Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 Concentration and Loading Variability from Grab and 24-Hour Composite Samples

Kyle Curtis, David Keeling, Kathleen Yetka, Allison Larson, Raul Gonzalez*

Hampton Roads Sanitation District, 1434 Air Rail Avenue, Virginia Beach, VA 23455

*Corresponding author email: rgonzalez@hrsd.com

Abstract

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) requires a significant, coordinated public health response. Assessing case density and spread of infection is critical and relies largely on clinical testing data. However, clinical testing suffers from known limitations, including test availability and a bias towards enumerating only symptomatic individuals. Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) has gained widespread support as a potential complement to clinical testing for assessing COVID-19 infections at the community scale. The efficacy of WBE hinges on the ability to accurately characterize SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater. To date, a variety of sampling schemes have been used without consensus around the appropriateness of grab or composite sampling. Here we address a key WBE knowledge gap by examining the variability of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater grab samples collected every 2 hours for 72 hours compared with

corresponding 24-hour flow-weighted composite samples. Results show relatively low variability (mean for all assays = 741 copies 100 mL^{-1}, standard deviation = 508 copies 100 mL^{-1}) for grab sample concentrations, and good agreement between most grab samples and their respective composite (mean deviation from composite = 159 copies 100 mL^{-1}). When SARS-CoV-2 concentrations are used to calculate viral load, the discrepancy between grabs (log_{10} difference = 12.0) or a grab and its associated composite (log_{10} difference = 11.8) are amplified. A similar effect is seen when estimating carrier prevalence in a catchment population with median estimates based on grabs ranging 62-1853 carriers. Findings suggest that grab samples may be sufficient to characterize SARS-CoV-2 concentrations, but additional calculations using these data may be sensitive to grab sample variability and warrant the use of flow-weighted composite sampling. These data inform future WBE work by helping determine the most appropriate sampling scheme and facilitate sharing of datasets between studies via consistent methodology.

Introduction

The outbreak of the novel severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in late 2019 escalated to a global pandemic. To date (7-1-2020) there are over 10.5 million confirmed cases and 500,000 deaths world-wide attributed to COVID-19, the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2. [1] Understanding the extent and density of infection is critical in effectively responding to this pandemic. However, due to limited diagnostic testing[2,3] and inconsistent reporting of results[4], generating reliable COVID-19

prevalence estimates in a community remains challenging. This is compounded by asymptomatic disease transmission, the rate of which is still unclear[5].

Wastewater-based epidemiology (WBE) represents a promising complement to clinical testing as a means of assessing COVID-19 trends and prevalence within a community. WBE has been used to investigate occurrence and trends for a variety of chemical (pharmaceuticals[6], illicit drugs[7]) and biological (pathogens[8], antibiotic resistance genes[9]) constituents at the community-scale by measuring biomarkers in wastewater. Unlike clinical testing data, which is susceptible to biases such as test availability and the inability to detect asymptomatic individuals, WBE yields a community-scale viral load estimate for a wastewater treatment plant catchment population. Considering these benefits, there has been much support for WBE as a complementary strategy to clinical testing in response to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.[9,10, 11]

The use of WBE in a variety of geographically and demographically disparate areas creates the opportunity to coordinate efforts, assimilate data, and assess SARS-CoV-2 trends on a larger scale than any single WBE study could alone. For this broad, integrated approach to succeed many knowledge gaps must first be addressed for appropriate data comparisons. Such areas include sample collection, preservation, concentration, and quantification in a complex and challenging wastewater matrix.[9,12,13,14,15] A fundamental study design knowledge gap considers how to collect a sample that is appropriately representative of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater. Given that influent flows at wastewater facilities fluctuate continually it is important to understand if these variations in flow correspond to significant virus concentration variation. Specifically, do grab samples sufficiently characterize wastewater SARS-CoV-2 concentrations, or are flow-weighted composites necessary?

