

Flushing of stagnant premise water systems after the COVID-19 shutdown can reduce infection risk by *Legionella* and *Mycobacterium* spp.

Raymond M. Hozalski,^{*,†} Timothy M. LaPara,[†] Xiaotian Zhao,[†] Taegyu Kim,[†]
Michael B. Waak,^{‡,¶} Tucker Burch,[§] and Michael McCarty^{||}

[†]*Department of Civil, Environmental, and Geo-Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis,
Minnesota, United States*

[‡]*Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway*

[¶]*Department of Infrastructure, SINTEF Community, Trondheim, Norway*

[§]*Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Marshfield, Wisconsin, United
States*

^{||}*School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States*

E-mail: hozalski@umn.edu

Phone: +1 612-626-9650. Fax: +1 612-626-7750

Abstract

1
2 The unprecedented widespread closing of buildings due to the COVID-19 pandemic has
3 allowed water to stagnate in premise plumbing systems, creating conditions that may facilitate
4 the growth of opportunistic pathogens. In this study, we flushed and collected samples from
5 showers in buildings that had been unoccupied for approximately two months and quantified
6 *Legionella pneumophila* using a commercial cultivation-based assay. In addition, all bacteria,
7 *Legionella* spp., *L. pneumophila*, *L. pneumophila* serogroup 1, non-tuberculous mycobacteria

8 (NTM), and *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) were analyzed using quantitative PCR
9 (qPCR). Despite low or negligible total chlorine in the stagnant pre-flush water samples,
10 *L. pneumophila* were not detected by either method; *Legionella* spp., NTM, and MAC, however,
11 were widespread. Using quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA), estimated risks of
12 clinical illness from exposure to legionella and MAC via showering were generally low, but the
13 risk of subclinical infection via *Legionella* spp. could exceed a 10^{-7} daily risk threshold if just a
14 small fraction ($\geq 0.1\%$) of those legionellae detected by qPCR are highly infectious. Flushing
15 cold and hot water lines rapidly restored a total chlorine (as chloramine) residual and decreased
16 all bacterial gene targets to building inlet water levels within 30 min. Following flushing, the
17 chlorine residual rapidly dissipated and bacterial gene targets rebounded, approaching pre-flush
18 concentrations after 6 to 7 days of stagnation. These results suggest that stagnant water in
19 premise plumbing may contain elevated levels of opportunistic pathogens; flushing, however,
20 can rapidly improve water quality and reduce the health risk but the improvement will be
21 short-lived if building disuse persists.

22 Introduction

23 The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in the abrupt closure of schools, gyms, restaurants, retail shops,
24 offices, and other facilities, which remained empty except for perhaps maintenance or cleaning.
25 Building inactivity results in stagnant water in the premise plumbing that can adversely affect water
26 quality, including the loss of residual chlorine, growth of bacteria, and release of harmful metals
27 like lead.¹⁻⁴ Temporarily idle buildings is not a new issue (e.g., during the annual summer recess
28 of schools). Yet, there are gaps in the peer-reviewed literature regarding microbiological water
29 quality changes during such closures and the corresponding risks. Specifically, it is unclear how the
30 unprecedented sudden temporary closure of buildings due to the recent pandemic will affect the
31 prevalence of and potential human exposure to opportunistic pathogens of genera *Legionella* and
32 *Mycobacterium*.

33 Legionellae and non-tuberculous mycobacteria (NTM) occur naturally in water and include

34 clinically notable species, especially *Legionella pneumophila* (causative agent of Legionnaires’
35 disease and Pontiac fever) and *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) (causative agent of pulmonary
36 and other infections).⁵ Other species of either genera, however, may also cause disease, and under-
37 reporting and under-diagnosis are believed to be significant challenges globally.⁶⁻⁸

38 Legionellae have been observed in drinking water distribution networks and premise plumbing
39 when there is little or no residual free chlorine (HOCl) but largely absent otherwise, especially when
40 residual chloramine is maintained in the water (as monochloramine, NH₂Cl).⁹⁻¹⁶ Conversely, NTM
41 are known for their resistance to disinfectants and other antimicrobial agents, which enables their
42 persistence in distribution networks containing chlorine or chloramine.¹⁶⁻¹⁹

43 One approach for addressing pathogen concerns in premise plumbing is flushing. Cold and hot
44 water flushing is recommended at least twice weekly in U.S. hospitals to mitigate *L. pneumophila*
45 in low-use or low-flow outlets.²⁰ In chlorinated and chloraminated water systems, flushing can
46 replenish disinfectant residuals and either decrease or increase water temperatures in the cold and
47 hot water lines, respectively, to outside the optimal range for pathogen growth (about 25 to 42 °C).⁵

48 In this study, showers in five university buildings that had been wholly or largely unused for
49 more than two months due to the COVID-19 pandemic were investigated prior to and during flushing
50 to assess the stagnant water quality and the changes that occur during flushing. These buildings
51 were located in two different cities, each supplied lime-softened, filtered, and chloraminated river
52 water from separate treatment and distribution systems. Conventional water quality indicators
53 (total chlorine, temperature, and pH) were measured onsite and microbiological water quality was
54 assessed using culture- and DNA-based techniques. Additional samples were collected from these
55 showers for up to a week after flushing to assess water quality changes during the post-flushing
56 stagnation period. Finally, quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) was performed to assess
57 the health risks of showering with water that had stagnated for an extended period and the risk
58 reduction benefits of flushing.

59 **Experimental Materials and Methods**

60 **Site Selection**

61 In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities (UMN) suspended
62 or significantly reduced most activities in March 2020. Five UMN buildings were selected for
63 accessibility, their known inactivity during the pandemic (i.e., according to facilities management
64 personnel and water meter readings), and to provide varying building ages (constructed from 1935
65 to 2014; [Table S1](#)). Four buildings (designated A to D) were located in Minneapolis, Minnesota
66 (United States), and one was located in St. Paul, Minnesota (building E). The buildings comprised
67 from 3 to 7 levels or floors and ranged in total gross area from 5300 to 28 700 m². Two conventional
68 showers—one each for hot and cold water—were arbitrarily selected and investigated per shower
69 room out of approximately 8 to 32 showers per room. One shower room was investigated per
70 building, except buildings D and E, where a secondary shower room was also analyzed. Fourteen
71 showers total were sampled in seven shower rooms.

72 The Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul are served by separate drinking water systems. Both sys-
73 tems withdraw water from the Mississippi River, perform lime softening, filtration, and disinfection,
74 and then distribute the water with a chloramine residual of approximately 3.5 mg/L Cl₂.

