table 3. Participant experiences with COVID-19 testing, stratified by primary language spoken

Survey question	Answer	Primary language spoken						Comparison	
		English		Spanish		Haitian Creole		English / Spanish (<i>p</i>)	English / Creole (<i>p</i>)
		%	No.	%	No.	%	No.		
Have you been tested for COVID-19?	Yes	61.90%	73	51.90%	69	42.40%	25	0.1112	0.0139^a
	No	38.10%	45	48.10%	64	57.60%	34		
Where were you tested?	DOH	23.90%	21	25.70%	19	7.10%	2		
	Immokalee Clinic	18.20%	16	36.50%	27	60.70%	17		
	Naples	20.50%	18	16.20%	12	14.30%	4		
	Fort Myers	22.70%	20	10.80%	8	0.00%	0		

	Other	14.80%	13	10.80%	8	17.90%	5	0.0547	<0.0000^b
How long for results?	<24 hours	31.50%	23	22.10%	15	56.00%	14		
	2-3 days	26.00%	19	25.00%	17	16.00%	4		
	4-6 days	11.00%	8	10.30%	7	12.00%	3		
	1 week+	31.50%	23	42.60%	29	16.00%	4	0.4967	0.1617 ^b
What was the result?	Positive	27.40%	20	26.10%	18	0.00%	0		
	Negative	71.20%	52	73.90%	51	96.00%	24	0.8514	0.0026^b
If you or another person in your household was showing symptoms such as fever, cough, fatigue, would you get tested for COVID-19?	Yes	87.30%	103	89.50%	119	91.40%	53		
	No	11.90%	14	3.00%	4	6.90%	4		
	Not sure	0.80%	1	7.50%	10	1.70%	1	0.0132	0.4292 ^b
If you were to be unable to isolate in your current housing for COVID-19, would you be open to temporarily going to a supportive isolation shelter?	Yes	53.40%	63	65.40%	87	66.70%	38		
	No	38.10%	45	29.30%	39	24.60%	14		
	Not sure	8.50%	10	5.30%	7	8.80%	5	0.0885	0.0702 ^a

^a Chi square

^b Fisher's exact

220 Note: Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).

221

222 3.5. Quality of Contact Tracing

223 Those that tested positive for COVID-19 expected to be called by the DOH to trace close

224 contacts, inquire about their ability to quarantine, and provide information about local resources

225 supporting quarantine. Table 4 reflects participants' experiences with the contact tracing process.

226 No Haitian Creole speakers from our sample reported having tested positive. Only 35% of

227 English speakers and 33% of Spanish speakers who tested positive were asked for names and

228 phone numbers of individuals with which they had been in close contact. 70% of English
 229 speakers were asked about their ability to safely quarantine, compared to only 39% of Spanish
 230 speakers ($p=0.041$). Forty-five percent of English speakers reported being provided information
 231 on local resources helping with quarantine, compared to 28% of Spanish speakers. Only 26% of
 232 English speakers reported being asked about their language preference compared to 82% of
 233 Spanish speakers, suggesting that most calls started in English and switched to Spanish if the
 234 recipient stated they did not understand English.

235
 236 Individuals that were identified as close contacts of someone that had tested positive for COVID-
 237 19 were also supposed to be called about their exposure and need to quarantine. 33% of English
 238 speakers and 42% of Spanish speakers reported being called by the DOH about their positive
 239 close contact.

240

Table 4. Contact tracing experiences of participants, stratified by primary language spoken

Survey question	Answer	Primary language spoken				Comparison
		English		Spanish		
		%	No.	%	No.	English / Spanish (p)
Participants who tested positive			20		18	
	Yes	35.00%	7	33.30%	6	
Contact tracing occurred ^a	No	60.00%	12	66.70%	12	1
Quarantine guidance given ^b	Yes	70.00%	14	38.90%	7	0.0409
	No	20.00%	4	61.10%	11	
Connected to resources ^c	Yes	45.00%	9	27.80%	5	0.3133
	No	50.00%	10	72.20%	13	
Asked language preference	Yes	26.30%	5	81.80%	9	0.0183
	No	57.90%	11	18.20%	2	

Language of phone call	English	94.70%	18	9.10%	1	<0.0000
	Spanish	5.30%	1	90.90%	10	
Participants with positive close contact			42		24	
Informed of positive contact	Yes	33.30%	14	41.70%	10	0.6005
	No	64.30%	27	58.30%	14	

^a Did they ask for assistance in identifying the names and phone numbers of individuals you were in contact with?