We address this knowledge gap via a comparison of grab and 24-hr flow-weighted composite samples over a 3-day intensive time series. The goal was to characterize SARS-CoV-2 variability in grab samples

collected every 2hrs for 72 hours and compare this variability with 3 flow-weighted composites collected over the same time frame. Specific objectives are; 1) to examine the variability of reverse transcription droplet digital PCR (RT-ddPCR) quantified SARS-CoV-2 concentrations, 2) compare instantaneous loading calculations from grab sample concentrations with loading calculations using respective 24-hr flow-weighted composite concentrations, and 3) compare instantaneous carrier prevalence estimates from grab sample concentrations with carrier prevalence estimates using respective 24-hr flow-weighted composite concentrations.

This work will aid future WBE studies in determining the most appropriate sampling scheme. Increasing the chance of accurately characterizing SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater allows WBE work to provide the best available data for use in subsequent calculations, such as estimates of carrier prevalence or epidemiological models.

Methods

Wastewater Treatment Facility

Army Base Treatment Plant (ABTP) is in Norfolk, VA, and is operated by Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD). It services an area of approximately 21 square miles, which is dominated by residential development, a port, and a large military base. The treatment plant serves a population of approximately 78,322, however this figure can fluctuate considerably due to the arrival and departure of military vessels and cargo ships. A further consideration is that the population of a catchment can vary based on redirection of flow throughout the collection system, a practice that is common for wastewater utilities.

For ABTP, pretreatment involves coarse screening via bar screens. Residual suspended solids, fats, oils, and grease are removed during a primary settling step. Secondary treatment consists of a 5-stage Bardenpho system and secondary settling. Secondary clarifier effluent is disinfected with sodium hypochlorite and dechlorinated via sodium bisulfite prior to discharge. ABTP has a design flow of 18 MGD with a peak capacity of 36 MGD, and average daily flows ranging 10-11 MGD. Over the three-day study period, the average daily flow was 12.46 MGD.

Study Design

Samples were aseptically collected over a 72-hour period (5/1/2020 10:00 EST– 5/4/2020 10:00 EST) from the ABTP Raw Water Influent (RWI) sample point prior to pretreatment. Uniform 1L grab samples were collected every two hours using an ISCO Avalanche portable refrigerated sampler (Teledyne ISCO, Lincoln, NE) which kept the samples at approximately 4°C. For each 24-hour period, a flow-weighted composite sample was collected concurrently with the sequentially collected grabs using an ISCO 3710 Portable sampler (Teledyne ISCO). The composite sampler was paced to take a 150mL aliquot every 230,000 gallons, with all aliquots collected in a sterile 15L carboy in a sampler base filled with ice that was replenished daily. Final Effluent (FNE) samples were collected aseptically after the 30-minute chlorine contact point between mid-morning and mid-day of each collection. Each set of 24-hour composite samples were transported on ice from the sampling site to the HRSD Central Environmental Laboratory (within 4 hours) where samples were processed upon arrival.

Sample Processing

Electronegative filtration, following the method in Worley-Morse et al[14], was used to concentrate SARS-CoV-2 from 50 mL of raw wastewater and 200 mL of treated final effluent. Filters were stored in a -80°C freezer immediately after concentration until RNA extraction using the NucliSENS easyMag (bioMerieux Inc., Durham, NC, USA) modified protocol described in Worley-Morse et al. RT-ddPCR was used to

enumerate SARS-CoV-2 N1, N2, and N3 assays[16] and the hepatitis G inhibition control on a Bio-Rad QX200 (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA) using the protocol in Gonzalez et al.[17]

Estimating SARS-CoV-2 Infections in the Sewage Collection System

A promising extension of WBE is calculating prevalence estimates to better gauge the number of truly infected individuals (both symptomatic and asymptomatic). This approach has been used in several recent SARS-CoV-2 publications.[11,18,19] The number of SARS-CoV-2 infected carriers for the ABTP service area were estimated using two values—viral load per person and total viral load to a treatment facility. For the purpose of viral load and carrier prevalence estimates, only the N2 assay was used. Equation 1 was used to calculate the viral load per person (the total amount of virus shed by an infected person via feces). The 90th percentile concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in stool reported from Wölfel et al.[20] was used was variable A in equation 1. A triangular distribution (minimum= 51, likeliest= 128, maximum= 796) for the fecal mass per person per day, variable B, was fitted from Rose et al.[21] This distribution was sampled during each of 10,000 Monte Carlo simulations conducted using Oracle Crystal Ball (Oracle, Berkshire, UK).

