**State-level Stay-at-home Orders and Objectively Measured Movement
in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic**

Kyle J. Bourassa, Ph.D.

Duke University Medical Center

Duke University

Word Count: 2,028

Tables: 1

Figures: 3

References: 15

Note: The author would like to acknowledge the review of this manuscript by Drs. Aaron M. Norr (VA Puget Sound, Seattle Division), Avshalom Caspi (Duke University), David A. Sbarra (University of Arizona), and Terrie E. Moffitt (Duke University). Conflicts of Interest and Source of Funding: The author does not have any conflicts of interest to disclose. The author received support from National Institute on Aging Training Grant T32-AG000029. Aggregated mobility data were provided by three companies: Cuebiq (cuebiq.com), Streetlight Data (<https://www.streetlightdata.com>), and Citymapper (via [Citymapper.com/cmi](https://www.citymapper.com/cmi)). Cuebiq is a location intelligence and measurement platform. Through its Data for Good program, Cuebiq provides access to aggregated mobility data for academic research and humanitarian initiatives. These first-party data are collected from anonymized users who have opted-in to provide access to their location data anonymously, through a GDPR-compliant framework. It is then aggregated to the county level to provide insights on changes in human mobility over time. Streetlight Data made data available for the purpose of nonprofit, public benefit research in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. County-level demographic, socioeconomic, and health behavior data were made available from the County Health Rankings & Roadmaps (<https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/>).

Abstract

Objective: Social distancing has been one of the primary interventions used to slow the spread of COVID-19. State-wide stay-at-home orders received a large degree of attention as a public health intervention to increase social distancing, but relatively little peer-reviewed research has examined the extent to which stay-at-home orders affected people's behavior. **Method:** This study used GPS-derived movement from 2,858 counties in the United States from March 1 to May 7, 2020 to test the degree to which changes in state-level stay-at-home orders were associated with movement outside the home.

Results: From the first week of March to the first week of April, people in counties within states that enacted stay-at-home orders decreased their movement significantly more than people in counties within states that did not enact state-level stay-at-home orders. From the first week of April to the first week of May, people in counties within states that ended their stay-at-home orders increased their movement significantly more than people in counties within states whose stay-at-home orders remained in place. The magnitude of change in movement associated with state-level stay-at-home orders was many times smaller than the total change in movement across all counties over the same periods of time in both cases. **Conclusions:** Stay-at-home orders are likely insufficient to reduce people's movement outside the home without additional public health actions. Existing research on behavior change would be useful to determine what additional interventions could support social distancing behaviors during the COVID-19 pandemic if becomes necessary to reduce movement in the future.

Keywords: COVID-19; social distancing; movement behavior; stay-at-home orders

Abbreviations: Coronavirus disease of 2019 = COVID-19.

Introduction

The coronavirus disease of 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has resulted in over 1.95 million confirmed infections and over 110,000 deaths in the United States as of June 10, 2020 (1,2). Due to the lack of pharmacological interventions, social distancing (3,4) became the primary strategy available to mitigate the spread of disease in the United States during the first months of the pandemic. State and local governments enacted limitations on business and movement to reduce travel outside the home, with the goal of slowing the rate of infection (4). Stay-at-home orders became a focus of public health and political decision-making based on the assumption that such orders determine people's behavior.

Should we expect that government orders would change people's movement outside the home? On the one hand, public health interventions can change behavior (5) and top-down mandates during a public health emergency may spur people to action. On the other hand, health-relevant behaviors are determined by a number of factors (6) and people's movement could be unrelated to such orders. Decades of research has illustrated the challenges associated with changing health-relevant behaviors, as well as maintaining change over time (5,6). Early evidence suggests that changes in people's movement did not correspond to when stay-at-home orders were enacted or ended (7,8). The extent to which people's movement outside the home is associated with changes in stay-at-home orders is an open question with direct relevance to future public health decision-making. This study examined whether state-level stay-at-home orders were associated with changes in movement, as well the magnitude of change associated with such orders compared to total change in people's behavior.