75 **Collecting Samples**

76 Buildings were investigated during May and June, 2020 ([Table S2](#)). Before flushing showers,
77 the quality of the municipal water supply was assessed by sampling as close as possible to the
78 building entry point (“inlet”). The inlet was first flushed for 5 to 10 min until steady-state was
79 reached with respect to temperature and pH, after which total chlorine was measured and a 1 to
80 2 L sample was aseptically collected into either an autoclave-sterilized polypropylene bottle or a
81 manufacturer-sterilized Whirl-Pak bag (Nasco; Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin). In the shower rooms,
82 shower heads were removed and the shower neck was flame-sterilized. The cold or hot water was
83 turned on and the first 1 to 2 L of water was collected and designated the “pre-flush” sample (time

84 $t = 0$ min). The showers remained on and additional water samples were collected at $t = 6, 15,$
85 30, and 45 min, for a total of 5 samples per shower. In all cases, the cold and hot water flushes
86 were staggered for ease of sampling with the cold water flush initiated first and the hot water flush
87 initiated 20 min later. Immediately upon sample collection, aliquots were removed for testing of
88 total chlorine, temperature, and pH. The remainder was placed on ice for immediate transport to the
89 laboratory. In buildings with a second shower room, the secondary showers were only flushed for
90 30 min and only two microbiological samples were collected ($t = 0$ and 30 min). Water samples
91 were subsequently collected from every shower 2 to 4 days later (follow-up 1) and again 6 or 7 days
92 later (follow-up 2) to assess post-flushing changes in water quality. Additional sample collection
93 details are provided in the Supporting Information (SI).

94 **Sample Processing**

95 Culturable *L. pneumophila* were enumerated by the Legiolert Quanti-Tray test (IDEXX Laboratories;
96 Westbrook, Maine) using the manufacturer's potable water protocol. Triplicate tests were performed
97 on all but 10 samples (7 duplicates and 3 single tests) during a temporary shortage of supplies.
98 Periodic testing of positive and negative controls were within manufacturer specifications. The
99 bulk of the remaining water (590 to 998 mL) was vacuum-filtered to collect the microorganisms
100 using a 47 mm mixed cellulose polymer membrane (0.2 μm pore size; MilliporeSigma; Burlington,
101 Massachusetts). DNA was extracted and purified from filter membranes, as previously detailed.¹⁴
102 Negative controls were collected with each sample set (approximately 1 per 14 microbiological
103 samples) by filtering 2 mL sterile water through a clean membrane.

104 **Chlorine decay experiment**

105 The chloramine decay rate in Minneapolis tap water was experimentally determined. Triplicate
106 glass bottles (1 L) were baked at 550 °C for 6 h to eliminate organic carbon and then filled with
107 cold tap water (after flushing approximately 40 min). Total chlorine, pH, and temperature were
108 periodically measured for 3 weeks. Chlorine decay rate constants were determined by nonlinear

109 (weighted) least-squares estimates in an exponential decay model using function *nls()* in the R
110 “stats” package.²¹

111 **Real-time qPCR**

112 Marker genes were targeted by real-time quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) to quantify
113 total *Bacteria* (16S rRNA genes²²), genus *Legionella* (*ssrA*²³), species *L. pneumophila* (*mip*²³),
114 *L. pneumophila* serogroup 1 (*wzm*²³), environmental NTM (genus *Mycobacterium atpE*²⁴), and
115 MAC (16S-23S internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region²⁵), using qPCR reaction chemistry and
116 amplification protocols previously described.^{14,18} Additional information on the qPCR can be found
117 in the SI.

118 **Data Analysis and Statistics**

119 To determine the effects of flushing and the post-flushing stagnation period, marker gene concen-
120 trations were compared using either paired maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) with survival
121 models (“survival” package) or Fong’s modified sign test via R software.^{21,26–29} Marker gene
122 concentrations were also assessed for correlation with water quality parameters (total chlorine,
123 temperature, and pH) using a multivariate approach—supplemental fitting of the parameters af-
124 ter principal components analysis (PCA) (“vegan” package) of the marker gene concentrations
125 as ranks.^{26,30} Spearman’s rank correlations were utilized as alternative. Statistical methods and
126 treatments are thoroughly detailed in the SI.

127 **Quantitative Microbial Risk Assessment**

128 Risks of illness from exposure to *Legionella* spp. and MAC while showering were quantified via
129 QMRA, using flushing period gene marker concentrations and the general approach of [Hamilton](#)
130 [et al.](#)^{31,32} Relevant health endpoints for legionellae were subclinical respiratory infection (i.e.,
131 Pontiac fever) and clinical severity respiratory infection (i.e., Legionnaires’ disease),³² with trans-

132 mission modeled via aerosol inhalation during showering. Relevant health endpoints for MAC
133 were respiratory infection (via aerosol inhalation while showering), systemic (disseminated) infec-
134 tion, and cervical lymphadenitis.³¹ The latter two are non-respiratory infections with transmission
135 modeled via accidental ingestion of water during showering.

136 Inhaled or ingested doses were calculated using equations from [Hamilton et al.](#),³² with input
137 values from [Ahmed et al.](#)³³ and a dose harmonization factor added for conversion of marker genes
138 to colony-forming units (CFU), as previously used by [Lee et al.](#)¹¹ and [Ditommaso et al.](#)³⁴ Inhaled
139 doses were determined for conventional and high-efficiency shower heads (13 L/min and 7 L/min,
140 respectively). More details are provided in the SI.

141 Water concentrations depended on availability of non-zero observations for the pathogen of
142 interest. For *Legionella* spp. in both cities and MAC in Minneapolis, concentrations were either
143 the observed values of *ssrA* and ITS or 0 (for non-detects). Because *Legionella* spp. were de-
144 tected in both cities (but never *L. pneumophila*), a range of percentages for *pneumophila*-like
145 *Legionella* (as a proportion of total *Legionella* spp.) was used to illustrate the potential range of
146 risks involved (0.1 %, 1 %, 10 %, and 100 %); at least 20 *Legionella* spp. have been documented
147 as human pathogens on the basis of their isolation from clinical material.³⁵ In these simulations,
148 *pneumophila*-like *Legionella* spp. were assumed to have the same dose-response characteristics as
149 *L. pneumophila*, consistent with how pneumonia due to either *L. pneumophila* or non-*pneumophila*
150 *Legionella* resemble each other clinically.³⁶ As an alternative supporting analysis, the concentration
151 of *L. pneumophila* was estimated at the theoretical 95 % detection limit of the Legiolert assay
152 (3 most probable number (MPN) in the total volume of water assayed).³⁷ Because MAC was never
153 detected while flushing showers in the St. Paul building, an upper limit was estimated based on
154 the theoretical 95 % detection limit of the qPCR assay (i.e., 3 copies in the total volume of water
155 analyzed by qPCR).³⁷

156 Exponential dose-response models were used for both *Legionella* health endpoints based on
157 a guinea pig model reported by [Armstrong and Haas](#)³⁸, which has been validated against human
158 outbreak data³⁹ and with “uncertain parameter” values as reported in [Hamilton et al.](#)³² For MAC

159 health endpoints, exponential dose-response models were used for pulmonary infection and cervical
160 lymphadenitis (i.e., Tomioka model and Jorgensen 1 model, respectively), and an approximate
161 beta-Poisson model for systemic infection (i.e., Yangco model).^{31,40}

162 QMRA calculations were implemented in R software, using the package “mc2d” to conduct
163 Monte Carlo simulations quantifying effects of uncertain inputs.^{21,41} Full equations and an example
164 of R code are provided in the SI. All calculations were segregated by city (Minneapolis vs. St. Paul),
165 and calculations involving aerosol inhalation were also segregated by shower head type. To assess
166 the effect of flushing on risk, pathogen doses were calculated using either the concentrations from
167 $t = 0$ min and 6 min, which represented the initial shower exposure after a stagnation period, or
168 $t = 15$ min, 30 min, and 45 min for subsequent post-flushing exposure.

