

1 **Efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater surveillance for detection of COVID-19 at a residential**
2 **private college**

3
4 Michelle Landstrom¹, Evan Braun¹, Ellen Larson², Merrill Miller², and Geoffrey H. Holm^{1*}

5
6 ¹Department of Biology, and ²Student Health Services, Colgate University, 13 Oak Dr., Hamilton,
7 NY, 13346

8 *Corresponding Author. Email address: gholm@colgate.edu

9
10
11 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, wastewater surveillance, sewershed, residential college

12
13 **Abstract.**

14 Many colleges and universities utilized wastewater surveillance testing for SARS-CoV-2
15 RNA as a tool to help monitor and mitigate the COVID-19 pandemic on campuses across the
16 United States during the 2020-2021 academic year. We sought to assess the efficacy of one
17 such program by analyzing wastewater RNA load data in relation to SARS-CoV-2 cases identified
18 through individual surveillance testing. Almost 80% of the cases on campus were associated
19 with positive wastewater tests, resulting in an overall positive predictive value of ~79% (Chi
20 square 48.1, Df = 1, $p < 0.001$). However, half of the positive wastewater samples occurred in
21 the two weeks following the return of a student to the residence hall following isolation, and
22 therefore were not useful in predicting new infections. When these samples were excluded, the
23 positive predictive value of a positive wastewater sample was ~54%. Overall, we conclude that
24 the continued shedding of viral RNA by patients past the time of potential transmission
25 confounds the identification of new cases using wastewater surveillance, and decreases its
26 effectiveness in managing SARS-CoV-2 infections on a residential college campus.

27
28 **Introduction.**

29 The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic clearly
30 poses significant challenges for many economic sectors. Prior to the introduction of vaccines,
31 and even post-introduction, many businesses and institutions that rely on in-person meetings
32 struggled to identify best practices that could allow for continued operation. In some instances,
33 especially during government-mandated “lockdowns,” institutions transitioned to remote

34 operations. However, in many cases, remote operation was either not sustainable or failed to
35 deliver satisfactory outcomes, leading these institutions to consider means for returning to in-
36 person operation. These challenges continue to be felt acutely among institutions of higher
37 education, particularly those with a sizeable residential component, as the high population
38 density of dormitories, especially those with shared bathroom facilities, create conditions that
39 can facilitate rapid transmission of respiratory pathogens.

40 As data emerged that SARS-CoV-2 can infect cells in the gastrointestinal tract (1, 2), and
41 that SARS-CoV-2 RNA can be detected in patient stool (3, 4), including from patients prior to the
42 onset of clinical symptoms (5), many groups began investigating whether detection of SARS-
43 CoV-2 RNA in wastewater could be used as a means of monitoring communities for emerging
44 infections, or of directing public health responses. Epidemiological wastewater surveillance had
45 previously been utilized for poliovirus, norovirus, and rotavirus (6–8), and gave strong
46 indication that similar approaches could be beneficial, either to directly assess disease burden
47 in a population, identify areas where the SARS-CoV-2 was newly introduced, or monitor
48 changes in transmission status over time and thereby assess the effects of community
49 interventions (9). The utility of these approaches became even more evident as data emerged
50 correlating levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater with number of cases in the sewershed
51 (10–12), with wastewater RNA levels increasing several days prior to an increase in positive test
52 results indicative of SARS-CoV-2 infections (13–15).

53 Based on these reports, in the lead up to the Fall 2020 academic semester, many
54 colleges and universities in the U.S. sought to implement wastewater surveillance as a tool to
55 manage the pandemic, either as a means to detect the presence of cases within the campus
56 population, to monitor infection levels on campus, or to target particular residence halls for
57 individual or pooled patient testing to directly identify infected individuals (16–21). Since
58 essentially all of these systems were implemented *de novo*, there was a lot of variability in how
59 they were set up and used. Some institutions monitored wastewater via campus or municipal
60 wastewater treatment plants, whereas others implemented systems to capture samples from
61 individual residence halls or sewer lines. Some institutions collected samples that were then
62 processed by commercial laboratories, whereas others handled their samples in house. Among

63 the strategies communicated by various institutions, there was considerable variation in the
64 timing and frequency of collection, and in the number of campus locations that were sampled.
65 Given this variability, it is important to assess the efficacy of the various approaches, to identify
66 best practices and help inform continued development and implementation of wastewater
67 surveillance strategies as a pandemic response (19).

68 In the summer of 2020, we developed and implemented a wastewater surveillance
69 system as one piece of a comprehensive plan to facilitate the return of students to campus
70 residences at Colgate University. Wastewater was assayed via 24-hour composite samples
71 taken 2-3 times weekly at each of seven campus locations (sewer lines or sewage lift stations)
72 and the samples were tested for the presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA by quantitative reverse-
73 transcriptase PCR (qRT-PCR). Simultaneously, students were regularly tested for SARS-CoV-2
74 infection by anterior nares swabs, using a commercial PCR-based testing provider. We obtained
75 de-identified information on student positive cases, the Ct value of the positive tests, and the
76 time of removal and return to the residence hall for isolation, and analyzed this data with
77 respect to the detection of SARS-CoV-2 in the waste stream. In the fall and spring academic
78 semesters, Colgate identified a total of 107 student cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Almost 80%
79 of these cases were associated with positive wastewater tests, resulting in an overall positive
80 predictive value of ~79%. However, half of the positive wastewater samples occurred in the two
81 weeks following the return of a student to the residence hall following isolation. When these
82 samples were excluded, the positive predictive value of a positive wastewater sample was
83 ~54%. Overall, we conclude that the continued shedding of viral RNA by patients past the time
84 of potential transmission confounds the identification of new cases using wastewater
85 surveillance, and decreases its effectiveness in managing SARS-CoV-2 infections on a residential
86 college campus.

87

88 **Materials and Methods.**

89 **Study site.** Colgate University is a private residential undergraduate college with around 3,000
90 students, situated in the rural community of Hamilton, NY (population ~3,800). For the 2020-
91 2021 academic year, students had the choice of remote or in-person instruction, and over 2,600

92 students chose to be in residence, with 2,333 students in campus residence halls in the fall
93 semester and 2280 students in campus residence halls in the spring semester (Table 1), and the
94 rest in off-campus (private) housing in the village of Hamilton.