Methods

Study Design

The current study used movement data from March 1 to May 7, 2020 collected using roughly 15 million GPS-enabled devices and made accessible for research purposes by Cuebiq and Streetlight Data. Data were aggregated at the county level—no individual-level data was used for this study. Daily data

from Streetlight were made available starting March 1, which was used as the start of the study period. United States counties were included if they had both sources of movement data ($N = 2,858$). Streetlight Data did not include movement data on counties in Alaska ($n = 29$) and Hawaii ($n = 5$), or 248 additional counties in the continental United States. Cuebiq data did not provide data for 2 additional counties. Supplemental Data 1 lists excluded counties.

Measures

Movement behavior. Daily movement was assessed using two outcomes, the *percentage of people staying within 1 mile of home* and *vehicle miles traveled*. Both outcomes used data from millions of individual GPS-enabled devices aggregated at the county level by Cuebiq and Streetlight Data. Cuebiq data measured the maximum distance people traveled from their homes (less than 300 feet, between 330 feet and 1 mile, between 1 and 10 miles, and more than 10 miles). Daily estimates of *percentage of people staying within 1 mile of home* were used for the current study. Streetlight data measured *vehicle miles traveled*, derived using a proprietary algorithm applied to the Cuebiq Mobility Index, a continuous measure of movement calculated separately from the distance people traveled from home. Change in vehicle miles was benchmarked to the vehicle miles travelled during the baseline period. Data were averaged over three periods: March 1-7, April 1-7, May 1-7. March 1-7 and May 1-7 presented the first and last weeks of the study period. April 1-7 was used as the period that roughly corresponded to the period of least movement outside the home and the middle of the study period. Study outcomes included changes in the weekly averages of the movement outcomes from March to April and from April to May. 7-day moving averages were calculated using the average of each date, along with the 3 days prior to and following it. Values were coded as missing if 4 or more days of data were unavailable.

Stay-at-home orders. Public media sources were used to collect data on state-level stay-at-home orders (or similar orders—e.g., shelter-in-place). For the March to April period, counties were coded as being in a state that enacted a stay-at-home order (85.2%) or not (14.8%). For the April to May

period, counties were coded as being in a state with a stay-at-home order that remained in place on May 7 (43.4%) or no stay-at-home order on May 7 (56.6%). The latter group included counties in states that ended their stay-at-home order or never enacted a stay-at-home order. Counties were also coded by the date when stay-at-home orders were enacted or ended to create additional categories.

Supplemental Data 2 includes these categories and full stay-at-home order data.

County-level covariates. Data from the 2019 County Health Rankings & Roadmaps were used for county-level demographic and socioeconomic covariates. Variables included county-level population, percentage of the population defined as rural, median household income, and percentage of the county population with a college degree. These data were derived from American Community Survey, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates, and Census Population Estimates

Data Analysis

This study used multiple regression models to test whether changes in movement were associated with state-level stay-at-home orders. The first set of models examined whether counties in states that enacted a stay-at-home order saw a greater decrease in movement outside the home from the first week of March to the first week of April. The second set of models examined whether counties in states that ended their stay-at-home orders before May 7 saw a greater increase in movement outside the home from the first week of April to the first week of May. Models first examined the bivariate association between stay-at-home orders and change in movement, then examined this association when controlling for covariates at the county level—population, rurality, education, household income, and baseline movement. Analyses were conducted in SPSS version 26.

Results

Decreases in County-level Movement from March to April

From the first week of March to the first week of April, counties in states that enacted a stay-at-home order had 3.1% more people remain within 1 mile of home (95% CI [2.6%, 3.6%], $p < .001$) and

1.6% fewer vehicle miles traveled (95% CI [0.6%, 2.6%], $p = .002$) compared to counties in states that did not enact a stay-at-home order. This difference was 7.1 times smaller than the total increase in people staying within 1 mile of home (21.9%) and 40.2 times smaller than the total decrease in vehicle miles people traveled (64.3%) over the same period. These results were relatively unchanged when controlling for county-level population, rurality, education, household income, and baseline movement (Table 1). When examining changes in daily movement over the entire period from early March to early April, decreases in movement stabilized by approximately March 23, 4 days earlier than the average date on which states issued a stay-at-home order (Figure 1).