^b Did they ask about your ability to safely isolate and quarantine in your current housing situation?

^c Did they provide information on any resources that exist to help assist with isolation or quarantine?

241 Note: Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05).

242

243 **4. Discussion**

244 In this first study of experiences with COVID-19 testing and contact tracing in an MSFW
245 population, we found high excess mortality and high COVID-19 risk, with low testing and
246 contact tracing rates and multiple language-based disparities despite many actions from a
247 coalition of stakeholders. The 108% excess mortality rate in Collier County calculated in this
248 study is extremely high. In comparison, average excess mortality in Florida was estimated to be
249 15.5% from March to September, with a peak of 38.1% in August,¹⁹ while nationwide data
250 showed an average of 18.5% excess deaths from March through the end of July.²⁰ While we
251 cannot discern how many of these excess deaths were specifically from Immokalee, we know it
252 is an especially vulnerable community within the county, as demonstrated by our data. With an
253 average household size of ~4 people with shared bathrooms, significant food and housing
254 insecurity, and a preponderance of essential workers, the risk of COVID-19 infection was and
255 continues to be high in this community.¹⁰ For non-English speakers, that risk is even higher, as
256 our data show they are less frequently able to work from home.

257

258 Confronted by this excess disease burden in a highly vulnerable population, the stakeholder
259 groups came together rapidly and worked towards a COVID-19 response. Through their
260 combined efforts, a new system for testing, quarantine and contact tracing was put into place.
261 Our data show the successes and challenges of setting up such a system in Immokalee, with
262 lessons relevant to MSFW populations across the U.S.

263
264 The initial testing system was based on appointments scheduled via an English-only online
265 portal. While most surveyed residents indicated willingness to test and quarantine, the data show
266 marked language disparities in testing, with significantly lower testing rates in Haitian Creole
267 speakers. The HCN helped address this disparity a few months into testing by initiating rapid
268 antigen testing at mobile field sites run by Haitian Creole- and Spanish-speaking staff. Our data
269 show that this change may have facilitated a higher testing rate in the Haitian Creole population;
270 amongst the number of Haitian Creole speakers tested, the majority received tests at these HCN
271 rapid-test sites. However, the data show overall low testing rates for all language groups despite
272 these collective efforts, demonstrating a need for even more accessible testing for predominantly
273 MSFW populations.

274
275 Our data also highlight challenges with initiating a contact tracing program. Contact tracing is a
276 key strategy for interrupting COVID-19 transmission and providing linkage to quarantine
277 resources for vulnerable individuals,^{21,22} but the percentage of participants in this sample that
278 received contact tracing calls was much lower than the 80% benchmark endorsed by recent
279 studies.²³ Language disparities were also present in contact tracing: Spanish-speaking individuals
280 were significantly less likely to be asked by contact tracers about their ability to safely isolate.

281 We were unable to collect any data on Haitian Creole speakers' experiences with contact tracing,
282 because so few Haitian Creole-speaking respondents were tested. Without access to testing, the
283 true burden of COVID-19 infections in the Haitian population is unknown, and uninterrupted
284 transmission is likely to have occurred.

285
286 These disparities in testing and contact tracing highlight the challenges that the population and
287 coalition of stakeholders faced while responding to the high COVID-19 rates in Immokalee. The
288 disparities demonstrate the need for all stakeholders in the larger health system to connect more
289 effectively with vulnerable communities like MSFW, especially Haitian Creole speakers who are
290 known to be particularly marginalized.

