

**Melissa Whitney**

**From:** JoAnn diFilippo [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 1, 2021 10:33 AM  
**To:** COB\_mail  
**Cc:** District1  
**Subject:** BOS November 2, 2021 meeting: Comment Letter for Agenda Item #10 - COVID 19 emergency items

**CAUTION:** This message and sender come from outside Pima County. If you did not expect this message, proceed with caution. Verify the sender's identity before performing any action, such as clicking on a link or opening an attachment.

Clerk of the Board: please accept this email as a Comment Letter to the Supervisors' November 2, 2021 – Agenda Item 10.

The email below was originally sent to each Supervisor via email on October 26, 2021.

Chairwoman Bronson and Supervisors:

On October 12, 2021, CHH released a memo regarding the results of his request to the Pima County Human Resources Department to "determine what actions counties of similar size to Pima County in surrounding states were doing with respect to COVID-19 vaccination policies." After reviewing the results, I provide the following comments:

1. A total of twelve regions comprised of either cities or counties were surveyed;
2. 1 respondent (County of Bernalillo, New Mexico) did not respond to the county's inquiry;
3. 2 areas (City of Phoenix and Maricopa County) are not listed in the chart analysis; however, CHH does make mention of their status in his cover memo. Thus, a total of 10 respondents are identified on the chart analysis plus 2 additional areas identified in CHH's memo indicating information was solicited in some format to achieve a total sampling pool of 12 respondents with "no response" from County of Bernalillo, New Mexico (or a sampling response of 91%);
4. The state breakdown of the 12 respondents is:
  - a. 2 target areas located in Arizona: Governor Ducey (Republican – state has no vaccination mandate)
  - b. 5 target areas located in California: Governor Newsom (Democrat – state has some form of vaccination mandate)
  - c. 1 target area located in Colorado: Governor Polis (Democrat – state has some form of vaccination mandate)
  - d. 1 target area located in Texas: Governor Abbott (Republican – state has no vaccination mandate)
  - e. 1 target area located in New Mexico: Governor Grisham (Democrat – state has no vaccination mandate at this time; however, state's website clearly identified COVID-19 public policy that mirrors many conditions and requirements of vaccination mandated states; see, [EPI-COVID19-Containment-Policies-9.30.2021.pdf \(nmhealth.org\)](#);
  - f. 1 target area located in Nevada: Governor Sisolak (Democrat – state has some form of vaccination mandate)
  - g. 1 target area located in Washington: Governor Inslee (Democrat – state has some form of vaccination mandate)

It appears the criteria (or directive) issued was to seek information from "counties of similar size to Pima County" only. If you consider the data sampling pool beyond the aspect of "similar size" (which should have occurred in order to present findings that are balanced and without bias) a researcher would have been able to ascertain controlling factors beyond the "similar size" requirement, namely:

1. What is the state vaccination mandate of the state in which the respondent city or county is geographically located?

2. Due to the politicization agenda surrounding COVID-19 mandates, what is the political affiliation of the respective state's governor; and
3. What type of state mandates have been directed by that governor to communities within that state's geographic boundaries?

Did you analyze the data methodology presented to you or just accept the "skewed" results as de facto? Why were there no cities or counties included from Utah, a neighboring state much closer geographically than Washington? Utah's Governor Cox is a Republican who has stated his office "challenges the legality of vaccine mandates" ([Gov. Cox issues statement on President Biden's vaccine mandate | Governor Spencer J. Cox \(utah.gov\)](#)). Or, Alabama cities/counties under Republican Governor Ivey's directive that "[we] will fight vaccine mandates" ([Alabama Gov. Kay Ivey: Oppose Biden vaccine mandate through courts, not legislation - al.com](#)). Numerous other examples could be presented; however, I believe you can ascertain the point illustrated in this discourse.

The sampling pool selected indicates a majority of respondents selected are from democrat-controlled states requiring some variation of COVID-19 mandate vs. 2 republican-controlled states which do not require COVID-19 mandates (Texas and Arizona). Perhaps this was an oversight in those compiling the data; perhaps not. When conducting any type of statistical analysis, it is well known that the "design of a sample refers to the method used to select the sample population (in this case counties of similar size to Pima County) and the random selection from the population. This methodology allows for every possible sample of a given size the **same chance** to be the sample selected. Random sampling avoids the **systematic favoritism or bias** that often results when a sample is formed by human choice (Moore, 1993).

Thus, in order to alleviate any sampling bias in future studies directed by any county official and/or administrative office, I suggest future directives to staff try to adjust the "random" sampling pool to include balanced sampling free from bias and, more importantly, statistical inference (the ability to infer conclusions based on data presented). If the Human Resources Department sought inquiry from balanced criteria the results presented would in all likelihood appear with minimalization of statistical inference in the results (lower numbers of "Yes" responses). For example, in the chart analysis of the referenced directive, the second column "employee vaccination requirements" might report a different visual (high number of "Yes" responses) or an equal number of "Yes" and "No" responses, etc. To do otherwise produces what every Statistics 101 student is warned against: "garbage in" results in "garbage out" and faulty consensus agendas. Please be careful when distributing information results to the public to ensure **misinformed trends** are not promoted and/or inferred. We, the taxpayers, deserve better from you. Thank you.

-----  
Moore, D. S. (1993). *Against All Odds: Inside Statistics*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) NY: New York. W. H. Freeman and Company.

JoAnn di Filippo, PhD

JoAnn di Filippo, PhD