Equation 1.

$$Load_{indiv} = C_{indiv} \times m$$

where;

$Load_{indiv}$ = Viral load per person (copies day^{-1})

C_{indiv} = concentration of SARS-CoV-2 virus in feces (copies g^{-1})

m = typical mass of stool produced per person per day (g day^{-1})

129 Total viral load to each WWTP during each sampling event was calculated using equation 2. In order to
130 quantify any potential carriers in the population the N2 assay concentration for each sample was used
131 as the C_{WWTP} value in Equation 2.

132 Equation 2.

133
$$Load_{WWTP} = C_{WWTP} \times Q \times f$$

134 where;

135 $Load_{WWTP}$ = Viral load to WWTP (copies day^{-1})

136 C_{WWTP} = concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater samples (copies 100 mL^{-1})

137 Q = Plant flow (MGD, million gal day^{-1})

138 f = Conversion factor between 100 mL and MG

139

140 Prevalence estimates were calculated using equation 3, which incorporated results from equations 1
141 and 2 for each sampling event. There is a possibility of asymptomatic carriers, those within higher age
142 groups, or individuals with co-morbidities shedding a higher range of viruses per stool event. However,
143 this cannot be accounted for in the population within the WWTP service area since shedding rates for
144 specific populations are unknown. Subsequently, attempting to adjust the population or the shedding
145 rates for these differences would require the use of data from other viruses, and would potentially
146 impart confounding factors in the estimate.

147 Equation 3.

148
$$\boldsymbol{I} = \frac{Load_{WWTP}}{Load_{indiv}}$$

where;

I = Estimated proportion of WWTP service area infected

Data Analysis and Visualization

Data analysis and visualization was conducted using R Statistical Computing Software version 3.6.3.[22] The dplyr[23] and tidyr[24] packages were primarily used for data manipulation and the ggplot2 package[25] was used for all plotting. The code used to create each figure can be found at https://github.com/mkc9953/WW_EPI_grab_composite_study.

Results and Discussion

Three large wastewater facilities collect and treat portions of the city of Norfolk's wastewater. The ABTP currently receives wastewater from approximately 36% of the city's population. During the study period there was 211, 211, and 239 clinically confirmed COVID-19 cases in the entire city (for days 1, 2, and 3, respectively). Gonzalez et al.[17] has been monitoring this facility, amongst others, weekly since March 9th, 2020. Detections of SARS-CoV-2 began on April 6, 2020—4 weeks prior to this study.

Influent Flow and Rainfall

Hourly wastewater influent flow during the study period ranged from 7.16 to 16.28 million gallons per day (MGD), with a mean flow of 12.3 MGD and standard deviation of 2.73 MGD. A description of flow characteristics by sample day can be found in Table 1. Two days prior to the first sampling event there was a storm generating approximately 1.0 inches of rainfall. A brief increase in flow was observed, likely due to stormwater infiltrating the sewer collection system. Influent flow at the treatment facility

returned to typical dry weather values in approximately 6hrs and remained at levels typical of dry weather throughout the study. No rainfall occurred in the vicinity of the treatment facility during the study period. The treatment facility serves several low-lying areas that are subject to inundation during moderate high tide events, causing saltwater intrusion into sewer collection system. Treatment plant influent conductivity, used as an indicator of seawater, begins to increase significantly following tidal levels greater than 3.5' Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW). High tides during the period sampled were 3.4' MLLW or less based on the Sewell's Point Tide Gage operated by NOAA.