291
292 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to examine community experiences with
293 COVID-19 for MSFW in Florida and the first to evaluate a COVID-19 contact tracing program
294 using probability sampling methods. The population sampled was representative of the diverse
295 Immokalee community with study demographics that parallel 2019 Census Data regarding
296 gender and race distribution and household size.²⁴ This study is well-powered to detect
297 differences regarding contact tracing experiences among language groups, especially as we
298 anticipated more clustering than was actually present in our sample.

299
300 In terms of future public health responses both in Immokalee and other MSFW communities, it
301 will be key to employ strategies that attend to differential access, vulnerability, and experiences.
302 For example, several programs across the United States indicate promises of linking social
303 support with contact tracing for vulnerable populations and represent an important target for

304 intervention for future health emergencies.^{23,25} The groups working in Immokalee are currently
305 implementing various social support programs, and further research is necessary to understand
306 the effects of this approach. Further research on the Haitian Creole population's experience will
307 also be essential in planning future responses that better reach the most vulnerable. Moving
308 forward, rapid upscaling of testing access, quality improvement of contact tracing, and
309 community vaccination are needed to prevent continued disproportionate COVID-19 spread and
310 death in vulnerable MSFW populations as new variants of SARS-CoV-2 surge.

311

312 **4.1 Limitations**

313 First, households were sampled from publicly available housing data, which may miss some
314 MSFW living in mobile homes. Also, the survey response rate was just over 50%, raising the
315 possibility of non-response bias. Our suspicion is that non-respondents were more likely to view
316 outreach efforts as intrusive during a pandemic and/or have concerns about migration status; we
317 hypothesize that non-respondents were probably less likely to be reached by public health
318 programs. Additionally, respondents who were migratory from June-October for farm work may
319 have been less likely to receive services. Finally, three participants whose primary language was
320 Mam (a Central American Indigenous language) completed the questionnaire in Spanish,
321 potentially affecting their answers. Future surveys should include all languages in Immokalee.

322

323 **5. Conclusion**

324 Overall, this study quantifies the impact of COVID-19 on Immokalee and elucidates the
325 individual, household, and occupational factors that place this community at especially high risk.
326 The data show that despite coordinated efforts from a committed group of stakeholders,

327 significant language-based inequities impacted the risk of contracting COVID-19, testing rates,
328 and receiving high-quality contact tracing. These inequities are a proxy for the disproportionate
329 barriers faced by non-English speaking populations in Immokalee to access care.

6. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Marley Monacello and Julia Perkins from the Coalition of Immokalee Workers, John “Trey” Fletcher from the Healthcare Network, and the staff at the Collier County Department of Health for their contributions.

Author Contributions:

Neha Limaye: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing-Original draft preparation, Project administration. **Brennan Ninesling:** Methodology, Investigation, Writing-Original draft preparation, Visualization. **Frantzso Marcelin:** Methodology, Investigation, Writing-Original draft preparation. **Cody Nolan:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Data Curation, Writing-Original draft preparation. **Walter Sobba:** Software, Formal analysis, Writing-Original draft preparation. **Matthew Hing:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing-Original draft preparation. **Emily Ptaszek:** Writing-Review & Editing. **Fernet Léandre:** Conceptualization, Writing- Reviewing & Editing. **Dan Palazuelos:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing-Review & Editing, Supervision.

The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The authors did not receive funds, grants, or other support from any organization for the submitted work.