Increases in County-level Movement from April to May

From the first week of April to the first week of May, counties in states that ended their stay-at-home orders by May 7 saw 1.2% fewer people remain within 1 mile of home (95% CI [1.0%, 1.4%], $p < .001$) and 6.2% more vehicle miles traveled (95% CI [4.6%, 7.9%], $p < .001$) compared to counties in states that maintained their stay-at-home orders. This difference was 8.2 times smaller than the total decrease in people staying within 1 mile of home (9.8%) and 9.1 times smaller than the total increase in vehicle miles traveled (56.6%) over the same period. These results were relatively unchanged when controlling for county-level population, rurality, education, household income, and baseline movement (Table 1). When examining changes in daily movement over the entire period from early April to early May, increases in movement began in mid-April, prior to the earliest date that state-level stay-at-home orders were ended, April 26 (Figure 2). The results suggest that stay-at-home orders were significantly associated with change in movement, but these effects were small in magnitude compared to the total change in movement over two study periods (Figure 3).

Discussion

The current study examined the association between state-level stay-at-home orders and changes in movement outside the home in 2,858 United States counties. People decreased their

movement more from March to April in counties within states that enacted stay-at-home orders. People increased their movement more from April to May in counties within states that ended their stay-at-home orders or did not have them to begin with. Changes in movement associated with changes in stay-at-home orders were many times smaller than the total amount that people changed their movement behavior over the same period. Changes in daily movement occurred prior to the earliest date that stay-at-home orders were enacted or ended, suggesting stay-at-home orders played only a part in shaping the overall pattern of behavior change. These findings match well with recent evidence that the rate of hospitalizations in late March, 2020 from COVID-19 slowed several days earlier than would be expected based on the date of stay-at-home orders in four states (9), suggesting social distancing increased prior to such orders. Stay-at-home orders alone are likely insufficient to change behavior to the degree observed over the study period. Future efforts to promote social distancing would likely benefit from additional public health interventions to either supplement or replace state-level stay-at-home orders.

These results highlight the importance of using objectively measured movement to assess the extent to which people travel outside their home, rather than making inferences based on state-level stay-at-home orders. A state ending a stay-at-home order does not mean people immediately revert to their pre-pandemic travel routines. If stay-at-home orders are assumed to drive the majority of people's behavior, movement would be expected to revert to pre-pandemic levels in states that ended such orders. This assumption, however, would lead to spurious conclusions regarding viral transmission risk associated with movement outside the home. For example, if movement behavior remained similar among states with different stay-at-home orders, similar infection rates among those states would give the impression that increased movement outside the home was unrelated to increased rate of infection.

There were limitations to the current study. First, this study did not directly assess the number of close-proximity contacts people had outside their homes. Movement behavior is likely to be highly correlated with such contacts, but it is also possible for people to be outside the home and maintain

physical distance from people outside their households. Second, this study tested the association between only one type of public health action (state-level stay-at-home-orders). There were a number of other public health actions that may have affected people's behavior. Third, the current study used data aggregated at the county-level. Studies of individuals' behavior may provide more information about how people's social distancing behaviors changed in response to state-level stay-at-home orders.

The small but significant change in social distancing behavior associated with state-wide stay-at-home orders matches well with what would be expected from an intervention targeting a multiply-determined health behavior. Interventions are most successful when they target various levels that influence behavior (10) and state-level stay-at-home orders by definition operate at a single level. Changes in movement are undoubtedly affected by numerous variables beyond whether a state enacts or ends a stay-at-home order. For example, people in states without stay-at-home order may have been influenced by other states that enacted such orders—increasing their perception of danger related to COVID-19—or other government actions, such as the closure of schools or restaurants. The influence of messaging about the pandemic could have operated at the national level as well. The way that trusted public officials discussed the danger (or lack of danger) related to the pandemic could have influenced people's behavior, regardless of local or state ordinances. Given empirical evidence linking movement and conventional health behaviors (e.g., smoking and physical activity; 11), previous social and behavioral scientific research (12,13) on health behavior (14) and health behavior change (5,6,15) could be productively used to promote social distancing behaviors—such as reduced movement outside the home—if it becomes necessary to do so in the future. This may become particularly relevant if hospitalizations from COVID-19 begin to increase as movement outside the house also increases in the future, necessitating new public health efforts to increase social distancing to slow infection rates.