169 **Results**

170 **Basic Water Quality Indicators**

171 **Total Chlorine**

172 Total chlorine concentrations in Minneapolis pre-flush samples ranged from non-detect (i.e.,
173 <0.1 mg/L; 7/10 samples) to 1.0 mg/L (Fig. S1). Total chlorine increased over time during cold
174 water flushing and reached the respective building inlet concentrations (3.0 to 3.1 mg/L) within
175 30 min. Conversely, for hot water flushing, chlorine concentrations increased throughout the entire
176 flushing period but reached only 22 to 91 % of building inlet values by the end of flushing. In
177 the post-flushing period, chlorine concentrations declined rapidly with little remaining after 2 to
178 3 days in most cases (Table S3). Similar results were observed for the St. Paul building, except
179 that the building inlet concentration (1.8 mg/L) was much lower than those in Minneapolis and
180 concentrations in all post-flushing samples were negligible (≤ 0.1 mg/L).

181 In Minneapolis, chlorine decay within the shower supply lines was compared to that in clean
182 glass bottles to assess the role of premise plumbing in chlorine consumption (Fig. S2). First-order

183 chlorine decay rates (K) in the cold and hot water supply lines (1.04/day and 0.74/day, respectively)
184 were much greater than the decay rate in clean glass bottles (0.05/day), suggesting a substantial
185 chlorine demand associated with premise piping.

186 **Temperature**

187 The temperature of pre-flush water samples ranged from 19.7 to 30.4 °C (median: 22.6 °C) and
188 either decreased over time for cold water flushes, approaching the building inlet temperatures, or
189 increased over time to approximately 40 °C for most of the hot water flushes (Fig. S1, Table S4).
190 Water temperature for one hot water flush in Minneapolis, however, did not increase substantially
191 likely due to a faulty mixing valve. For the first hot water flush in St. Paul, the water became
192 progressively colder because the water heating system initially was off. Water temperatures in the
193 post-flushing period ranged from 24.2 to 29.1 °C.

194 **pH**

195 The pre-flush pH ranged from 8.5 to 9.3 and tended to increase during cold water flushing up to the
196 respective building inlet pH (9.2 to 9.5) and decrease slightly during hot water flushing (Fig. S1).
197 The pH decreased over time in the post-flushing period for the cold-water flushed showers but was
198 relatively stable for hot-water flushed showers (Table S5).

199 **Microbiological Indicators**

200 **Bacteria**

201 Bacterial 16S rRNA genes were detected in all pre-flush samples at concentrations of 5.6 to
202 7.6 log₁₀[copies/L] (Fig. 1). In Minneapolis buildings, concentrations decreased by 2 to 3 orders
203 of magnitude within 6 min of flushing and stabilized at or near the respective building inlet con-
204 centrations (<method quantification limit (MQL) to 4.8 log₁₀[copies/L]). In the St. Paul building,
205 the decline during flushing was less apparent (Fig. 1) because the concentration in the inlet to the

206 St. Paul building was relatively high (5.4 log₁₀[copies/L]). Concentrations of bacterial 16S rRNA
207 genes increased during the follow-up period. When all sites are considered together, pre-flush
208 samples were significantly differentiated from samples collected following 30 min of flushing
209 ($p < 0.001$ via MLE) and from samples collected 2 to 4 days and then 6 to 7 days after flushing
210 ($p < 0.001$ and $p = 0.007$, respectively, via MLE; [Table S6](#)).

211 **Legionellae**

212 No culturable *L. pneumophila* were detected in 91 samples (260 Quanti-Trays total, including
213 all technical replicates). All water samples were likewise negative for *mip* and *wzm* gene targets
214 (*L. pneumophila* and *L. pneumophila* sg1).

215 Conversely, most pre-flush water samples in Minneapolis (8/10) and St. Paul (4/4) were positive
216 for *ssrA* (*Legionella* spp.), with concentrations ranging from 4.4 to 6.2 log₁₀[copies/L] ([Fig. 2](#)).
217 The only two pre-flush samples that were negative for *Legionella* spp. were hot water samples.
218 *Legionella* spp. were not detected at Minneapolis building inlets or in samples collected during
219 flushing (i.e., 6 to 45 min) but were detected again during follow-up sampling in 20 % of showers
220 after 2 to 4 days and 40 % of showers after 6 to 7 days.

221 In St. Paul, *Legionella* spp. were detected at the inlet and in 5 of 10 water samples collected
222 during flushing at 4.3 to 5.4 log₁₀[copies/L], including 3 of 4 end-of-flush samples (30 or 45 min).
223 The water heating system in building E was off during the first hot water flush (due to building
224 disuse)—effectively another cold water flush, albeit from the hot water lines. The water heater was
225 in operation, however, for the second flush. *Legionella* spp. were detected in all eight follow-up
226 samples at concentrations ranging from 4.7 to 6.2 log₁₀[copies/L]. Combining results from all
227 buildings, *ssrA* gene concentrations were still less than pre-flush levels in the follow-up sampling
228 after 6 to 7 days ($p = 0.04$ via MLE; [Table S6](#)).

229 **Mycobacteria**

230 In Minneapolis buildings, neither mycobacterial *atpE* nor MAC ITS were detected at building inlets
231 but were detected in most pre-flush samples (9/10) at concentrations up to $7.6 \log_{10}[\text{copies/L}]$ and
232 $5.4 \log_{10}[\text{copies/L}]$, respectively (Fig. 3). In the St. Paul building, *atpE* was detected at the inlet
233 ($3.8 \log_{10}[\text{copies/L}]$) and in all four pre-flush samples (<3.1 to $5.8 \log_{10}[\text{copies/L}]$), but MAC were
234 never observed.

235 Mycobacterial *atpE* concentrations—and in Minneapolis, MAC ITS concentrations—declined
236 rapidly during flushing and were significantly reduced within 30 min ($p = 0.02$ by MLE and
237 $p = 0.02$ by Fong's test for *atpE* and ITS, respectively; Tables S6 and S7). Mycobacterial *atpE*
238 genes were detected again in 60 % of Minneapolis and 100 % of St. Paul samples collected 2
239 to 4 days after flushing. The concentrations of these genes, however, were still below pre-flush
240 levels ($p = 0.02$ by MLE). The frequency of detection of Mycobacterial *atpE* genes increased
241 to 80 % in Minneapolis and 100 % in St. Paul for samples collected 6 to 7 days after flushing,
242 with concentrations still below pre-flush levels ($p = 0.02$ by MLE). In Minneapolis, MAC ITS
243 concentrations were not significantly different from pre-flush levels at 6 to 7 days ($p = 0.21$ by
244 Fong's test).