SARS-CoV-2 Concentration and Variability

All three assays used for this study (N1, N2, N3) yielded positive results for every raw wastewater influent sample. All three final effluent samples were below the limit of detection (LOD = 58 copies/100 mL). For composite samples, concentrations of all assays ranged from 580 – 1380 copies 100 mL^{-1}, with a mean of 900 and standard deviation of 215 copies 100 mL^{-1}, showing good agreement across the three days (Figure 1). Similarly, composite samples showed relatively low variability within (largest range = 490 copies 100 mL^{-1}) and between assays (largest range = 580 copies 100 mL^{-1}) for a given day (Table 2). Grab sample concentration variability was also low, ranging from 25 to 1100 copies 100 mL^{-1} for all samples collected (Table 3) with a coefficient of variation (CV) of 68.5%. Grab sample concentrations showed good agreement across assays as means, minima, and maxima were each in the same respective order of magnitude (Table 3). Examining the association between each possible pair of assays showed a positive monotonic relationship for all combinations, with Pearson coefficients ranging 0.72-0.90 (Figure 2). Comparing results by day for all assays showed similarly low variability with the greatest difference in any two daily mean concentrations of 114.8 copies 100 mL^{-1} (Table 3).

Grab sample concentrations showed good agreement with corresponding composite concentrations (Figure 1), with a mean deviation of 159 copies 100 mL^{-1} between a grab sample and its associated

193 composite. Over half of the total number of grab samples (59/108) had concentrations which were
194 within 50% of their respective composite. Interestingly, the discrepancy between grab and composite
195 concentrations, regardless of magnitude, often (75/108) showed grabs at lower concentration than the
196 corresponding composite (Figure 1). These drops in virus concentration were not concurrent with times
197 of lowest influent flow but seemed to lag by approximately 4-6hrs (Figure 1). This pattern may be
198 influenced by the number and density of COVID-19 infections in the region. In a case with few infected
199 individuals the viral signal would be sporadic in the daily flow. Conversely, if a catchment area were
200 highly impacted by infections, the virus signal in wastewater would be less variable and minimally
201 influenced by changes in flow. The ABTP catchment could have a high enough infection density to
202 consistently detect a wastewater signal, but not so ubiquitous that the signal is entirely unimpacted by
203 diurnal cycles in flow. Considering this, grab samples should be collected at times that avoid early
204 morning flow minima and the subsequent 4-6hrs dips in viral concentration, in order to avoid
205 underestimating viral load to the treatment facility.

206

207 *Viral Load and Carrier Prevalence*

208 Wastewater N2 SARS-CoV-2 concentrations were used to calculate viral load for grab and composite
209 samples (Figure 3). Viral loads calculated using composite sample values showed low variability between
210 days, ranging from $4.2*10^{11}$ – $6.3*10^{11}$. Variability in instantaneous load derived using grab sample
211 concentrations was greater, ranging from $3.7*10^{10}$ – $1.11*10^{12}$, with a mean of $4.1*10^{11}$ and standard
212 deviation of $2.8*10^{11}$. While the variability in grab sample concentration (CV=68.5%) and viral load
213 calculated from grab sample concentration (CV=69.3%) are expectedly similar, the magnitude of any
214 given deviation in viral load is increased due to the way load is derived (Equation 2). For example, the
215 greatest difference in concentration between a grab and composite sample, within a common assay,

was 1340 copies 100 mL^{-1}. When viral load is calculated using this same grab and composite the difference between the two types of sample is $2.8*10^{11}$ copies 100 mL^{-1}. For all load calculations using grab sample values, the mean deviation from the corresponding composite value was $8.4 *10^{10}$, or 14.9%. Data presented here demonstrate the potentially large disparity in viral load values calculated using SARS-CoV-2 concentrations given a difference in only 2hrs between grab sample collection times. For this study grab samples more often had lower concentrations than the corresponding composite, thus there is a higher likelihood of underestimating concentrations when collecting grabs. Viral concentration data which are biased low will affect downstream calculations made using these data, such as estimates of viral load and carrier prevalence in the catchment population. If these metrics are used to inform a public health response it is critical that they do not systematically underestimate the extent of COVID-19 infections in the community.