95

96 **Wastewater sample collection.** Wastewater samples were collected at seven locations on the
97 Colgate University campus (Table 1; Fig. 1) using three ISCO GLS compact composite samplers
98 (Teledyne ISCO, Lincoln, NE). Five of the seven locations (GH, SPW, BAE, CD, BC) were in sewer
99 access holes, while two were at lift stations (PL, TH). A 24 h composite sample (50 ml every 20
100 min) was collected at around 10 AM each weekday, and the samplers were rotated among the
101 collection points at that time, resulting in each collection point being sampled an average of 2.1
102 times per week. Three of the access points (GH, BC, and TH) required external ground-level
103 storage of the sampler; at these locations, a single draw was obtained during the times when
104 the ambient air temperature was too low to permit composite sampling (intermittently
105 between Jan. and Mar.). Composite samples were mixed by agitation and ~250 ml of the total
106 volume of each sample was collected and returned to the lab, where it was stored at 4°C until
107 processing. The interior tubing of the samplers was rinsed with 10% bleach followed by distilled
108 water after each sample collection. Dedicated collection hoses and filters remained at each
109 location and were rinsed with distilled water after each collection and with 10% bleach on a
110 regular basis. Samples were also collected from the Village of Hamilton wastewater treatment
111 plant, though these samples were excluded from this analysis since infection data from the
112 entire population serviced by this facility (which includes Colgate University and Colgate's
113 isolation space) was not available.

114

115 **Ultracentrifugation and RNA extraction.** RNA was extracted following the method of Wilder et
116 al. 2021 (22). All steps prior to RNA extraction were conducted in BSL2 conditions, as approved
117 by the Colgate University Institutional Biosafety Committee. Briefly, ~26 ml of composite
118 sample was layered over 12 ml of sucrose cushion (50% sucrose in 20 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.0), 100
119 mM NaCl, and 2 mM EDTA) in a 25x89 mm ultracentrifuge tube (Beckman Coulter, Brea, CA).
120 The samples were then centrifuged in a SW28 Ti rotor (Beckman Coulter) at 150,000 x g in a L7-

121 55 ultracentrifuge (Beckman) for 45 m at 4°C. The supernatant was decanted and the pellets
122 were resuspended in 200 µl of PBS and transferred to a 1.7 ml microcentrifuge tube. RNA was
123 extracted from the sample either using an AllPrep PowerViral DNA/RNA kit (Qiagen Biosciences)
124 according to manufacturer's protocol (with the omission of the optional bead beating step), or
125 using Trizol (1 ml; Invitrogen/ThermoFisher) according to manufacturer's protocol. Both
126 methods yielded equivalent RNA isolation based on pilot runs using duplicate samples. RNA was
127 eluted in 50 µl of RNase-free water and stored (when necessary prior to analysis) at -80°C.
128 Samples (5 µl) were treated with DNase I (Invitrogen/ThermoFisher) according to the
129 manufacturer's protocol. DNase-treated samples were then directly used for quantitative
130 reverse transcriptase PCR (qRT-PCR).

131

132 ***Quantification of relative wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels.*** Levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in
133 undiluted samples were detected by one-step multiplex TaqMan qRT-PCR, using TaqPath 1-step
134 Multiplex Master Mix (ThermoFisher) according to manufacturer's protocol. SARS-CoV-2 RNA
135 was detected using the 2019-nCoV CDC RUO kit (Integrated DNA Technologies; IDT), containing
136 primers amplifying two regions in the SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid (N) gene (N1 and N2). A control
137 plasmid containing the complete nucleocapsid gene from SARS-CoV-2 (IDT), as well as a
138 synthetic SARS-CoV-2 RNA (Applied Biological Materials, Richmond, BC, Canada), were used as
139 positive controls for isolation procedures and for qRT-PCR reactions. To normalize for
140 differences in biological material in each sample, extracted RNA was also probed using TaqMan
141 primers specific for human RNase P (2019-nCoV CDC RUO primers and probe kit; IDT), and for
142 the crAssphage bacteriophage (22). Initial samples showed a high degree of correlation
143 between RNase P Ct values and crAssphage Ct values, although crAssphage was not as reliably
144 detected in all samples (not shown). Therefore, RNase P Ct values were used to normalize
145 SARS-CoV-2 N gene multiplex Ct values, using the $\Delta\Delta\text{Ct}$ method, to obtain a relative value for
146 SARS-CoV-2 RNA for each sample, which was reported to the Colgate University Health
147 Analytics Team.

148

149 ***Individual SARS-CoV-2 surveillance testing.*** For both academic semesters, all Colgate University
150 students were required to submit negative results from a home PCR-based SARS-CoV-2 test
151 taken ~7 days prior to arrival at campus. Students, along with all employees, were then tested
152 using a PCR-based test at the time of student arrival to campus. All students then entered a
153 mandatory 14-day quarantine period. Students were tested a second time ~7-9 days post-
154 arrival and were not released from quarantine until the results from the second test had been
155 returned. Following quarantine, the whole campus population (students and employees) were
156 randomly selected for surveillance testing at a rate of 6% of each residence hall/area or campus
157 employee population per week (fall semester), or scheduled for surveillance testing once every
158 2 weeks (spring semester). In the fall semester, ~50-70 additional students were selected each
159 week for targeted surveillance testing based on wastewater SARS-CoV-2 results, identified
160 positive cases within specific residence halls, or other events indicating increased risk of
161 transmission (bringing the total percentage of the student population tested up to ~10% per
162 week). Targeted surveillance testing was not widely performed during the spring semester,
163 given the increased frequency of baseline surveillance testing. Patient samples were collected
164 from the anterior nares by Colgate University Student Health Services and volunteers, and were
165 shipped to Aegis Biosciences (Nashville, TN) for PCR-based analysis. Ct values for positive tests
166 were reported by Aegis to Colgate University Student Health Services. The average Ct value for
167 two or three PCR reactions using individual primer pairs was calculated for each case and used
168 for analysis. In both semesters, students with symptoms consistent with COVID-19 were
169 diagnostically tested in-house using a rapid PCR-based assay (Cepheid Biosciences). In some
170 cases, patient tests were performed at other local laboratories. Ct values were not available for
171 these test results. Students that tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, and their close contacts, were
172 identified upon receipt of test results (typically 48-72 h post-collection) and separately isolated
173 or quarantined at a local facility (which was not subject to wastewater surveillance), or, if
174 feasible, at their family home, until allowed to return to their residence hall as established by
175 Madison County Board of Health and New York State guidelines.
176