245 **Relationships Between Water Quality and Microbiological Indicators**

246 After controlling for confounding effects of municipal water supply and building, total chlorine,
247 temperature, and pH were fit to PCA biplots for cold and hot water (Fig. S3). Full statistical output
248 is provided in the SI, including summary results of Spearman's rank correlation tests (Tables S8
249 and S9). Total chlorine was strongly associated with gene marker concentrations (cold water:
250 $r^2 = 0.57$, $p = 0.001$, and hot water: $r^2 = 0.52$, $p = 0.001$). Spearman's rank tests indicated a
251 strong negative correlation between gene markers and total chlorine, particularly in Minneapolis
252 (ρ values = -0.84 to -0.49). Temperature likewise corresponded to gene marker concentrations
253 (cold water: $r^2 = 0.57$, $p = 0.001$, and hot water: $r^2 = 0.21$, $p = 0.008$). Spearman's rank tests
254 indicated positive correlation with temperature (ρ up to 0.80) for cold water—and hot water at

255 building E, which had not been heated in one case—and negative correlation for hot water in
256 Minneapolis (ρ down to -0.59). Water pH was weakly associated with gene marker concentrations
257 in cold water ($r^2 = 0.14$, $p = 0.03$) but not hot ($r^2 = 0.06$, $p = 0.3$). Spearman’s rank tests indicated
258 a negative correlation between gene markers and pH, but only in Minneapolis cold water ($\rho = -0.55$
259 to -0.66).

260 **Human Health Risks**

261 **Legionellae**

262 *L. pneumophila* risk estimates were typically lower than a daily equivalent of the U.S. Environmental
263 Protection Agency (EPA) 10^{-4} annual acceptable risk threshold ($10^{-4}/365 = 3 \times 10^{-7}$ infections
264 per day; Fig. 4, with full results detailed in Tables S10 and S11). The median risk of subclinical
265 infection (per showering exposure) ranged from 10^{-8} to 10^{-7} , while the median risk of clinical
266 severity infection was between 10^{-11} and 10^{-10} per exposure. Note that all *L. pneumophila* risk
267 estimates presented here are likely to be upper limits on true risk, as *L. pneumophila* was never
268 detected in Minneapolis or St. Paul.

269 Initial exposure risk estimates for *Legionella* spp.-induced health impacts varied widely and were
270 linearly related to the percentage of *Legionella* spp. assumed to be *pneumophila*-like (Tables S10
271 and S11). Risks of subclinical infection (per exposure) were as low as 10^{-6} if only 0.1 % of
272 *Legionella* spp. were assumed to be *pneumophila*-like, whereas they exceeded 10^{-2} if 100 % of
273 *Legionella* spp. were assumed to be *pneumophila*-like. Risks of clinical severity infection illustrated
274 a similar range, though were about 1000-fold lower than the corresponding risks of subclinical
275 infection, which corresponded with the differences in dose-response models for these two health
276 endpoints. Finally, all risk estimates for *pneumophila*-like *Legionella* were 10-fold or more greater
277 than those for *L. pneumophila* assuming *L. pneumophila* was present at the Legiolert lower limit of
278 detection. Thus, if no *Legionella* spp. were *pneumophila*-like, then overall risks from exposure to
279 legionellae are substantially overestimated.

280 Regardless of differences between the *L. pneumophila* and *pneumophila*-like assumptions,

281 differences between shower head type were consistent. Risk for conventional shower heads was
282 always about 5 times higher than risk for efficient shower heads, which corresponded to the assumed
283 model parameter differences for these two fixture types. This can likely be attributed to the lower
284 flow rates of efficient shower heads, as well as to different aerosol size distributions between the
285 two.

286 Differences in initial exposure risk estimates between cities were also generally consistent
287 between *L. pneumophila* and *pneumophila*-like *Legionella*. For *L. pneumophila*, risk was higher
288 in the St. Paul building compared to that in the Minneapolis buildings by a factor of 3, and for
289 *pneumophila*-like *Legionella*, risk estimates were higher in St. Paul by a factor of nearly 8. In the
290 former case, the higher estimated risk in St. Paul resulted from the smaller total volume of water
291 sampled (14 flushing period samples in St. Paul compared to 42 in Minneapolis). In the latter case,
292 higher risk in St. Paul is attributed to the relatively high concentrations of *Legionella* spp. after 6
293 min of flushing (Fig. 2). There were substantial differences in the benefits of flushing with respect
294 to infection risk for buildings in the two cities. Flushing reduced the risk by more than 4 orders of
295 magnitude in the Minneapolis buildings compared to only one order of magnitude in the St. Paul
296 building. This is attributed to the relatively high concentrations of *Legionella* spp. throughout the
297 flushing period likely resulting from the relatively high concentrations in the St. Paul building inlet
298 water.

299 **MAC**

300 In general, MAC risk estimates were relatively low (Fig. 5, with full results detailed in Tables S12
301 and S13). The risk for pulmonary infections from inhalation exposures were all 2.4×10^{-9} or lower,
302 regardless of whether the samples were from the initial exposure after stagnation or subsequent
303 flushing period. Median risk estimates for illness from ingestion exposures were in the range
304 of 2.7×10^{-11} to 1.5×10^{-6} , with the higher value for systemic infection from pre-flush samples
305 in Minneapolis. The difference in risk for the two exposure routes is largely due to differences
306 in assumed water exposure (4 to 20 μ L of aerosolized water versus 0.1 to 2.0 mL of accidentally

307 ingested water). Between the two health endpoints relevant for ingestion exposure, risk estimates
308 for systemic infection were about 10-fold higher than those for cervical lymphadenitis, which
309 corresponded to differences in the dose-response models for these two endpoints. Between cities,
310 risk estimates for the buildings in Minneapolis were about 700-fold higher than for the building in
311 St. Paul, which corresponded to differences in water concentrations between cities. In particular,
312 MAC were never detected in St. Paul, so as noted earlier, MAC risk estimates in St. Paul were based
313 on the theoretical detection limit of the qPCR assay. Note also that all MAC risk estimates are likely
314 to be conservatively high, because the dose harmonization factor was assumed to be 1, while in
315 reality it is probably higher (e.g., it was assumed to be 10 to 30 for legionellae).

316 Discussion

317 Pre-flush samples from idle showers serviced by two independent chloraminated distribution
318 networks were uniformly negative for *L. pneumophila* using both cultivation-based and cultivation-
319 independent methods. The lack of *L. pneumophila* is a significant finding from a public health
320 perspective, because *L. pneumophila* are well-known to cause the potentially fatal pneumonia called
321 Legionnaires' disease and the less serious flu-like illness called Pontiac fever. These results are
322 consistent with previous reports that premises receiving chloraminated drinking water tend to have
323 lower levels of legionellae compared to chlorinated drinking water.^{10,12} Although limited to two
324 systems, the results from this study expand on prior work by suggesting that chloramine affords
325 protection from *L. pneumophila* colonization of premise plumbing and subsequent proliferation
326 during extended water stagnation.