SAR-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater can also be used to estimate the prevalence of carriers in a catchment population (Equation 3). Currently there is considerable uncertainty around the viral shedding rate in feces of people infected with COVID-19. A widely reference paper by Wölfel et al. examining nine clinical cases found concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 viral RNA in stool ranging from below the limit of detection to $7.1*10^{8}$ copies 100 mL^{-1}.[20] Furthermore, a sensitivity analysis of previous carrier prevalence model iterations highlights the high susceptibility to the shedding rate variability, increasing the error associated with resulting estimates. However, as viral shedding rate is more fully described, carrier estimates could become increasingly important, given the potential public health value in generating a reliable estimate of infected people in a catchment. Results of this study highlight the importance of collecting a sample that is representative of SARS-CoV-2 concentrations in wastewater, as subsequent viral load and carrier estimates are based on this value. As with viral

concentration and viral load data, variability in was low in carrier estimates for composite samples with median values of 703, 1057, 709 copies 100 mL^{-1} (Figure 3). When including the 10^{th} and 90^{th} percentile results, estimates ranged from 365 to 2474 carriers in the catchment for composite samples. Carrier estimates based on grab samples were more variable, with an overall range of 32 to 4336 carriers, and median estimates ranging from 62-1853 carriers. The median carrier estimate from 24 of 36 grab samples fell within the 10^{th}-90^{th} percentile range for the corresponding composite. Of the 12 grabs for which the median carrier estimate was outside of the composite estimate 10^{th} – 90^{th} range, 11 were below the composite estimate range and 4 showed no overlap between the grab and composite (10 – 90^{th} percentile) ranges. Because these calculations are based on viral concentration it was expected that estimates from grabs would more often be lower than estimates made using composite concentrations. For these data, the potential underestimation of median carrier prevalence due to collecting a grab sample rather than a composite could be as large as 995 people, based on the minimum median carrier estimate (62) and corresponding composite estimate (1057) (Figure 3). That discrepancy in estimated carriers has practical implications if WBE is used as a component of the public health response to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Choosing an appropriate sampling scheme can minimize potential bias introduced into these estimates by accurately characterizing viral concentration. If replication in other studies shows that grab samples reliably underestimate viral concentration, then either composite sampling or grab samples targeting the expected peak viral concentration should be employed to reduce the likelihood of generating data which are biased low.

Limitations and Future Work

One important consideration for using WBE to examine viral trends during a pandemic is the heterogenous and dynamic nature of the spread of infections. Epidemiological work has shown that,

particularly during the early stages of pathogen spread, rates of infection are not uniform but rather clustered in localized hotspots often driven by importation of cases[26,] and the disproportionate effects of "superspreading" events[27]. Interpreting WBE data is also confounded by transient use of the sewerage system from people who may be infected by do not live in the catchment area, e.g. tourists or people who commute to a different area for work. Restrictions such as stay-at-home orders and the subsequent reopening of cities add further complexity to the characteristics of viral spread in a community. As a result, extrapolation of findings from one catchment to the surrounding region are not often appropriate. Therefore, data and patterns presented here pertain to this specific catchment over a 3-day period, and do not easily extend to other areas or timeframes. To address this, we suggest a surveillance approach to WBE, monitoring multiple catchments on a routine basis[17] to characterize trends specific to a region over time. As noted, variability in influent concentration change as density of cases increase or decrease within the catchment. Calculations using influent flow, such as viral load and carrier prevalence, will also be influenced by diel and seasonal changes in influent flow volume as well as short term increases due to wet weather. Regular monitoring of facilities reduces some uncertainty by establishing a context for changes in viral loading. Though estimating carrier prevalence remains challenging due to uncertainty around viral shedding rates, tracking viral load from a catchment over time may be sufficient to gain insight into community-level trends.