7. References


1. Hansen E, Donohoe M. Health issues of migrant and seasonal farmworkers. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2003;14(2):153-164. doi:10.1353/hpu.2010.0790
2. Rust GS. Health status of migrant farmworkers: a literature review and commentary. *Am J Public Health*. 1990;80(10):1213-1217. doi:10.2105/AJPH.80.10.1213
3. Zahm SH, Blair A. Cancer among migrant and seasonal farmworkers: an epidemiologic review and research agenda. *Am J Ind Med*. 1993;24(6):753-766. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700240612
4. Lighthall D. The poor health of farm workers. *West J Med*. 2001;175(4):223-224. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1071557/>. Accessed May 17, 2021.
5. Frank AL, Liebman AK, Ryder B, Weir M, Arcury TA. Health care access and health care workforce for immigrant workers in the agriculture, forestry, and fisheries sector in the southeastern US. *Am J Ind Med*. 2013;56(8):960-974. doi:10.1002/ajim.22183
6. McCoy HV, Williams ML, Atkinson JS, Rubens M. Structural Characteristics of Migrant Farmworkers Reporting a Relationship with a Primary Care Physician. *J Immigr Minor Health Cent Minor Public Health*. 2016;18(3):710-714. doi:10.1007/s10903-015-0265-2
7. Macias Gil R, Marcelin JR, Zuniga-Blanco B, Marquez C, Mathew T, Piggott DA. COVID-19 Pandemic: Disparate Health Impact on the Hispanic/Latinx Population in the United States. *J Infect Dis*. 2020;222(10):1592-1595. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa474
8. Kullar R, Marcelin JR, Swartz TH, et al. Racial Disparity of Coronavirus Disease 2019 in African American Communities. *J Infect Dis*. 2020;222(6):890-893. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa372
9. Clark E, Fredricks K, Woc-Colburn L, Bottazzi ME, Weatherhead J. Disproportionate impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on immigrant communities in the United States. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2020;14(7). doi:10.1371/journal.pntd.0008484
10. Fielding-Miller RK, Sundaram ME, Brouwer K. Social determinants of COVID-19 mortality at the county level. *PloS One*. 2020;15(10):e0240151. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0240151
11. Handal AJ, Iglesias-Ríos L, Fleming PJ, Valentín-Cortés MA, O'Neill MS. "Essential" but Expendable: Farmworkers During the COVID-19 Pandemic-The Michigan Farmworker Project. *Am J Public Health*. 2020;110(12):1760-1762. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.305947
12. Flocks J. The Potential Impact of COVID-19 on H-2A Agricultural Workers. *J Agromedicine*. 2020;25(4):367-369. doi:10.1080/1059924X.2020.1814922

13. Tutor Marcom R, Freeman Lambar E, Rodman B, et al. Working along the Continuum: North Carolina's Collaborative Response to COVID-19 for Migrant & Seasonal Farmworkers. *J Agromedicine*. 2020;25(4):409-412. doi:10.1080/1059924X.2020.1815621
14. Ogles J. Rural Immokalee now has more COVID-19 cases than any other zip code in Florida. *Fla Polit - Campaigns Elections Lobbying Gov*. June 2020. <https://floridapolitics.com/archives/342071-rural-immokalee-now-has-more-covid-19-cases-than-any-zip-code-in-florida/>. Accessed May 17, 2021.
15. Florida: Doctors Without Borders ends COVID-19 activities in Immokalee. Doctors Without Borders - USA. <https://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/what-we-do/news-stories/news/florida-doctors-without-borders-ends-covid-19-activities-immokalee>. Published June 26, 2020. Accessed May 17, 2021.
16. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)--a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009;42(2):377-381. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
17. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*. 2019;95:103208. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208
18. COVID-19: Essential Workers in the States. National Conference of State Legislatures. <https://www.ncsl.org/research/labor-and-employment/covid-19-essential-workers-in-the-states.aspx>. Published January 11, 2021. Accessed May 17, 2021.
19. Tatar M, Habibdoust A, Wilson FA. Analysis of Excess Deaths During the COVID-19 Pandemic in the State of Florida. *Am J Public Health*. 2021;111(4):704-707. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.306130
20. Faust JS, Krumholz HM, Du C, et al. All-Cause Excess Mortality and COVID-19-Related Mortality Among US Adults Aged 25-44 Years, March-July 2020. *JAMA*. 2021;325(8):785. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.24243
21. Schneider J, Love W, Rusie L, et al. COVID-19 Contact Tracing Conundrums: Insights From the Front Lines. *Am J Public Health*. 2021;111(5):917-922. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2021.306200
22. World Health Organization. Contact tracing in the context of COVID-19. <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/contact-tracing-in-the-context-of-covid-19>. Published February 1, 2021. Accessed May 17, 2021.
23. Juneau C-E, Briand A-S, Pueyo T, Collazzo P, Potvin L. Effective Contact Tracing for COVID-19: A Systematic Review. *medRxiv*. July 2020:2020.07.23.20160234. doi:10.1101/2020.07.23.20160234