References

1. Lai CC, Shih TP, Ko WC, Tang HJ, Hsueh PR. Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and corona virus disease-2019 (COVID-19): The epidemic and the challenges. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2020;55(3):105924. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2020.105924>
2. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Cases in the U.S. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/cases-in-us.html/>. Accessibility verified May 27, 2020.
3. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Social Distancing. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/social-distancing.html>. Accessibility verified May 27, 2020.
4. Koo JR, Cook AR, Park M, et al. Interventions to mitigate early spread of SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore: A modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020. Published online March 23, 2020. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30162-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30162-6)
5. Glanz K, Bishop DB. The role of behavioral science theory in development and implementation of public health interventions. *Ann Rev Public Health*. 2010;31:399-418. <https://doi.org/annurev.publhealth.012809.103604>
6. Kelly MP, Barker M. Why is changing health-related behaviour so difficult?. *Public Health*. 2016;136:109-116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2016.03.030>
7. Malone C, Bourassa KJ. Americans Didn't Wait For Their Governors To Tell Them To Stay Home Because Of COVID-19. *FiveThirtyEight*. May 8, 2020. <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/americans-didnt-wait-for-their-governors-to-tell-them-to-stay-home-because-of-covid-19/>
8. Dance GJX, Gamio L. As Coronavirus Restrictions Lift, Millions in U.S. Are Leaving Home Again. *New York Times*. May 12, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/05/12/us/coronavirus-reopening-shutdown.html>

9. Sen S, Karaca-Mandic P, Georgiou A. Association of Stay-at-Home Orders With COVID-19 Hospitalizations in 4 States. *JAMA*. Published online May 27, 2020.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.9176>
10. Sallis JF, Owen N, Fisher E. Ecological models of health behavior. *Health Behavior: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Eds. Glanz K et al. 2015;5:43-64. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
11. Bourassa KJ, Sbarra D, Caspi A, Moffitt TE. Social Distancing as a Health Behavior: County-level Movement in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic is Associated with Conventional Health Behaviors. *PsyArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/bt5ac>
12. West R, Michie S, Rubin GJ, Amlôt R. Applying principles of behaviour change to reduce SARS-CoV-2 transmission. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2020;4:451-459. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0887-9>
13. Bavel JJV., Baicker, K, Boggio, PS et al. Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2020;4:460-471. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
14. Glanz K, Rimer BK, Viswanath K. *Health Behavior and Health Education*. 2008. San Francisco, Josey Bass.
15. Richard L, Gauvin L, Raine K. Ecological models revisited: Their uses and evolution in health promotion over two decades. *Ann Rev Public Health*. 2011; 32: 307-326.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031210-101141>

Table 1. *The Association Between Changes in State-level Stay-at-home Orders and Movement Behavior*

<i>N</i> = 2,858	Bivariate associations		Adding covariates	
	<i>B</i>	95% CI	<i>B</i>	95% CI
Movement associated with enacting a stay-at-home order				
Increase in % remaining within 1 mile of home	3.10**	[2.61, 3.60]	2.91**	[2.61, 3.22]
Decrease in % of vehicle miles traveled	1.60**	[0.58, 2.61]	2.56**	[1.85, 3.26]
Movement associated with ending a stay-at-home order				
Decrease in % remaining within 1 mile of home	1.20**	[1.04, 1.36]	1.58**	[1.42, 1.74]
Increase in % of vehicle miles traveled	6.25**	[4.62, 7.87]	7.25**	[5.56, 8.94]

Note: Movement associated with enacting a stay-at-home order assessed changes in movement from the first week of March to the first week of April for counties in states that enacted a stay-at-home order compared to those that did not. *Movement associated with ending a stay-at-home order* assessed changes from the first week of April to the first week of March for counties in states whose stay-at-home order remained in place on May 7, 2020 compared to those that did not. Models adding covariates included county-level baseline movement, population, rurality, household income, and education as additional predictors. CI = confidence interval.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Figure 1. 7-day moving average of movement in U.S. counties from March to April. Percentages are benchmarked to the first week of March.

Figure 2. 7-day moving average of movement in U.S. counties from April to May. Percentages are benchmarked to the first week of April.

Figure 3. Comparing the overall magnitude of changes in movement to changes in movement associated with state-level stay at home orders.

Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

**State-level Stay-at-home Orders and Objectively Measured Movement
in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic**

Kyle J. Bourassa

Supplemental Information

Supplemental Data 1.	Excluded Counties.....	2
Supplemental Data 2.	State-level Stay-at-home Orders Data.....	5

Supplemental Data 1. Excluded Counties

2013	AK	Aleutians East Borough	8113	CO	San Miguel County
2016	AK	Aleutians West Census Area	8115	CO	Sedgwick County
2020	AK	Anchorage Borough	13007	GA	Baker County
2050	AK	Bethel Census Area	13061	GA	Clay County
2060	AK	Bristol Bay Borough	13239	GA	Quitman County
2068	AK	Denali Borough	13265	GA	Taliaferro County
2070	AK	Dillingham Census Area	13307	GA	Webster County
2090	AK	Fairbanks North Star	15001	HI	Hawaii County
2100	AK	Haines Borough	15003	HI	Honolulu County
2105	AK	Hoonah-Angoon Census	15005	HI	Kalawao County
2110	AK	Juneau Borough	15007	HI	Kauai County
2122	AK	Kenai Peninsula Borough	15009	HI	Maui County
2130	AK	Ketchikan Gateway Bo	16003	ID	Adams County
2150	AK	Kodiak Island Borough	16015	ID	Boise County
2158	AK	Kusilvak Census Area	16023	ID	Butte County
2164	AK	Lake and Peninsula B	16025	ID	Camas County
2170	AK	Matanuska-Susitna Bo	16033	ID	Clark County
2180	AK	Nome Census Area	16035	ID	Clearwater County
2185	AK	North Slope Borough	16037	ID	Custer County
2188	AK	Northwest Arctic Borough	16061	ID	Lewis County
2195	AK	Petersburg Census Area	20017	KS	Chase County
2198	AK	Prince of Wales-Hyde	20019	KS	Chautauqua County
2220	AK	Sitka Borough	20025	KS	Clark County
2230	AK	Skagway Municipality	20033	KS	Comanche County
2240	AK	Southeast Fairbanks	20039	KS	Decatur County
2261	AK	Valdez-Cordova Census Area	20049	KS	Elk County
2275	AK	Wrangell City	20071	KS	Greeley County
2282	AK	Yakutat Borough	20083	KS	Hodgeman County
2290	AK	Yukon-Koyukuk Census	20097	KS	Kiowa County
6003	CA	Alpine County	20101	KS	Lane County
6091	CA	Sierra County	20105	KS	Lincoln County
8009	CO	Baca County	20109	KS	Logan County
8017	CO	Cheyenne County	20153	KS	Rawlins County
8023	CO	Costilla County	20187	KS	Stanton County
8025	CO	Crowley County	20199	KS	Wallace County
8027	CO	Custer County	20203	KS	Wichita County
8033	CO	Dolores County	21189	KY	Owsley County
8047	CO	Gilpin County	21201	KY	Robertson County
8053	CO	Hinsdale County	22059	LA	La Salle Parish
8057	CO	Jackson County	25019	MA	Nantucket County
8061	CO	Kiowa County	26003	MI	Alger County
8065	CO	Lake County	26083	MI	Keweenaw County
8079	CO	Mineral County	26095	MI	Luce County
8091	CO	Ouray County	26131	MI	Ontonagon County
8109	CO	Saguache County	26153	MI	Schoolcraft County
8111	CO	San Juan County	27031	MN	Cook County