177 **Data analysis.** Data on positive SARS-CoV-2 test results, their Ct values (if available), and the
178 start and return dates of isolation, devoid of patient-identifying information were obtained
179 from Colgate University Student Health Services. Data on de-identified total residence hall
180 occupancies were obtained from the Office of Institutional Planning and Research. Due to low
181 case numbers in one residence (GH), data from this residence and waste stream was combined
182 with that of BAE to eliminate potentially identifying information. Additionally, specific dates
183 have not been included in the manuscript to also eliminate potentially identifying information.
184 This project was ruled as exempt from the review process by the Colgate University Institutional
185 Review Board. Data was analyzed using GraphPad Prism statistical software package as
186 indicated. For temporal analysis, positive wastewater samples were categorized according to
187 their temporal relationship with positive student case(s), including those that occurred: i)
188 within seven days prior to detection of a positive case; ii) between the date of a positive patient
189 sample and when the student was moved to the isolation facility; iii) between the date a
190 student was moved to the isolation facility and when they returned to the residence; iv) within
191 5 days of the student's return from isolation; v) within 6-14 days of the student's return from
192 isolation; and vi) those that did not correspond to any identified case within those temporal
193 parameters.

194

195 **Results.**

196 During the spring and summer of 2020, Colgate University engaged in a strategic
197 planning process to determine how best to facilitate the return of students to campus for the
198 2020-2021 academic year, given the challenges associated with the SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19
199 pandemic. At that time, data was emerging regarding the efficacy of detecting the presence of
200 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater efflux via quantitative reverse transcriptase PCR (qRT-PCR) as a
201 means of population surveillance. SARS-CoV-2 RNA can be detected in the wastewater stream
202 as early as a week prior to identification of patients with COVID-19 based on screening of
203 symptomatic individuals (13, 14), and based on this information, we decided to implement
204 wastewater surveillance as one part of a comprehensive plan to facilitate the return of students
205 to campus residences for the academic year. Colleagues at other local academic institutions

206 were working on methods to quantify SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater (22) and graciously
207 assisted in developing protocols for wastewater surveillance at Colgate University.

208 The University purchased three compact composite wastewater samplers and we
209 consulted with the Facilities Department to determine locations for sampling. We identified
210 seven locations on campus that would allow as many student residences as possible to be
211 sampled, while minimizing the overlap with effluent waste from academic and administrative
212 buildings (Fig. 1). However, due to the integrated nature of some administrative spaces within
213 residence halls, it was impossible to exclude these entirely at some of the sampling points. In
214 total, the sampling locations captured waste from thirteen individual residence halls or
215 residential complexes, which housed approximately 73% of Colgate students living in campus-
216 owned residences (Table 1). The largest population sampled was a complex with 370 students,
217 while the smallest was a residence with 73 students, with a mean of 242 residents sampled at
218 each collection point. Due to containing potentially identifying information, data from the
219 smallest residence (GH) was combined with that for BAE for analysis. For wastewater samples,
220 the relative level of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was determined using the Ct value of multiplex qRT-PCR
221 reactions targeting the SARS-CoV-2 genome, normalized to the amount of biological material in
222 the sample, as determined by the Ct value of a qRT-PCR reaction to detect human RNase P
223 mRNA.

224 Concurrently, Colgate University engaged in individual surveillance testing of students
225 and employees, as outlined. During the fall semester, from the start of first year arrival in late
226 August, 2020 until most students left campus in mid-November, PCR-based surveillance testing
227 detected 44 cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the student population (Table 1; Fig. 2A). Of the
228 fall cases, 36 of the 44 (81%) were detected during the two arrival testing periods, and many of
229 these cases had Ct values of >35, suggesting low viral RNA levels. The mean Ct value of the
230 positive tests in the fall was 34.54 (Fig. 3A). Thirty-one of the cases (70.5%) occurred in
231 residences from which wastewater samples could be collected. In the spring semester, from
232 arrival for most students starting in late January, 2021, through the end of the semester in early
233 May, 63 cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection were detected (Table 1; Fig. 2B). Again, a large number
234 of cases (28; 44%) were detected during the two arrival testing periods. The mean Ct value of

235 the positive tests in the spring was 26.59, which was significantly lower (higher viral RNA levels)
236 than in the fall (Fig. 3A; $p < 0.0001$). The percentage of cases that occurred in residences from
237 which wastewater samples could be collected (48 of 63; 76.2%) was not significantly different
238 than in the fall ($p = 0.51$ by Chi-square analysis).

239 In the fall, SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected in 12 wastewater samples, from 6 out of the 7
240 collection points (Table 1; Fig. 2A). During the spring semester, 48 wastewater samples tested
241 positive for SARS-CoV-2, from all 7 collection points (Table 1; Fig. 2B). The relative level of SARS-
242 CoV-2 RNA detected in wastewater samples was not significantly different between the two
243 semesters (Fig. 3B). We analyzed the data for each wastewater sample location (Fig. 4), plotting
244 the relative wastewater SARS-CoV-2 levels (black circles; left Y-axis); as well as the Ct value of
245 each positive patient sample (red circles; right Y-axis). We also plotted positive patient samples
246 for which no Ct value was available (red stars), as well as the dates the positive cases were
247 moved from the residence hall into the isolation facility (yellow squares) and the dates the
248 cases moved back to the residence hall following isolation (green squares). From these data, we
249 categorized each positive wastewater sample according to its temporal relationship with
250 positive student case(s), as described.