327 Despite this promising finding, *Legionella* spp. were still observed in pre-flush samples by
328 qPCR targeting *ssrA*, indicating that some *Legionella* spp. survive in these chloraminated premise
329 plumbing environments. Additionally, the re-occurrence of *Legionella* spp. during follow-up
330 monitoring suggests these organisms were present in premise plumbing biofilms or in the water
331 at the end of flushing at concentrations less than the detection limit of our assay. Bédard et al.⁴²
332 attributed the rapid increase in culturable cell density after short stagnation times (1 day) to bacterial

333 detachment from the biofilm as opposed to cell growth or restoration of culturability. As our
334 post-flushing samples were obtained with up to 7 days of stagnation, cell growth may also be a
335 factor. To assess the risk posed by the legionellae in these plumbing systems, additional work would
336 be needed to determine the strains present and their proclivity to cause human disease.

337 Neither NTM nor MAC were detected in the building inlets in Minneapolis but were present in
338 most pre- and post-flushing samples. In contrast, NTM were detected in the inlet, during flushing,
339 and in the follow-up sampling of the St. Paul building, although MAC were never observed. The
340 rapid rebound of NTM, MAC, or both in the post-flushing samples in this study is consistent with
341 their presence in premise plumbing biofilms. It is not surprising to find NTM in these premise
342 plumbing systems because NTM are predominant members of biofilm communities in chloraminated
343 distribution networks^{17,18} and may also reside in premise plumbing biofilms.⁴³ The proliferation of
344 NTM in these environments is attributed to their well-known resistance to disinfectants and other
345 antimicrobial agents.⁴⁴ Despite our previous observations of abundant NTM in two chloraminated
346 systems, MAC were not detected in any water or biofilm samples collected directly from the
347 distribution mains of those systems.^{17,18} A key factor that may explain this apparent discrepancy
348 is the low to negligible total chlorine concentrations in the premise plumbing versus relatively
349 high concentrations in distribution mains (approximately 3.5 mg/L). Haig et al.¹⁹ reported a
350 correlation between *M. avium* abundance in water samples and water age, which accounted for
351 distribution network travel time and stagnation time in premise plumbing. Despite correlating with
352 water age, surprisingly, chloramine concentration—averaging 2.04 mg/L—was not identified as a
353 statistically significant parameter correlating to *M. avium* abundance.¹⁹ The presence of MAC in
354 the Minneapolis showers poses some, albeit minor, risk given the potential for MAC to cause fatal
355 pneumonia in people with compromised immune systems or chronic lung conditions.⁵

356 Few QMRAs for opportunistic pathogens have examined risks associated with indoor use of
357 distributed potable water based on site-specific measurements. Instead, prior work has largely
358 focused on reclaimed water use, greywater reuse, and/or roof-harvested rainwater use.^{31,45,46} Addi-
359 tionally, Hamilton et al.³² worked backwards from target risk values to derive critical concentrations

360 informing monitoring efforts for *L. pneumophila* exposures associated with indoor use of potable
361 water. Thus, the current QMRA is novel in its reliance on site-specific empirical measurements of
362 *Legionella* spp. from distributed water systems, and we are aware of only one other comparable
363 study in the peer-reviewed literature.⁴⁷ Assuming a conversion factor of 0.97 disability-adjusted life
364 years (DALYs) per subclinical infection³² and 365 daily exposures per year, the Sharaby et al.⁴⁷
365 risk estimates correspond to probabilities of subclinical infection equal to approximately 2×10^{-6}
366 and 7×10^{-6} per person per daily exposure for faucet use and showering, respectively. These risk
367 estimates are consistent with the low end of the range for pre-flush samples reported in the current
368 study, when 0.1 % of *Legionella* spp. are assumed to be *pneumophila*-like.

369 Considering previous studies investigating other types of source water and exposures, the risk
370 estimates for *L. pneumophila* and *pneumophila*-like *Legionella* spp. from the present study are
371 generally comparable. Blanky et al.⁴⁵ estimated annual probabilities of subclinical *L. pneumophila*
372 infection between 10^{-8} and 10^{-5} for garden irrigation with greywater and between 10^{-6} and 10^{-4}
373 for toilet flushing with greywater. Meanwhile, Hamilton et al.³¹ estimated annual probabilities
374 of subclinical *L. pneumophila* infection between approximately 10^{-6} and 10^{-2} for a number of
375 exposure scenarios involving roof-harvested rainwater. In addition, Hamilton et al.⁴⁶ estimated
376 annual probabilities of subclinical *L. pneumophila* infection between 10^{-6} and 10^{-2} for toilet
377 flushing with reclaimed wastewater. When converted to daily risk (assuming 365 daily exposures
378 per year for any given activity), the majority of these risk estimates fall well below 10^{-5} subclinical
379 infections per person per daily exposure, which correspond to the low to mid-range risk estimates
380 for the current study.

381 Furthermore, when compared to the EPA annual acceptable risk threshold of 10^{-4} infections
382 per person per year (which equates to approximately 3×10^{-7} infections per person per day),
383 most *L. pneumophila* risk estimates were also relatively low, with the exception of subclinical
384 infection risks for conventional shower fixtures in St. Paul (2.7×10^{-7}). Additionally, pre-flush
385 risks of subclinical infection for *pneumophila*-like *Legionella* spp. all exceed the daily equivalent
386 of the EPA annual threshold but could be substantially reduced by flushing, especially in the

387 Minneapolis buildings. It should be emphasized, however, that the true percentage of *pneumophila*-
388 like *Legionella* spp. in the currently study is unknown, and the assumed values were selected
389 arbitrarily to illustrate trends among a range of possible scenarios. Future work quantifying the
390 proportion of highly infectious (i.e., *pneumophila*-like) *Legionella* spp. in tap water or premise
391 plumbing biofilms, or both, would therefore be particularly valuable for refining these risk estimates.

392 Previous QMRA studies for MAC are extremely limited. Rice et al.⁴⁸ considered exposure of
393 individuals with acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) to MAC via distributed drinking
394 water but only estimated probabilities of exposure rather than probabilities of infection or illness
395 because dose-response models for MAC were unavailable at the time of their study. Hamilton
396 et al.³¹ performed a risk assessment for roof-harvested rainwater and considered a wide variety of
397 exposure routes for MAC, including 9 ingestion routes and 5 inhalation routes. Ingestion-associated
398 risk estimates, including from intentional consumption of drinking water, were generally higher
399 than inhalation-associated risk estimates for MAC (10^{-7} to 1 versus 10^{-10} to 10^{-4} , respectively).
400 MAC risk estimates from the present study, with median probabilities of infection (per single
401 shower exposure) between approximately 10^{-11} and 10^{-6} , are on the lower end of values reported
402 by Hamilton et al.³¹

403 It is important to note that our QMRA analysis considered showering exposures only and
404 excluded exposures from other common indoor water uses such as toilet flushing and the use of
405 faucets. This choice was justified based on previous work demonstrating that showering presents
406 the highest risk compared to other indoor water uses.³² In addition, the current analysis has focused
407 on per exposure (i.e., per showering event) risk estimates rather than annual risk estimates because
408 the concern was about exposure to stagnant water following an extended period of building disuse,
409 which is unlikely to occur repeatedly throughout an entire year.