27069	MN	Kittson County	31087	NE	Hitchcock County
27077	MN	Lake of the Woods Co	31091	NE	Hooker County
27087	MN	Mahnomen County	31103	NE	Keya Paha County
27125	MN	Red Lake County	31113	NE	Logan County
27155	MN	Traverse County	31115	NE	Loup County
28055	MS	Issaquena County	31117	NE	McPherson County
29129	MO	Mercer County	31133	NE	Pawnee County
29227	MO	Worth County	31149	NE	Rock County
30005	MT	Blaine County	31165	NE	Sioux County
30011	MT	Carter County	31171	NE	Thomas County
30015	MT	Chouteau County	31173	NE	Thurston County
30019	MT	Daniels County	31183	NE	Wheeler County
30025	MT	Fallon County	32009	NV	Esmeralda County
30033	MT	Garfield County	32011	NV	Eureka County
30037	MT	Golden Valley County	32015	NV	Lander County
30039	MT	Granite County	32017	NV	Lincoln County
30045	MT	Judith Basin County	32021	NV	Mineral County
30051	MT	Liberty County	32027	NV	Pershing County
30055	MT	McCone County	35003	NM	Catron County
30057	MT	Madison County	35011	NM	DeBaca County
30059	MT	Meagher County	35013	NM	Dona Ana County
30065	MT	Musselshell County	35019	NM	Guadalupe County
30069	MT	Petroleum County	35021	NM	Harding County
30071	MT	Phillips County	35023	NM	Hidalgo County
30073	MT	Pondera County	35033	NM	Mora County
30075	MT	Powder River County	35059	NM	Union County
30077	MT	Powell County	36041	NY	Hamilton County
30079	MT	Prairie County	37177	NC	Tyrrell County
30091	MT	Sheridan County	38001	ND	Adams County
30097	MT	Sweet Grass County	38005	ND	Benson County
30099	MT	Teton County	38007	ND	Billings County
30101	MT	Toole County	38011	ND	Bowman County
30103	MT	Treasure County	38013	ND	Burke County
30107	MT	Wheatland County	38019	ND	Cavalier County
30109	MT	Wibaux County	38023	ND	Divide County
31005	NE	Arthur County	38027	ND	Eddy County
31007	NE	Banner County	38029	ND	Emmons County
31009	NE	Blaine County	38031	ND	Foster County
31015	NE	Boyd County	38033	ND	Golden Valley County
31017	NE	Brown County	38037	ND	Grant County
31049	NE	Deuel County	38039	ND	Griggs County
31057	NE	Dundy County	38041	ND	Hettinger County
31069	NE	Garden County	38043	ND	Kidder County
31071	NE	Garfield County	38045	ND	LaMoure County
31073	NE	Gosper County	38047	ND	Logan County
31075	NE	Grant County	38051	ND	McIntosh County
31077	NE	Greeley County	38063	ND	Nelson County
31085	NE	Hayes County	38065	ND	Oliver County

38069	ND	Pierce County	46137	SD	Ziebach County
38075	ND	Renville County	48011	TX	Armstrong County
38081	ND	Sargent County	48033	TX	Borden County
38083	ND	Sheridan County	48045	TX	Briscoe County
38085	ND	Sioux County	48095	TX	Concho County
38087	ND	Slope County	48101	TX	Cottle County
38091	ND	Steele County	48125	TX	Dickens County
38095	ND	Towner County	48137	TX	Edwards County
38103	ND	Wells County	48155	TX	Foard County
40025	OK	Cimarron County	48229	TX	Hudspeth County
41021	OR	Gilliam County	48235	TX	Irion County
41037	OR	Lake County	48243	TX	Jeff Davis County
41055	OR	Sherman County	48261	TX	Kenedy County
41069	OR	Wheeler County	48263	TX	Kent County
42023	PA	Cameron County	48269	TX	King County
42053	PA	Forest County	48271	TX	Kinney County
42113	PA	Sullivan County	48301	TX	Loving County
46003	SD	Aurora County	48311	TX	McMullen County
46007	SD	Bennett County	48327	TX	Menard County
46017	SD	Buffalo County	48345	TX	Motley County
46021	SD	Campbell County	48377	TX	Presidio County
46025	SD	Clark County	48393	TX	Roberts County
46031	SD	Corson County	48413	TX	Schleicher County
46037	SD	Day County	48431	TX	Sterling County
46039	SD	Deuel County	48433	TX	Stonewall County
46041	SD	Dewey County	48443	TX	Terrell County
46043	SD	Douglas County	48447	TX	Throckmorton County
46045	SD	Edmunds County	49009	UT	Daggett County
46049	SD	Faulk County	49017	UT	Garfield County
46055	SD	Haakon County	49031	UT	Piute County
46059	SD	Hand County	49033	UT	Rich County
46063	SD	Harding County	49055	UT	Wayne County
46069	SD	Hyde County	50009	VT	Essex County
46071	SD	Jackson County	50013	VT	Grand Isle County
46073	SD	Jerauld County	51017	VA	Bath County
46075	SD	Jones County	51091	VA	Highland County
46085	SD	Lyman County	51678	VA	Lexington city
46089	SD	McPherson County	53013	WA	Columbia County
46095	SD	Mellette County	53019	WA	Ferry County
46097	SD	Miner County	53023	WA	Garfield County
46102	SD	Oglala Lakota County	53069	WA	Wahkiakum County
46105	SD	Perkins County	54013	WV	Calhoun County
46107	SD	Potter County	54071	WV	Pendleton County
46111	SD	Sanborn County	54075	WV	Pocahontas County
46117	SD	Stanley County	55037	WI	Florence County
46119	SD	Sully County	55041	WI	Forest County
46121	SD	Todd County	55078	WI	Menominee County
46129	SD	Walworth County	56027	WY	Niobrara County