251 Overall, 14 of the positive samples (23.3%) were collected in the seven days prior to the
252 identification of an infected individual in a residence that contributed to the sampled waste
253 stream, or in the time between when patient specimen was collected and the time the
254 individual moved to quarantine (Fig. 5A). Thirty of the positive samples (50%) were collected
255 from locations in the two weeks following the return of an individual from isolation into that
256 waste stream. Only two positive samples were collected in the period between when an
257 infected individual was removed to the isolation facility and when they returned to the
258 residence, which could result from lingering biological material in the waste stream. Twelve
259 positive samples (20%) were not linked temporally with any student cases in that waste stream.
260 There was no significant difference in the relative wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in
261 samples from these categories (Fig. 5B; $p = 0.2$ by Kruskal-Wallis test). We also analyzed the
262 wastewater results according to the number of student cases identified in the residences

263 contributing to the waste stream at the time of sample collection. Again, no significant
264 differences were observed (Fig. 5C; $p = 0.17$ by Kruskal-Wallis test).

265 A similar analysis was conducted on the Ct values of the patient specimens based on the
266 temporal proximity of positive wastewater samples (Fig. 5D). In this analysis, 21 of the
267 identified student cases in sampled residences (21.5%) were not linked temporally with any
268 positive wastewater sample. There was a significant difference in Ct values between categories,
269 with significantly higher Ct values (lower viral RNA levels) found in patient samples that were
270 not linked with any positive wastewater samples than in those found in patients in which a
271 positive wastewater sample was detected in the seven days prior to specimen collection ($p <$
272 0.001 by Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparisons).

273 Examining the ability of a positive wastewater test to predict the presence of a case in a
274 residence, we found that 46 positive wastewater samples were collected from residences in
275 which a student case was identified, in the period from 7 days prior to the positive patient
276 sample(s) being collected to 14 days after the student(s) returned to the residence following
277 isolation. In contrast, 12 positive wastewater samples were collected from residences in which
278 no student case was identified (i.e. false positives), resulting in an overall positive predictive
279 value of ~79% (Table 2; Chi square 48.1, Df = 1, $p < 0.001$). Out of 350 negative wastewater
280 samples, 120 were collected in the period from 7 days prior to a positive case identification to
281 14 days after the student(s) returned to the residence (i.e. false negatives), resulting in an
282 overall negative predictive value of ~66%. From this data, the sensitivity of the wastewater
283 testing was ~28%, while the specificity was ~95%. The fact that many of the positive samples
284 occurred in the 14 day period following students returning to a residence following isolation
285 was not unexpected, as SARS-CoV-2 RNA can be detected in patient stool for several weeks
286 following infection (23). However, this could confound the use of wastewater samples to
287 identify new cases in a residence hall. To assess the predictive capacity for an isolated positive
288 wastewater sample to identify new cases in residence halls with no recent cases, we excluded
289 all samples collected in the 14 days following the return of a student to a residence from the
290 analysis. We identified 14 positive wastewater samples collected in the period 7 days prior to
291 when a positive patient sample was collected, in contrast to 10 negative samples collected in

292 the same period, giving a sensitivity of ~58% (Table 3; Chi square 64.61, Df = 1, $p < 0.001$). The
293 positive predictive value of these positive samples, based on the 12 false positive samples, was
294 ~54%, while the negative predictive value was ~96%.

295 Overall, this data suggests that wastewater testing deployed in this manner can be
296 largely predictive of SARS-CoV-2 infections in college residence halls; however, the analysis of a
297 positive result can be complicated in situations where infected students return to a residence
298 following isolation, as SARS-CoV-2 RNA may continue to be detected in the waste stream for at
299 least two weeks after return.

300

301 **Discussion.**

302 Municipal wastewater testing for SARS-CoV-2 RNA can provide a robust indicator of
303 community transmission (11, 13, 14), and this information can be used to inform public health
304 responses. Many colleges and universities implemented wastewater surveillance testing during
305 the 2020-2021 academic year (19); however, the efficacy of these efforts in identifying infection
306 clusters and leading to mitigation of transmission has not been fully investigated. In this study,
307 we combine data on wastewater SARS-CoV-2 detection from discrete campus residences with
308 information on student cases, including RNA levels and timing of exit and return to the
309 residence following isolation, to provide insight into the efficacy of wastewater surveillance as a
310 public health strategy at a residential undergraduate college. Overall, we found that while
311 around a quarter of positive wastewater samples indicated the presence of SARS-CoV-2-
312 infected individuals prior to their identification by individual surveillance testing, half of the
313 positive wastewater samples occurred within 14 days after students returned to residence halls
314 following isolation. The capacity for individuals to continue to shed SARS-CoV-2 RNA in stool
315 past the point of likely transmission potentially limits the utility of wastewater surveillance in a
316 college environment where students leave and return to residences following infection.

317 Our results are generally concordant with other reports of wastewater surveillance
318 programs on college campuses. Our determined positive predictive value for isolated
319 wastewater positive samples (excluding dormitories with students returning from isolation), of
320 ~54% is lower than some reported values, such as at the University of Arizona (82%; (21)), or at

321 UC San Diego, where wastewater surveillance allowed for the early diagnosis of 85% of cases on
322 campus (16). However, these programs operated on a very different scale, with, for example,
323 the UCSD system employing 68 samplers with automated sample processing of daily samples.
324 Similar to other institutions, we could identify single cases in a residence hall from wastewater
325 samples (17, 18), although a large number of negative samples from residences with student
326 cases decreased the overall sensitivity. Groups that sampled on a weekly basis concluded that
327 that was too infrequent for effective identification of cases, and suggested that daily testing
328 would be most appropriate (20). We found that our strategy, where most residences were
329 sampled 2-3 times a week, was generally effective while not becoming impractical to manage
330 for a small academic laboratory.