410 There were distinct differences in total chlorine and bacterial gene target concentrations for the
411 building inlets in Minneapolis versus the one in St. Paul despite the fact that the water for both
412 systems is primarily sourced from the Mississippi River, treated similarly, and distributed with a
413 similar residual chloramine concentration. The likely explanation for the observed water quality

414 differences is that the water in St. Paul was older, due to the presence of a university-owned water
415 storage tower combined with low water use on the campus due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The
416 differences in building inlet water qualities also translated into substantial differences in how the
417 showers on each campus responded to flushing and and the resulting post-flushing health risks from
418 *Legionella* spp. exposure.

419 The total chlorine residual in all buildings was unstable, rapidly decaying during post-flushing
420 stagnation. Decay rates were 14 to 19 times greater in the premise plumbing compared to clean
421 glass bottles, which is consistent with a report by Rhoads et al.⁴⁹, who observed high chloramine
422 decay rates in green building water systems. The microbiological results suggest that biofilms
423 are present in the plumbing, and biofilms are known to exert a chloramine demand, especially
424 nitrifying biofilms.⁵⁰ The observed pH decrease during post-flushing stagnation is consistent with
425 ammonia-oxidizing microorganism activity. Plumbing components or substances associated with
426 those components may also contribute to chlorine decay. For example, copper ions from actively
427 corroding copper pipes can exert a chlorine demand.⁵¹ The negative correlation between total
428 chlorine and marker genes is consistent with the well-known effects of residual disinfectant on
429 bacterial growth. All bacterial marker gene concentrations rapidly increased during the post-flushing
430 period and after 6 to 7 days approached those in the pre-flush water that had stagnated for about 2
431 months. This further supports the need for frequent flushing to maintain a residual in plumbing, in
432 addition to adequate cold or hot water temperatures, as control measures against bacterial growth
433 during a shutdown. Guidance for recommended residual levels is ≥ 0.2 mg/L for free chlorine⁵² but
434 less formally defined for chloramine, though total chlorine as low as 0.1 mg/L may still afford some
435 protection against *Legionella*.¹⁶

436 Despite the overall low health risks from opportunistic pathogen exposure observed in this
437 work, the results have important implications for flushing practice. First, flushing showers with
438 chloraminated cold water or hot water may be able to reduce *Legionella* spp., NTM, and MAC
439 concentrations to below detection limits in as little as 6 min. Although temperature was significantly
440 associated with bacterial gene markers, positively in cold water and negatively in hot water, this

441 was likely due to the arrival of fresh water containing a residual disinfectant and lower bacteria
442 concentrations. Nevertheless, when the building inlet water contains microorganisms of potential
443 health concern like legionellae or NTM, preliminary flushing of local water mains and water turnover
444 in nearby storage tanks may be necessary. Finally, given that water quality declines rapidly during
445 stagnation, further consideration should be given to flushing periodically during shutdowns, or at a
446 minimum, flushing within 2 or 3 days of building re-occupancy. Certainly, every building is unique
447 and flushing requirements may be different for other locations.

448 **Acknowledgement**

449 The authors thank Scott Bernardson, Kirk Hall, and Tony Gutterman from UMN Facilities Manage-
450 ment for their assistance with building access and sampling. The authors also thank personnel at
451 the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH), especially Anita Anderson, Kim Larsen, and Alex
452 Bartley, for guidance in the development of a sampling and flushing plan. Finally, the authors thank
453 MDH for financial support of this research.

454 **Supporting Information Available**

455 Supplemental experimental materials and methods, including sample collection processing, real-
456 time qPCR, data analysis and statistics (with example R software code), and QMRA equations
457 (with example code); supplemental results, including relationships between water quality and
458 microbiological indicators (with R software hypothesis testing console output); supplemental
459 tables summarizing building sites, sample collection dates, total chlorine observations, water
460 temperature observations, water pH observations, paired MLE contrasts, Fong's modified sign test
461 contrasts, Spearman's rank correlations for Minneapolis and St. Paul, all QMRA estimates for
462 simulated *Legionella* exposure via inhalation and MAC exposure via inhalation and ingestion in both
463 Minneapolis and St. Paul, measured and predicted hydraulic characteristics during flushing, and
464 qPCR calibration curves; supplemental figures showing water quality during flushing, chloramine

465 decay and decay rates, qPCR of bacterial 16S rRNA genes, and PCA biplots of marker genes.

References

- (1) Ji, P.; Parks, J.; Edwards, M. A.; Pruden, A. Impact of water chemistry, pipe material and stagnation on the building plumbing microbiome. *PLOS ONE* **2015**, *10*, e0141087.
- (2) Lautenschlager, K.; Boon, N.; Wang, Y.; Egli, T.; Hammes, F. Overnight stagnation of drinking water in household taps induces microbial growth and changes in community composition. *Water Res.* **2010**, *44*, 4868–4877.
- (3) Zlatanović, L.; van der Hoek, J.; Vreeburg, J. An experimental study on the influence of water stagnation and temperature change on water quality in a full-scale domestic drinking water system. *Water Res.* **2017**, *123*, 761–772.
- (4) Proctor, C. R.; Rhoads, W. J.; Keane, T.; Salehi, M.; Hamilton, K.; Pieper, K. J.; Cwiertny, D. M.; Prévost, M.; Whelton, A. J. Considerations for large building water quality after extended stagnation. *AWWA Water Sci.* **2020**,
- (5) Falkinham, J. O.; Hilborn, E. D.; Arduino, M. J.; Pruden, A.; Edwards, M. A. Epidemiology and ecology of opportunistic premise plumbing pathogens: *Legionella pneumophila*, *Mycobacterium avium*, and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Environ. Health Persp.* **2015**, *123*, 749–758.
- (6) Alarcon Falconi, T. M.; Cruz, M. S.; Naumova, E. N. The shift in seasonality of legionellosis in the USA. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **2018**, *146*, 1824–1833.
- (7) Dooling, K. L. et al. Active bacterial core surveillance for legionellosis—United States, 2011–2013. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly Rep.* **2015**, *64*, 1190–1193.
- (8) ECDC, *European Legionnaires' Disease Surveillance Network (ELDSNet): Operating procedures*; 2012.