Supplemental Data 2. State-level Stay-at-home Order Data.

The following information was collected using public media websites describing state-level stay-at-home orders (<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/states-reopen-map-coronavirus.html>; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2020/national/states-reopening-coronavirus-map/>). Stay-at-home categories were coded as follows: 1 = stay-at-home order enacted by March 25, 2 = stay-at-home order enacted between March 26 and March 31, 3 = stay-at-home order enacted after April 1, 4 = no stay-at-home order. Reopening categories were coded as follows: 1 = stay-at-home order was in place on May 7, 2 = stay-at-home order ended between May 1 and May 7, 3 = stay-at-home order ended before May 1, 4 = no stay-at-home order.

State name	Stay-at-home order	Stay-at-home order date	Stay-at-home category	Order on May 7	Date order ended	Order end category
Alabama	Yes	4/4/2020	3	No	4/30/2020	3
Arizona	Yes	3/31/2020	2	Yes	N/A	1
Arkansas	No	None	4	No	N/A	4
California	Yes	3/19/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Colorado	Yes	3/26/2020	2	No	4/26/2020	3
Connecticut	Yes	3/23/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Delaware	Yes	3/24/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Washington D.C.	Yes	4/1/2020	3	Yes	N/A	1
Florida	Yes	4/2/2020	3	No	5/4/2020	2
Georgia	Yes	4/3/2020	3	No	4/30/2020	3
Idaho	Yes	3/25/2020	1	No	4/30/2020	3
Illinois	Yes	3/21/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Indiana	Yes	3/24/2020	1	No	5/4/2020	2
Iowa	No	None	4	No	N/A	4
Kansas	Yes	3/30/2020	2	No	5/3/2020	2
Kentucky	Yes	3/26/2020	2	Yes	N/A	1
Louisiana	Yes	3/23/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Maine	Yes	4/2/2020	3	Yes	N/A	1
Maryland	Yes	3/30/2020	2	Yes	N/A	1
Massachusetts	Yes	3/24/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Michigan	Yes	3/24/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Minnesota	Yes	3/27/2020	2	Yes	N/A	1
Mississippi	Yes	4/3/2020	3	No	4/27/2020	3
Missouri	Yes	4/6/2020	3	No	5/3/2020	2

Montana	Yes	3/28/2020	2	No	4/26/2020	3
Nebraska	No	None	4	No	N/A	4
Nevada	Yes	4/1/2020	3	Yes	N/A	1
New Hampshire	Yes	3/27/2020	2	Yes	N/A	1
New Jersey	Yes	3/21/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
New Mexico	Yes	3/24/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
New York	Yes	3/22/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
North Carolina	Yes	3/30/2020	2	Yes	N/A	1
North Dakota	No	None	4	No	N/A	4
Ohio	Yes	3/23/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Oklahoma	No	None	4	No	N/A	4
Oregon	Yes	3/23/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Pennsylvania	Yes	4/1/2020	3	Yes	N/A	1
Rhode Island	Yes	3/28/2020	2	Yes	N/A	1
South Carolina	Yes	4/7/2020	3	No	5/4/2020	2
South Dakota	No	None	4	No	N/A	4
Tennessee	Yes	3/31/2020	2	No	4/30/2020	3
Texas	Yes	4/2/2020	3	No	4/30/2020	3
Utah	No	None	4	No	N/A	4
Vermont	Yes	3/24/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Virginia	Yes	3/30/2020	2	Yes	N/A	1
Washington	Yes	3/23/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
West Virginia	Yes	3/24/2020	1	No	5/3/2020	2
Wisconsin	Yes	3/25/2020	1	Yes	N/A	1
Wyoming	No	None	4	No	N/A	4