24. U.S. Census Bureau. American Community Survey 5-year estimates. Census Reporter Profile page for Immokalee, FL. <http://censusreporter.org/profiles/16000US1233250-immokalee-fl/>. Published 2019. Accessed May 31, 2021.
25. Cevik M, Baral SD, Crozier A, Cassell JA. Support for self-isolation is critical in covid-19 response. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n224. doi:10.1136/bmj.n224


8. Appendix

Appendix A, Figure 1. Timeline of COVID-19-related services in Collier County, Florida.



Appendix Figure 1: Timeline of COVID-19-related services in Collier County, Florida

Appendix A, Figure 2. Flow diagram of participant recruitment



Appendix A, Table 1. Results for total recorded deaths, predicted deaths, and estimated excess deaths.

Week Date	May					June					July					August		Total
	1 4/27-5/3	2 5/4-5/10	3 5/11-5/17	4 5/18-5/24	5 5/25-5/31	6 6/1-6/7	7 6/8-6/14	8 6/15-5/21	9 6/22-6/28	10 6/29-7/5	11 7/6-7/12	12 7/13-7/19	13 7/20-7/26	14 7/27-8/2	15 8/3-8/9	16 8/10-8/16		
Total all-cause recorded deaths, no.	0	5	20	24	12	16	25	16	27	23	30	32	22	29	37	1	319	
Predicted deaths, no.	0	2.4	9.6	4.5	13.5	15.3	13.0	14.5	14.2	11.2	8.1	12.1	11.0	13.5	10.7	0.4	154	
Excess deaths, no.	0	2.6	10.4	19.5	0.0	0.7	12.0	1.5	12.8	11.8	21.9	19.9	11.0	15.5	26.3	0.6	167	
Excess deaths, %	0%	108%	108%	433%	0%	5%	92%	10%	90%	105%	270%	164%	100%	115%	246%	150%	108%	

Appendix B
Community Questionnaire, English

Health Determinants and COVID Questionnaire		
General Instructions: Thank you for participating in this survey. The survey is anonymous. For any question, if you do not feel comfortable answering, you can skip the question or say you prefer not to answer. If you want to end the survey at any time, you can stop whenever you would like.		
Section 1: Screening		
A.1	Are you 18 years or older?	Yes 1 No 2 >>> End Survey
A.2	Do you live in Immokalee?	Yes 1 No 2 >>>End Survey
Have you spent two or more weeks staying in Immokalee between March and November 2020?		
A.3		Yes 1 No 2 >>> End Survey
Section 2: Demographics		
D.1	What gender do you identify as?	Female 1 Please read all options Male 2 Transgender 3 Non-binary 4 Other 5 Prefer not to answer 6
D.2	How old are you?	18-24 1 25-34 2 35-44 3 45-64 4 65-80 5 81+ 6
D.3	What race or ethnicity do you identify with?	White 1 Please read all options Black 2 Latino/a 3 Indigenous 4 Asian 5 Pacific Islander 6 Native American (US Tribe) 7 Prefer not to answer 8 Other: 9
D.4	What language do you prefer to use to communicate?	English 1 Spanish 2 Haitian Creole 3 Mam 4 Other:
D.5	What was the highest grade in school that you completed?	No formal schooling 1 Between kindergarten-5th grade 2 Between 6-8th grade 3 Between 9-12th grade 4 13+ grades (beyond high school) 5
D.6	What is your primary occupation?	Farmworker 1 Packinghouse Worker 2 Crew Leader/Agricultural Supervisor 3 Landscaping 4 Construction 5 Food service 6 Other: 7
D.7	Have you been working during the pandemic?	Yes 1 No 2 >>>Skip to S1
D.8	Were you offered the option of working from	Yes 1 No 2
D.9	equipment (facemasks, gloves) while at	Yes 1 No 2
D.10	Would you be offered sick leave if you were to	Yes 1 No 2
Section 3: Social Determinants of Health		
S.1	What is your housing situation?	I do not have housing (I am staying 1 Please read all options I have housing today, but I am worried 2 I have housing 3 Other: 4
S.2	How many people are living in the place where you currently stay?	Write in number
S.3	How many bathrooms are there in the place you are currently staying?	Write in number
S.4	How many bedrooms are in the place you are currently staying?	Write in number
S.5	If you were to be unable to isolate in your current housing for COVID-19, would you be open to temporarily going to a supportive isolation shelter to protect the others in your home?	Yes 1 No 2 Not sure 3
S.6	In the past month, did you run out of food before you had money to buy more?	Yes 1 No 2 Not sure 3 Prefer not to answer 4
Section 4: Covid-19 Impact		
C.1	During the past few months, where have you received information about COVID-19?	Please read all options, and have participant select all that apply Newspapers 1 Television 2 Internet news 3 Social media 4 Health promoters/promotoras 5 Clinic/Hospital 6 Friends 7 Family 8 Co-Workers 9 Radio 10 Other: 11