- (9) Dupuy, M.; Mazoua, S.; Berne, F.; Bodet, C.; Garrec, N.; Herbelin, P.; Ménard-Szczebara, F.; Oberti, S.; Rodier, M.-H.; Soreau, S.; Wallet, F.; Héchar, Y. Efficiency of water disinfectants against *Legionella pneumophila* and *Acanthamoeba*. *Water Res.* **2011**, *45*, 1087–1094.
- (10) Flannery, B.; Gelling, L. B.; Vugia, D. J.; Weintraub, J. M.; Salerno, J. J.; Conroy, M. J.; Stevens, V. A.; Rose, C. E.; Moore, M. R.; Fields, B. S.; Besser, R. E. Reducing *Legionella* colonization of water systems with monochloramine. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **2006**, *12*, 588–596.
- (11) Lee, J. V. et al. An international trial of quantitative PCR for monitoring *Legionella* in artificial water systems. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2011**, *110*, 1032–1044.
- (12) Moore, M. R.; Pryor, M.; Fields, B. S.; Lucas, C.; Phelan, M.; Besser, R. E. Introduction of monochloramine into a municipal water system: Impact on colonization of buildings by *Legionella* spp. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2006**, *72*, 378–383.
- (13) Srinivasan, A.; Bova, G.; Ross, T.; Mackie, K.; Paquette, N.; Merz, W.; Perl, T. M. A 17-month evaluation of a chlorine dioxide water treatment system to control *Legionella* species in a hospital water supply. *Infect. Cont. Hosp. Ep.* **2003**, *24*, 575–579.
- (14) Waak, M. B.; LaPara, T. M.; Hallé, C.; Hozalski, R. M. Occurrence of *Legionella* spp. in water-main biofilms from two drinking water distribution systems. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2018**, *52*, 7630–7639.
- (15) Xue, Z.; Lee, W. H.; Coburn, K. M.; Seo, Y. Selective reactivity of monochloramine with extracellular matrix components affects the disinfection of biofilm and detached clusters. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2014**, *48*, 3832–3839.
- (16) Donohue, M. J.; Vesper, S.; Mistry, J.; Donohue, J. M. Impact of chlorine and chloramine on the detection and quantification of *Legionella pneumophila* and *Mycobacterium* species. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2019**, *85*, e01942–19.

- (17) Gomez-Smith, C. K.; LaPara, T. M.; Hozalski, R. M. Sulfate reducing bacteria and mycobacteria dominate the biofilm communities in a chloraminated drinking water distribution system. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2015**, *49*, 8432–8440.
- (18) Waak, M. B.; LaPara, T. M.; Hallé, C.; Hozalski, R. M. Nontuberculous mycobacteria in two drinking water distribution systems and the role of residual disinfection. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2019**, *53*, 8563–8573.
- (19) Haig, S.-J.; Kotlarz, N.; LiPuma, J. J.; Raskin, L. A high-throughput approach for identification of nontuberculous mycobacteria in drinking water reveals relationship between water age and *Mycobacterium avium*. *mBio* **2018**, *9*, e02354–17.
- (20) Veterans Health Administration, Directive 1061: Prevention of healthcare-associated *Legionella* disease and scald injury from potable water distribution systems. Washington, DC, United States, 2014.
- (21) R Core Team, R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing: Vienna, Austria, 2019.
- (22) Muyzer, G.; de Waal, E. C.; Uitterlinden, A. G. Profiling of complex microbial-populations by denaturing gradient gel-electrophoresis analysis of polymerase chain reaction-amplified genes coding for 16S rRNA. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **1993**, *59*, 695–700.
- (23) Benitez, A. J.; Winchell, J. M. Clinical application of a multiplex real-time PCR assay for simultaneous detection of *Legionella* species, *Legionella pneumophila*, and *Legionella pneumophila* serogroup 1. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2013**, *51*, 348–351.
- (24) Radomski, N.; Roguet, A.; Lucas, F. S.; Veyrier, F. J.; Cambau, E.; Accrombessi, H.; Moilleron, R.; Behr, M. A.; Moulin, L. *atpE* gene as a new useful specific molecular target to quantify *Mycobacterium* in environmental samples. *BMC Microbiol* **2013**, *13*, 277.

- (25) Rocchetti, T. T.; Silbert, S.; Gostnell, A.; Kubasek, C.; Widen, R. Validation of a multiplex real-time PCR assay for detection of *Mycobacterium* spp., *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* complex, and *Mycobacterium avium* complex directly from clinical samples by use of the BD Max open system. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2016**, *54*, 1644–1647.
- (26) Helsel, D. R. In *Statistics for Censored Environmental Data Using Minitab and R*, 2nd ed.; Scott, M., Barnett, V., Eds.; Statistics in Practice; John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: Hoboken, New Jersey, 2012; p 344.
- (27) Huston, C.; Juarez-Colunga, E. Guidelines for Computing Summary Statistics for Data-Sets Containing Non-Detects. 2009; <http://bvcentre.ca>.
- (28) Therneau, T. M. A package for survival analysis in R. 2020.
- (29) Fong, D. Y. T.; Kwan, C. W.; Lam, K. F.; Lam, K. S. L. Use of the sign test for the median in the presence of ties. *Am. Stat.* **2003**, *57*, 237–240.
- (30) Oksanen, J.; Blanchet, F. G.; Friendly, M.; Kindt, R.; Legendre, P.; McGlinn, D.; Minchin, P. R.; O’Hara, R. B.; Simpson, G. L.; Solymos, P.; Stevens, M. H. H.; Szoecs, E.; Wagner, H. *vegan: Community Ecology Package*. 2018.
- (31) Hamilton, K. A.; Ahmed, W.; Toze, S.; Haas, C. N. Human health risks for *Legionella* and *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) from potable and non-potable uses of roof-harvested rainwater. *Water Res.* **2017**, *119*, 288–303.
- (32) Hamilton, K. A.; Hamilton, M. T.; Johnson, W.; Jjemba, P.; Bukhari, Z.; LeChevallier, M.; Haas, C. N.; Gurian, P. L. Risk-based critical concentrations of *Legionella pneumophila* for indoor residential water uses. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2019**, *53*, 4528–4541.
- (33) Ahmed, W.; Vieritz, A.; Goonetilleke, A.; Gardner, T. Health Risk from the use of roof-harvested rainwater in Southeast Queensland, Australia, as potable or nonpotable water,