331 We observed significantly higher average Ct values (lower viral RNA levels) among cases
332 in the fall semester than the spring semester (Fig. 3A). This is most likely a reflection of changes
333 in the stringency of the cutoff for the identification of a positive case used by the PCR testing
334 provider that occurred around October 2020. Initially, a positive case was identified by a
335 defined Ct value of <40 in one of two PCR reactions using different primer pairs. Starting in
336 October, a third PCR reaction was added to the protocol, with a positive case identified with a
337 defined Ct value of <40 in at least two of the three reactions. This increased stringency may
338 have helped exclude potential false positives, especially when the positive predictive value of
339 the PCR-based test was low due to low prevalence in the population. These data could also
340 potentially be explained by students having been infected during the summer and continuing to
341 shed low levels of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in their nasopharynx at the time of the arrival tests in
342 August. If this were the case, however, we would have expected the pre-arrival test that
343 students took ahead of coming to campus to identify these individuals. Alternatively, students
344 may have been infected during travel to campus, and therefore have been tested at a time
345 prior to when they reached peak RNA levels. However, if this were the case, we would have
346 expected that positive cases identified in the second round of arrival testing would have lower
347 Ct values (higher RNA levels), which was not observed. Whatever the reason for this difference,
348 it has implications for our wastewater results, as cases with higher Ct values (lower RNA levels)
349 were significantly less likely to be associated with a positive wastewater result (Fig. 5D).

350 We observed no significant difference in the normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in
351 wastewater based on the proximity of the wastewater sample to when a positive student case
352 was identified (Fig. 5B), or based on the number of cases contributing to the waste stream (Fig.
353 5C). These results are contrary to other reports, in which wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels
354 were observed to tightly correlate with case numbers (13, 14). We attribute this discrepancy to
355 the relatively small number of people contributing to each waste stream in our study (hundreds
356 vs. several thousand individuals in some municipal sewer sheds), and to the variable and
357 sporadic nature of the flow rate at each sampling location. Composite samples from the lift
358 stations tended to be more consistent than from the sewer access holes, where the flow rate
359 changed dramatically on a minute-by-minute basis, and where the structure of the sewer
360 caused pooling in some lines more than others. This caused marked differences in the amount
361 and density of samples collected, and this variability could potentially lead to differences in the
362 amount of biological material collected between the locations, or between samples from the
363 same location. Additionally, during periods of inclement weather, some sampling locations
364 could only be sampled with a single draw, rather than a 24-hour composite. These factors could
365 therefore impact the relative concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA present in each sample, despite
366 the use of RNase P RNA levels to normalize the SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels. Furthermore, the
367 variable flow rate, as well as the lack of equipment to accurately measure this type of flow,
368 made absolute quantification of SARS-CoV-2 genome copies per milliliter, (the standard used by
369 several other studies; (11, 13)), impossible. We conclude that under these conditions, detection
370 of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the waste stream should be considered on a positive/negative basis,
371 rather than attempting to use RNA quantification as a predictor of case load or timing.

372 One limitation of the study is that, due to the layout of campus infrastructure, several of
373 the sample collection points did not only capture waste from student residences. In some cases,
374 other campus buildings contributed to the waste stream (though every effort was made to
375 minimize this), whereas in other cases, the residence halls also house additional administrative
376 or classroom spaces. Additionally, custodial and facilities maintenance staff routinely accessed
377 the buildings and may have contributed to the waste stream at the sampling locations. In one
378 instance in the fall semester, a positive SARS-CoV-2 RNA signal in a wastewater sample was

379 used to guide targeted PCR-based testing of students in residences, which did not identify any
380 positive student cases. Concurrently, however, an employee that spent time in the space(s)
381 contributing to that waste stream did test positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection, although whether
382 they used restroom facilities in those location(s) is not known. Therefore, it is possible that
383 other positive wastewater samples that did not coincide with a positive case may not be “false
384 positives,” per se, but rather reflect other non-residents that contributed to the waste stream.
385 It is also possible that these positive wastewater samples reflect infected students that were
386 not identified by individual surveillance testing, either because they were not tested during
387 their infection or their test results were falsely negative.

388 There are several additional limitations of this study that impact our ability to fully
389 interpret the data. First, students that reported symptoms consistent with COVID-19 were
390 tested using an in-house rapid nucleic acid amplification system that does not provide Ct
391 values. Differences in viral dynamics at the time of testing (in surveillance tests vs. symptomatic
392 testing) could skew our analysis of the Ct values of cases associated with positive wastewater
393 detection of SARS-CoV-2. Second, the nature of our sampling strategy, with the collectors
394 rotating between sampling locations on a two-to-three-day schedule, means that our samples
395 were not evenly spaced, especially around times of arrival testing, when a majority of our
396 positive cases were detected, and around times when students returned to residence halls
397 following isolation. This confounds our analysis of wastewater RNA levels relative to the time of
398 case detection or return, as it meant that some residences may have been sampled the
399 morning after a student returned (potentially leading to a higher level of viral RNA shed into the
400 waste stream), whereas others might not have been sampled until up to 72 h post-return, when
401 shed RNA levels may have been lower. A sampling protocol that allowed for more continuous
402 monitoring of wastewater RNA levels from residences following a return from isolation may
403 have allowed for a more precise correlation between RNA levels and time from isolation return
404 to be detected. This, however, would require more resources devoted to the project and would
405 be beyond the scope of what our laboratory could handle. Finally, due to infrastructure
406 architecture and geography, only around 73% of students lived in residences that could be

407 easily monitored via the waste stream. This decreased the overall utility of wastewater
408 surveillance as a means for managing emerging cases on campus.

409 Overall, based on the data presented here and our lived experience of managing the
410 COVID-19 pandemic during the 2020-2021 academic year at Colgate University, we found that
411 on a practical level, wastewater surveillance had more utility in the fall semester, when a
412 smaller percentage of the community was subject to random PCR-based individual surveillance
413 testing. The wastewater results could then be used to direct additional targeted testing to
414 individual residences with positive wastewater RNA samples, and, with a positive predictive
415 value of ~54% for an isolated wastewater positive sample, this could be potentially be a more
416 cost- and resource-effective means of detecting new positive cases than large-scale individual
417 student testing. In the spring semester, with approximately half of the students in each
418 residence were tested each week, by the time a positive wastewater sample was detected, it
419 was more practical to wait for the individual surveillance results to become available than to
420 target students in those residences for additional testing. This was further confounded when
421 positive student cases returned to the residences following isolation, making it difficult to
422 distinguish between a new infection and continued SARS-CoV-2 RNA shedding in previously-
423 infected individuals. Additionally, the presence of cases in residences in which no wastewater
424 SARS-CoV-2 RNA was detected suggests that wastewater surveillance of this type should not be
425 used as the only means for the detection of cases on campus. As the price of personal
426 surveillance testing, via pooled or individual samples, continues to decrease, we conclude that
427 this should be viewed as a more effective means of controlling SARS-CoV-2 transmission on
428 campus than wastewater testing of individual residence halls.