Acknowledgements

284

285 References

286 1. Dong, E.; Du, H.; Gardner, L. An Interactive Web-Based Dashboard to Track COVID-19 in Real
287 Time. Lancet Infect. Dis. 2020, 3099 (20), 19– 20, DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30120-1
288 2. Babiker, A.; Myers, C.W.; Hill, C.E.; Guarner, J. SARS-CoV2-2 Testing: Trials and Tribulations. Am. J. of
289 Clin. Pathol. 2020, (153) 706-708
290 3. Schneider, E.C. Failing the Test- The Tragic Data Gap Undermining the U.S. Pandemic Response. N.
291 Engl. J. Med. 2020, DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2014836
292 4. https://www.richmond.com/special-report/coronavirus/virginia-misses-key-marks-on-virus-testing-
293 as-leaders-eye-reopening/article_021e12c6-6d20-5030-9068-4caaeda495f7.html
294 5. Kronbichler, A.; Kresse, D.; Yoon, S.; Lee, K.W.; Effenberger, M.; Shin, J.I. Asymptomatic patients as a
295 source of COVID-19 infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int. J. Infect. Dis.2020, In
296 Press. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.06.052
297 6. Choi, P.M.; Tscharke, B.J.; Donner, E.; O'Brien, J.W.; Grant, S.C.; Kaserzon, S.L.; Mackie, R.; O'Malley,
298 E.; Crosbie, N.D.; Thomas, K.V; Mueller, J.F. Wastewater-based epidemiology biomarkers: past,
299 present and future. Trend. Anal. Chem. 2018, (105) 453-469.
300 7. Been, F.; Rossi, L.; Ort, C.; Rudaz, S.; Delémont, O.; Esseiva, P. Population normalization with
301 ammonium in wastewater-based epidemiology: Application to illicit drug monitoring. Environ. Sci.
302 Technol. 2014, 48(14), 8162-8169.
303 8. Sims, N.; Kasprzyk-Hordern, B. Future perspectives of wastewater-based epidemiology: Monitoring
304 infectious disease spread and resistance to the community level. Environ. Int. 2020, (139), DOI:
305 10.1016/j.envint.2020.105689.

9. Bivens A.; …. Bibby, K. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology: Global Collaborative to Maximize Contributions in the Fight Against COVID-19. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2020, DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.0c02388.
10. Hata, A,; Honda, R. Potential Sensitivity of Wastewater Monitoring for SARS-CoV-2: Comparison with Norovirus Cases. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2020, DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.0c02271.
11. Ahmed, W.; ….. Mueller, J.F. First confirmed detection of SARS-CoV-2 in untreated wastewater in Australia: A proof of concept for the wastewater surveillance of COVID-19 in the community. Sci. Total Environ. 2020, (728) 138764.
12. Mao, K.; Zhang, K.; Du, W.; Ali, W.; Feng, X.; Zhang, H. The potential of wastewater-based epidemiology as surveillance and early warning of infectious disease outbreaks. Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Health. 2020, (17), 1-7.
13. Daughton, C. The international ipmerative to rapidly and inexpensively monitor community-wide COVID-19 infection status and trends. Sci. Total Environ. 2020, (726) 138149
14. Worley-Morse, T.; Mann, M.; Khunjar, W.; Olabode, L.; Gonzalez, R. Evaluating the fate of bacterial indicators, viral indicators, and viruses in wastewater resource recovery facilities. Water Environ. Res. 2019, (91) 830-842.
15. Kitajima, M.; Ahmed, W.; Bibby, K.; Carducci, A.; Gerba, C.P.; Hamilton, K.A.; Harmoto, E.; Rose, J.B. SARS-CoV-2 in wastewater: State of the knowledge and reasearch needs. Sci. Total Environ. 2020, (739) 139076.
16. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel. 2020.
17. Gonzalez, R.; Curtis, K.; Bivins, A.; Bibby, K.; Weir, M.; Yetka, K.; Thompson, H.; Keeling, D.; Mitchell, J.; Gonzalez, D. COVID-19 Surveillance in Southeastern Virginia Using Wastewater -Based Epidemiology. Water. Res. 2020, Under Review.