C.2	Which of these sources of information do you trust the most?		
	Newspapers	1	Please have participant select ONE
	Television	2	
	Internet news	3	
	Social media	4	
	Health promoters/promotoras	5	
	Clinic/Hospital	6	
	Friends	7	
	Family	8	
	Co-Workers	9	
	Radio	10	
Other:	11		
C.3	Have you ever been tested for COVID-19?		
	Yes	1	
	No	2	>>>Skip to C.12
C.4	Where did you get tested?		
	Department Of Health	1	
	Immokalee Clinic	2	
	Fellowship Church	3	
	Naples	4	
Fort Meyers	5		
Other:	6		
C.5	How long did it take to find out the results?		
	<24 hours	1	
	2-3 days	2	
	4-6 days	3	
	One week or more?	4	
C.6	What was the result of the test?		
	Positive	1	
	Negative	2	>>>Skip to C.13
	Not sure	3	>>>Skip to C.13
C.7	When you received the phone call about your test result, did they ask for assistance in identifying the names and phone numbers of individuals you were in contact with?		
	Yes	1	
	No	2	
	Not sure	3	
C.8	Did they ask about your ability to safely isolate and quarantine in your current housing situation?		
	Yes	1	
	No	2	
	Not sure	3	
C.9	At any point during the phone call, did they provide information on any resources that exist to help assist with isolation or quarantine?		
	Yes	1	
	No	2	
	Not sure	3	
C.10	What language did the phone call take place in?		
	English	1	
	Spanish	2	
	Haitian Creole	3	
Other:	4		
C.11	Did the caller ask about your language preference?		
	Yes	1	>>>Skip to C.13
	Not sure	3	>>>Skip to C.13
	No	2	>>>Skip to C.13
C.12	Which (if any) of the following factors prevent you from getting tested for COVID-19?		Please read all options, and have participant select all that apply
	I did not have symptoms/I do not feel sick	1	
	Not concerned about it	2	
	Ability to pay for testing	3	
	I dont understand the testing process	4	
	Afraid to get tested	5	
	I dont want to be judged if I have it	6	
	Lack of transportation	7	
	Live alone and do not have a caretaker	8	
	Injury or disability prevent me from leavi	9	
Other	10		
C.13	Did anyone in your household or another person close to you with test positive for COVID-19?		
	Yes	1	
	No	2	>>>Skip to C.17
	Not sure	3	>>>Skip to C.17
C.14	Were you called by the Department of Health about the positive contact?		
	Yes	1	
	No	2	
	Not sure	3	
C.15	What language did the phone call take place in?		
	English	1	
	Spanish	2	
	Haitian Creole	3	
Other:	4		
C.16	Did the caller ask about your language preference?		
	Yes	1	
	Not sure	3	
No	2		
C.17	If you or another person in your household was showing symptoms such as fever, cough, fatigue, would you get tested for COVID-19?		
	Yes	1	>>>End of Survey
	No	2	>>>End of Survey
Not Sure	3	>>>End of Survey	