429
430 **Authorship contribution statement:** **G.H.H.** initiated the project, developed the wastewater
431 sampling strategy and SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection protocol, contributed to sample collection,
432 analyzed and interpreted the data, and drafted the manuscript; **M.L.** contributed to sample
433 collection, performed the RNA extraction and qPCR, analyzed the qPCR data, and edited the
434 manuscript; **E.B.** contributed to sample collection; **E.L.** and **M.M** collected and assembled
435 deidentified patient information, and edited the manuscript.

436

437 **Declaration of competing interest:**

438

439 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
440 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this manuscript.

441

442 **Data availability statement:** All data related to this project is available at figshare.com, licensed
443 CC by 4.0

444

445 **Acknowledgments:** The authors wish to thank David Larsen (Syracuse University) and Hyatt
446 Green (SUNY ESF) for their initial input and advice on implementing a wastewater surveillance
447 system. We also wish to thank Dan Gough, former Colgate University Associate Vice President
448 for Campus Safety, and Environmental Health, and Emergency Management for assistance in
449 initiating the project, and in procuring the wastewater sample collection devices. The authors
450 are also grateful to Jim Albertina and the Colgate University Plumbing Department for their
451 assistance in identifying, establishing, and maintaining wastewater sampling locations. We
452 thank Karen Cheal, Neal Albert, and the office of Institutional Planning and Research for
453 providing student housing data. We also thank Bineyam Taye and David Larsen for their
454 thoughtful review of the manuscript. The authors are extremely grateful to the employees in
455 Student Health Services, as well as the student and other volunteers who worked tirelessly in
456 collecting student and employee patient samples throughout the year. Finally, the authors are
457 extremely grateful to the Colgate University Health Analytics Team, especially Sev Flanigen, Tim
458 Borfitz, and Mary Williams, for their work on behalf of the university, and for their thoughtful
459 and productive analysis on the use of wastewater surveillance data to manage Colgate's COVID-
460 19 pandemic response. This project was funded entirely by Colgate University.

461

462 **References.**

463 1. **Xiao F, Tang M, Zheng X, Liu Y, Li X, Shan H.** 2020. Evidence for Gastrointestinal Infection
464 of SARS-CoV-2. *Gastroenterology*2020/03/03. **158**:1831-1833.e3.

- 465 2. **Lee S, Yoon GY, Myoung J, Kim S-J, Ahn D-G.** 2020. Robust and persistent SARS-CoV-2
466 infection in the human intestinal brush border expressing cells. *Emerg Microbes Infect*
467 **9**:2169–2179.
- 468 3. **Chen Y, Chen L, Deng Q, Zhang G, Wu K, Ni L, Yang Y, Liu B, Wang W, Wei C, Yang J, Ye**
469 **G, Cheng Z.** 2020. The presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in the feces of COVID-19 patients. *J*
470 *Med Virol* **92**:833–840.
- 471 4. **Zhang Y, Chen C, Song Y, Zhu S, Wang D, Zhang H, Han G, Weng Y, Xu J, Xu J, Yu P, Jiang**
472 **W, Yang X, Lang Z, Yan D, Wang Y, Song J, Gao GF, Wu G, Xu W.** 2020. Excretion of SARS-
473 CoV-2 through faecal specimens. *Emerg Microbes Infect* **9**:2501–2508.
- 474 5. **Tang A, Tong Z-D, Wang H-L, Dai Y-X, Li K-F, Liu J-N, Wu W-J, Yuan C, Yu M-L, Li P, Yan J-**
475 **B.** 2020. Detection of Novel Coronavirus by RT-PCR in Stool Specimen from
476 Asymptomatic Child, China. *Emerg Infect Dis*2020/06/17. **26**:1337–1339.
- 477 6. **Santiso-Bellón C, Randazzo W, Pérez-Cataluña A, Vila-Vicent S, Gozalbo-Rovira R,**
478 **Muñoz C, Buesa J, Sanchez G, Rodríguez Díaz J.** 2020. Epidemiological Surveillance of
479 Norovirus and Rotavirus in Sewage (2016-2017) in Valencia (Spain). *Microorganisms*
480 **8**:458.
- 481 7. **Lodder WJ, Buisman AM, Rutjes SA, Heijne JC, Teunis PF, de Roda Husman AM.** 2012.
482 Feasibility of quantitative environmental surveillance in poliovirus eradication strategies.
483 *Appl Environ Microbiol*2012/03/23. **78**:3800–3805.
- 484 8. **Zurbriggen S, Tobler K, Abril C, Diedrich S, Ackermann M, Pallansch MA, Metzler A.**
485 2008. Isolation of sabin-like polioviruses from wastewater in a country using inactivated
486 polio vaccine. *Appl Environ Microbiol*2008/07/18. **74**:5608–5614.
- 487 9. **Sims N, Kasprzyk-Hordern B.** 2020. Future perspectives of wastewater-based
488 epidemiology: Monitoring infectious disease spread and resistance to the community
489 level. *Environ Int*2020/04/04. **139**:105689.
- 490 10. **Nemudryi A, Nemudraia A, Wiegand T, Surya K, Buyukyoruk M, Cicha C, Vanderwood**
491 **KK, Wilkinson R, Wiedenheft B.** 2020. Temporal Detection and Phylogenetic Assessment
492 of SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater. *Cell Reports Med* **1**:100098.
- 493 11. **Wu F, Zhang J, Xiao A, Gu X, Lee WL, Armas F, Kauffman K, Hanage W, Matus M, Ghaeli**