- determined using quantitative microbial risk assessment. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2010**, *76*, 7382–7391.
- (34) Ditommaso, S.; Ricciardi, E.; Giacomuzzi, M.; Arauco Rivera, S. R.; Zotti, C. M. *Legionella* in water samples: How can you interpret the results obtained by quantitative PCR? *Mol. Cell Probe* **2015**, *29*, 7–12.
- (35) Diederer, B. *Legionella* spp. and Legionnaires' disease. *J. Infection* **2008**, *56*, 1–12.
- (36) Muder, R. R.; Yu, V. L. Infection due to *Legionella* species other than *L. pneumophila*. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2002**, *35*, 990–998.
- (37) Stokdyk, J. P.; Firnstahl, A. D.; Spencer, S. K.; Burch, T. R.; Borchardt, M. A. Determining the 95% limit of detection for waterborne pathogen analyses from primary concentration to qPCR. *Water Res.* **2016**, *96*, 105–113.
- (38) Armstrong, T. W.; Haas, C. N. A quantitative microbial risk assessment model for Legionnaires' disease: Animal model selection and dose-response modeling. *Risk Anal.* **2007**, *27*, 1581–1596.
- (39) Armstrong, T. W.; Haas, C. N. Legionnaires' disease: evaluation of a quantitative microbial risk assessment model. *J. Water Health* **2008**, *6*, 149–166.
- (40) Hamilton, K. A.; Weir, M. H.; Haas, C. N. Dose response models and a quantitative microbial risk assessment framework for the *Mycobacterium avium* complex that account for recent developments in molecular biology, taxonomy, and epidemiology. *Water Res.* **2017**, *109*, 310–326.
- (41) Pouillot, R.; Delignette-Muller, M. L. Evaluating variability and uncertainty separately in microbial quantitative risk assessment using two R packages. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* **2010**, *142*, 330–340.

- (42) Bédard, E.; Laferrière, C.; Déziel, E.; Prévost, M. Impact of stagnation and sampling volume on water microbial quality monitoring in large buildings. *PLOS ONE* **2018**, *13*, e0199429.
- (43) Falkinham, J. O.; Pruden, A.; Edwards, M. Opportunistic premise plumbing pathogens: Increasingly important pathogens in drinking water. *Pathogens* **2015**, *4*, 373–386.
- (44) Le Dantec, C.; Duguet, J.-P.; Montiel, A.; Dumoutier, N.; Dubrou, S.; Vincent, V. Chlorine disinfection of atypical mycobacteria isolated from a water distribution system. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2002**, *68*, 1025–1032.
- (45) Blanky, M.; Sharaby, Y.; Rodríguez-Martínez, S.; Halpern, M.; Friedler, E. Greywater reuse - Assessment of the health risk induced by *Legionella pneumophila*. *Water Res.* **2017**, *125*, 410–417.
- (46) Hamilton, K. A.; Hamilton, M. T.; Johnson, W.; Jjemba, P.; Bukhari, Z.; LeChevallier, M.; Haas, C. N. Health risks from exposure to *Legionella* in reclaimed water aerosols: Toilet flushing, spray irrigation, and cooling towers. *Water Res.* **2018**, *134*, 261–279.
- (47) Sharaby, Y.; Rodríguez-Martínez, S.; Höfle, M.; Brettar, I.; Halpern, M. Quantitative microbial risk assessment of *Legionella pneumophila* in a drinking water supply system in Israel. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2019**, *671*, 404–410.
- (48) Rice, G.; Wright, J. M.; Boutin, B.; Swartout, J.; Rodgers, P.; Niemuth, N.; Broder, M. Estimating the frequency of tap-water exposures to *Mycobacterium avium* complex in the U.S. population with advanced AIDS. *J. Toxicol. Env. Heal. A* **2005**, *68*, 1033–1047.
- (49) Rhoads, W. J.; Pruden, A.; Edwards, M. A. Survey of green building water systems reveals elevated water age and water quality concerns. *Env. Sci. Water Res. Tech.* **2015**, *2*, 164–173.
- (50) Zhang, Y.; Edwards, M. Accelerated chloramine decay and microbial growth by nitrification in premise plumbing. *J. Am. Water Works Assoc.* **2009**, *101*, 51–62.

- (51) Nguyen, C.; Elfland, C.; Edwards, M. Impact of advanced water conservation features and new copper pipe on rapid chloramine decay and microbial regrowth. *Water Res.* **2012**, *46*, 611–621.
- (52) WHO, In *Legionella and the Prevention of Legionellosis*; Bartram, J., Chartier, Y., Lee, J. V., Pond, K., Surman-Lee, S., Eds.; World Health Organization Press: Geneva, Switzerland, 2007; p 252.




Figure 1. Heatmap of bacterial 16S rRNA genes (via qPCR) in Minneapolis (buildings A to D) and St. Paul (building E) premise water systems at the building inlet, during flushing of shower cold and hot water supplies in shower rooms, and during a follow-up monitoring period.




Figure 2. Heatmap of genus-wide *Legionella ssrA* genes (via qPCR) in Minneapolis (buildings A to D) and St. Paul (building E) premise water systems at the building inlet, during flushing of shower cold and hot water supplies in shower rooms, and during a follow-up monitoring period.

Environmental NTM (*atpE*) and *M. avium* complex (16S-23S ITS)




Figure 3. Heatmap of non-tuberculous mycobacteria (NTM) *atpE* genes and *Mycobacterium avium* complex 16S-23S internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region (via qPCR) in Minneapolis (buildings A to D) and St. Paul (building E) premise water systems at the building inlet, during flushing of shower cold and hot water supplies in shower rooms, and during a follow-up monitoring period.




Figure 4. Per-exposure risk (median \pm 95% confidence interval via Monte Carlo simulation) of clinical and subclinical legionellosis in the Minneapolis and St. Paul university shower rooms, for the initial shower after stagnation versus the subsequent post-flushing interval. Scenario A (top) assumes 100% *pneumophila*-like *Legionella* spp. using a conventional shower head, while Scenario B (bottom) assumes 0.1% *pneumophila*-like *Legionella* spp. using a water-efficient shower head. Dashed line indicates a daily acceptable risk threshold.




Figure 5. Per-exposure risk (median \pm 95 % confidence interval via Monte Carlo simulation) for the initial shower after stagnation versus the subsequent post-flushing interval in the Minneapolis and St. Paul university shower rooms, resulting in either (A) pulmonary infection via *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) inhalation using either conventional or water-efficient shower heads, and (B) systemic infection or cervical lymphadenitis via ingestion of MAC. Dashed line indicates a daily acceptable risk threshold.

SI Figures & Tables

This page is for LaTeX cross-referencing to the Supporting Information in this draft version of the manuscript only.

Figure S1. Water quality during flushing

Figure S2. Chloramine decay in Minneapolis water

Figure S3. PCA biplot of ranked marker gene concentrations

Table S1. Building site descriptions

Table S2. Sample collection dates

Table S3. Total chlorine summary

Table S4. Water temperature summary

Table S5. Water pH summary

Table S6. Paired MLE contrasts

Table S7. Fong's modified sign test contrasts

Table S8. Spearman's rank correlations, Minneapolis

Table S9. Spearman's rank correlations, St. Paul

Table S10. Full QMRA results for *Legionella* exposure (Minneapolis)

Table S11. Full QMRA results for *Legionella* exposure (St. Paul)

Table S12. Full QMRA results for MAC exposure via inhalation

Table S13. Full QMRA results for MAC exposure via ingestion

Table S14. Measured and predicted hydraulic characteristics

Table S15. Real-time qPCR summary

Graphical TOC Entry