18. Medema, G.; Heijnen, L.; Elsinga, G.; Italiaander, R.; Brouwer, A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-2 in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of the Epidemic in the Netherlands. Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett. 2020, DOI: 10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357
19. Wu, F.; Xiao, A.; Zhang, J.; Gu, X.; Lee, W.L.; Kauffman, K.; Hanage, W.; Matus, M.; Ghaeli, N.; Endo, N.; Duvallet, C.; Moniz, K.; Erickson, T.; Chai, P.; Thompson, J.; Alm, E. SARS-CoV-2 titers in wastewater are higher than expected from clinically confirmed cases. medRxiv, 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.05.20051540
20. Wölfel R.; Corman, V.M.; Guggemos, W.; Seilmaier, M.; Zange, S.; Muller, M.A.; Niemeyer, D.; Jones, T.C.; Vollmar, P.; Camilla, R.; Hoelscher, M.; Bleicker T.; Brunink, S.; Schneider, J.; Ehmann, R.; Zwirglmaier, K.; Drosten, C.; Wendtner, C. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-19. Nature. 2020, (581) 465-469
21. Rose, C.; Parker, A.; Jefferson, B.; Cartmell, E. The Characterization of Feces and Urine: A Review of the Literature to Inform Advanced Treatment Technology. Crit. Rev. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2015, (45) 1827-1879.
22. R Core Team (2017). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.
23. Wickham, H.; Francois, R.; Henry, L; Müller, K. dplyr: A grammar of data manipulation. R package version 0.8.5. 2015. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr
24. Wickham, H.; Henry, L. tidyr: Easily Tidy Data with 'spread()' and 'gather()' Functions. R package version 1.0.2. 2018 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr
25. Wickham, H. ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis. Springer-Verlag New York. 2016, ISBN 978-3-319-24277-4, https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org.

352 26. Bajardi, P.; Poletto, C.; Ramasco, J.J.; Tizzoni, M.; Colizza, V.; Vespignani, A. Human Mobility
353 Networks, Travel Restrictions, and the Global Spread of 2009 H1N1 Pandemic. PLoS One. 2011b,
354 6(1).
355 27. Lipsitch, M.; Cohen, T.; Cooper, B.; Robins, J.M.; Ma, S.; James, J.; Gopalakrishna, G.; Chew S.K.; Tan,
356 C.C.; Samore, M.H., Fisman, D.; Murray, M. Transmission Dynamics and Control of Sever Acute
357 Respiratory Disease. Science. 2003, (300) 1966-1970.

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372 Tables

373 1. Influent Flow for Study Period

Influent Flow For Study Period					
	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Hour of Peak flow
Day 1	8.18	15.64	12.47	2.60	2000
Day 2	7.86	15.37	12.11	2.79	1200
Day 3	7.16	16.28	12.31	3.02	1200

374

375

376

377 2. SARS-CoV-2 Concentrations in Composite Samples

Composite SARS-CoV-2 Concentration				
Date	Composite	N1	N2	N3
5/2/2020	1	860	890	890
5/3/2020	2	800	1380	1010
5/4/2020	3	580	910	780

378

379

3.

Grab Sample SARS-CoV-2 Concentration (copies 100 mL^{-1})				
By Assay				
	N1	N2	N3	Overall
Min	50	90	140	50
Max	2200	2000	2100	1100
Mean	608	848	768	741
St. Dev	501	500	506	508
By Day				
	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Overall
Min	220	50	110	50
Max	2200	2100	1800	1100
Mean	759	790	675	726
St. Dev	456	571	497	502

391 Figures

392

393 Figure 1.

394 Wastewater log_{10} SARS-CoV-2 concentrations (copies 100 mL^{-1}). Grab sample concentrations
395 are denoted by dots with each color representing an assay (N1, N2, N3). Shaded areas denote
396 the timeframe for three discrete 24hr flow-weighted composites. Concentrations for each
397 composite sample are noted. Influent flow is plotted in the lower panel.



398

399

400 Figure 2.

401

402 Associations between SARS-CoV-2 assays (N1, N2, N3). X and Y axes show $\log_{10}$ concentrations for each

403 assay. Lines represent linear association between assays, shaded areas denote standard error for

404 regression. Spearman correlation coefficients are listed in orange on each plot.

405



406

407

408

409

410

411

412 Figure 3.

413 Wastewater SARS-CoV-2 load and carrier prevalence estimates for the 72-hour study. For the upper
414 panel, load (log_{10} copies) calculated using grab sample concentrations are denoted by blue dots, while
415 load (log_{10} copies) from 24-hr composite concentrations are denoted by horizontal orange lines. In the
416 lower panel, prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infected carriers is estimated using Monte Carlo simulation.
417 Estimates derived using grab sample concentrations are denoted by blue dots (median number of
418 carriers) with error bars indicating the 10th and 90th percentile range in estimates. Shaded areas indicate
419 the 10th to 90th percentile range of carrier estimates calculated using 24hr composite samples.



420

421

422 Graphical Abstract – For Table of Contents Only



423