- 494 **N, Endo N, Duvallet C, Poyet M, Moniz K, Washburne AD, Erickson TB, Chai PR,**
495 **Thompson J, Alm EJ.** 2020. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than Expected
496 from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems* **5**:e00614-20.
- 497 12. **Weidhaas J, Aanderud ZT, Roper DK, VanDerslice J, Gaddis EB, Ostermiller J, Hoffman K,**
498 **Jamal R, Heck P, Zhang Y, Torgersen K, Laan J Vander, LaCross N.** 2021. Correlation of
499 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater with COVID-19 disease burden in sewersheds. *Sci Total*
500 *Environ*2021/02/12. **775**:145790.
- 501 13. **Peccia J, Zulli A, Brackney DE, Grubaugh ND, Kaplan EH, Casanovas-Massana A, Ko AI,**
502 **Malik AA, Wang D, Wang M, Warren JL, Weinberger DM, Arnold W, Omer SB.** 2020.
503 Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater tracks community infection dynamics.
504 *Nat Biotechnol* **38**:1164–1167.
- 505 14. **Randazzo W, Truchado P, Cuevas-Ferrando E, Simón P, Allende A, Sánchez G.** 2020.
506 SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater anticipated COVID-19 occurrence in a low prevalence
507 area. *Water Res* **181**:115942.
- 508 15. **Medema G, Heijnen L, Elsinga G, Italiaander R, Brouwer A.** 2020. Presence of SARS-
509 Coronavirus-2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the
510 Early Stage of the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ Sci Technol Lett*
511 *acs.estlett*.0c00357.
- 512 16. **Karthikeyan S, Nguyen A, McDonald D, Zong Y, Ronquillo N, Ren J, Zou J, Farmer S,**
513 **Humphrey G, Henderson D, Javidi T, Messer K, Anderson C, Schooley R, Martin NK,**
514 **Knight R, McGrath J.** 2021. Rapid, Large-Scale Wastewater Surveillance and Automated
515 Reporting System Enable Early Detection of Nearly 85% of COVID-19 Cases on a
516 University Campus. *mSystems* **0**:e00793-21.
- 517 17. **Scott LC, Aubee A, Babahaji L, Vigil K, Tims S, Aw TG.** 2021. Targeted wastewater
518 surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 on a university campus for COVID-19 outbreak detection and
519 mitigation. *Environ Res* **200**:111374.
- 520 18. **Gibas C, Lambirth K, Mittal N, Juel MAI, Barua VB, Roppolo Brazell L, Hinton K, Lontai J,**
521 **Stark N, Young I, Quach C, Russ M, Kauer J, Nicolosi B, Chen D, Akella S, Tang W,**
522 **Schlueter J, Munir M.** 2021. Implementing building-level SARS-CoV-2 wastewater

- 523 surveillance on a university campus. *Sci Total Environ*2021/03/30. **782**:146749.
- 524 19. **Harris-Lovett S, Nelson KL, Beamer P, Bischel HN, Bivins A, Bruder A, Butler C,**
525 **Camenisch TD, De Long SK, Karthikeyan S, Larsen DA, Meierdiercks K, Mouser PJ,**
526 **Pagsuyoin S, Prasek SM, Radniecki TS, Ram JL, Roper DK, Safford H, Sherchan SP,**
527 **Shuster W, Stalder T, Wheeler RT, Korfmacher KS.** 2021. Wastewater Surveillance for
528 SARS-CoV-2 on College Campuses: Initial Efforts, Lessons Learned, and Research Needs.
529 *Int J Environ Res Public Heal* .
- 530 20. **Sharkey ME, Kumar N, Mantero AMA, Babler KM, Boone MM, Cardentey Y, Cortizas**
531 **EM, Grills GS, Herrin J, Kemper JM, Kenney R, Kobetz E, Laine J, Lamar WE, Mader CC,**
532 **Mason CE, Quintero AZ, Reding BD, Roca MA, Ryon K, Solle NS, Schürer SC, Shukla B,**
533 **Stevenson M, Stone T, Tallon JJ, Venkatapuram SS, Vidovic D, Williams SL, Young B,**
534 **Solo-Gabriele HM.** 2021. Lessons learned from SARS-CoV-2 measurements in
535 wastewater. *Sci Total Environ* **798**:149177.
- 536 21. **Betancourt WQ, Schmitz BW, Innes GK, Prasek SM, Pogreba Brown KM, Stark ER, Foster**
537 **AR, Sprissler RS, Harris DT, Sherchan SP, Gerba CP, Pepper IL.** 2021. COVID-19
538 containment on a college campus via wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical
539 testing and an intervention. *Sci Total Environ*2021/03/13. **779**:146408.
- 540 22. **Wilder ML, Middleton F, Larsen DA, Du Q, Fenty A, Zeng T, Insaf T, Kilaru P, Collins M,**
541 **Kmush B, Green HC.** 2021. Co-quantification of crAssphage increases confidence in
542 wastewater-based epidemiology for SARS-CoV-2 in low prevalence areas. *Water Res*
543 *X*2021/04/06. **11**:100100.
- 544 23. **Jones DL, Baluja MQ, Graham DW, Corbishley A, McDonald JE, Malham SK, Hillary LS,**
545 **Connor TR, Gaze WH, Moura IB, Wilcox MH, Farkas K.** 2020. Shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in
546 feces and urine and its potential role in person-to-person transmission and the
547 environment-based spread of COVID-19. *Sci Total Environ*2020/07/31. **749**:141364.

548

549 **Figure Legends.**

550

551 **Figure 1.** Location of wastewater sample collection points on the Colgate University campus.

552 Locations 1-5 were at sewer access holes, while locations 6-7 were at wastewater lift stations.

553 Colored lines indicate approximate location of sewage drains from each residence.

554

555 **Figure 2.** Aggregate wastewater and patient case data at Colgate University, August 2020-May 2021.

556 Normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in wastewater (black symbols; left Y-axis) and number of positive

557 student cases (gray bars; right Y-axis) are shown from the fall semester 2020 (A) and spring semester

558 2021 (B). Symbol shapes represent individual sampling locations and associated residence halls, as

559 indicated in the legend.

560

561 **Figure 3.** The relative level of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in positive SARS-CoV-2 clinical cases, but not the

562 levels of wastewater RNA, were significantly higher in the spring semester. The data points

563 represent the average Ct value from positive cases (A) and the normalized level of SARS-CoV-2 RNA

564 levels in positive wastewater samples (B). ****, $p < 0.0001$ by Welch's t test. ns, $p > 0.05$ of log

565 transformed data by Welch's t test.

566

567 **Figure 4. Aggregate wastewater and patient case data for sampled sewersheds, Colgate**

568 **University, August 2020 - May 2021.** Normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in wastewater (black

569 circles; left Y-axis) and average Ct values of positive cases (red circles; right Y-axis) are shown from

570 each wastewater sampling location. Red stars indicate positive student tests for which no Ct value

571 was available. Yellow and green squares represent the time of isolation start (when individual

572 student cases were removed from the indicated residences) and the time of return to the residence

573 following isolation, respectively.

574

575 **Figure 5. Temporal association of SARS-CoV-2 levels in wastewater RNA and Ct values of positive**

576 **cases.** Data from individual wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA samples and positive SARS-CoV-2 cases

577 were classified according to the indicated temporal relationships. A. The number of positive

578 wastewater samples according to temporal category, with respect to positive case in the residences

579 contributing to the waste stream. B. The relative wastewater SARS-CoV-2 level according to

580 temporal category, with respect to positive case(s) in residences contributing to the waste stream. C.

581 The relative wastewater SARS-CoV-2 level according to the number of clinical cases identified in
582 residences contributing to the waste stream at the time of collection. D. The relative Ct value of
583 positive case(s) according to temporal category, with respect to positive detection(s) of SARS-CoV-2
584 in the waste stream. Data represent total number of samples (a) or a box and whisker plot indicating
585 the 5th and 95th percentile (B,C). ***, $p < 0.001$ by Kruskal-Wallis test, with Dunn's multiple
586 comparison.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Table 1. Student population, cases, and positive wastewater samples at Colgate University, Fall 2020-Spring 2021.

Sampling Locations	Fall Population	Spring Population	Fall Cases	Spring Cases	Fall Positive WW samples	Spring Positive WW samples
GH/BAE	336	336	4	7	4	7
SWP	289	269	3	5	3	5
CD	338	330	6	13	0	13
BC	370	365	5	6	2	2
PL	162	160	7	5	2	12
TH	219	212	6	12	1	9
Total Student Population/Cases in Sampled Residences (percent of total)	1714 (73.5%)	1672 (73.3%)	31 (70.5%)	48 (76.2%)		
Total Student Population/Cases in Non-Sampled Campus Residences	619 (26.5%)	608 (26.7%)	13 (29.5%)	15 (23.8%)		
Total	2333	2280	44	63		

Table 2. Performance of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater testing (within <7 days pre-case identification to 14 days post return from isolation) in predicting human cases at Colgate University, Fall 2020-Spring 2021

	Student case(s) in the sampled residence	No student case(s) in the sampled residence	
Positive wastewater sample (from within <7 days pre-case identification to <14 days post-return from isolation)	46	12	PPV: 79.31%
Negative wastewater sample (from within <7 days pre-case identification to <14 days post-return from isolation)	120	230	NPV: 65.71%
	Sensitivity: 27.71%		
Chi-square value 48.1, Df = 1, p < 0.001	Specificity: 95.04%		

Table 3. Performance of SARS-CoV-2 wastewater testing (within <7 days pre-case identification) in predicting human cases at Colgate University, Fall 2020-Spring 2021

	Student case(s) in the sampled residence	No student case(s) in the sampled residence	
Positive wastewater sample (from within <7 days pre-case identification)	14	12	PPV: 53.85%
Negative wastewater sample (from within <7 days pre-case identification)	10	230	NPV: 95.83%
	Sensitivity: 58.33%		
Chi-square value 64.61, Df = 1, p < 0.001	Specificity: 95.04%		

1. Gate House (GH)
2. Burke/Andrews/East (BAE)
3. Stillman/West/Pinchin (SWP)
4. Curtis/Drake (CD)
5. Bryan/113 Broad (BC)
6. Parker Lift Station (PL)
7. Townhouses (TH)




Figure 1. Location of wastewater sample collection points on the Colgate University campus. Locations 1-5 were at sewer access holes, while locations 6-7 were at wastewater lift stations. Colored lines indicate approximate location of sewage drains from each residence.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




Figure 2. Aggregate wastewater and patient case data at Colgate University, August 2020-May 2021. Normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in wastewater (black symbols; left Y-axis) and number of positive student cases (gray bars; right Y-axis) are shown from the fall semester 2020 (A) and spring semester 2021 (B). Symbol shapes represent individual sampling locations and associated residence halls, as indicated in the legend.




Figure 3. The relative level of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in positive SARS-CoV-2 clinical cases, but not the levels of wastewater RNA, were significantly higher in the spring semester. The data points represent the average Ct value from positive cases (A) and the normalized level of SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in positive wastewater samples (B). ****, $p < 0.0001$ by Welch's t test. ns, $p > 0.05$ of log transformed data by Welch's t test.




Figure 4. Aggregate wastewater and patient case data for sampled sewersheds, Colgate University, August 2020 - May 2021. Normalized SARS-CoV-2 RNA levels in wastewater (black circles; left Y-axis) and average Ct values of positive cases (red circles; right Y-axis) are shown from each wastewater sampling location. Red stars indicate positive student tests for which no Ct value was available. Yellow and green squares represent the time of isolation start (when individual student cases were removed from the indicated residences) and the time of return to the residence following isolation, respectively.




Figure 5. Temporal association of SARS-CoV-2 levels in wastewater RNA and Ct values of positive cases. Data from individual wastewater SARS-CoV-2 RNA samples and positive SARS-CoV-2 cases were classified according to the indicated temporal relationships. A. The number of positive wastewater samples according to temporal category, with respect to positive case in the residences contributing to the waste stream. B. The relative wastewater SARS-CoV-2 level according to temporal category, with respect to positive case(s) in residences contributing to the waste stream. C. The relative wastewater SARS-CoV-2 level according to the number of clinical cases identified in residences contributing to the waste stream at the time of collection. D. The relative Ct value of positive case(s) according to temporal category, with respect to positive detection(s) of SARS-CoV-2 in the waste stream. Data represent total number of samples (a) or a box and whisker plot indicating the 5th and 95th percentile (B,C). *******, $p < 0.001$ by Kruskal-Wallis test, with Dunn's multiple comparison.