

1 **Comparison of infection control strategies to reduce COVID-19** 2 **outbreaks in homeless shelters in the United States**

3
4
5 **Lloyd A.C. Chapman PhD¹, Margot Kushel MD², Sarah N. Cox MSPH³,**
6 **Ashley Scarborough MPH³, Caroline Cawley MPH⁴, Trang Nguyen MPH PhD³,**
7 **Isabel Rodriguez-Barraquer MD PhD¹, Bryan Greenhouse MD¹,**
8 **Elizabeth Imbert MD MPH⁵, and Nathan C. Lo MD PhD¹**
9

10 ¹Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

11 ²Center for Vulnerable Populations, Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma
12 Center, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

13 ³San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco, CA, USA

14 ⁴Department of Emergency Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco,
15 CA, USA

16 ⁵Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine, University of California, San
17 Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA
18

19 **Running title:** COVID-19 outbreaks in homeless shelters

20 **Abstract Word Count:** 250/250

21 **Main Text Word Count:** 3,003/3,000

22 **Figures:** 3

23 **Tables:** 2

24
25 **Keywords:** COVID-19, homelessness, shelters, infection control, outbreaks
26

27 **Correspondence:**

28 Lloyd A.C. Chapman, PhD and Nathan C. Lo, MD PhD

29 University of California, San Francisco

30 Department of Medicine

31 San Francisco, CA, USA 94110
32

33 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.
34

35 **Email:**

36 Dr Lloyd A.C. Chapman (Lloyd.Chapman@ucsf.edu)

37 Dr Nathan C. Lo (Nathan.Lo@ucsf.edu)
38

39 **Summary:** Combining symptom-screening, twice-weekly PCR testing and universal masking is
40 unlikely to prevent COVID-19 outbreaks in high-risk congregate homeless shelters and settings
41 with high community incidence, but may be sufficient in lower-risk settings. Alternative housing
42 arrangements are needed in high-risk settings.

43 **Abstract**

44 **Background:** Multiple COVID-19 outbreaks have occurred in homeless shelters across the US,
45 highlighting an urgent need to identify the most effective infection control strategy to prevent
46 future outbreaks.

47
48 **Methods:** We developed a microsimulation model of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in a homeless
49 shelter and calibrated it to data from cross-sectional polymerase-chain-reaction (PCR) surveys
50 conducted during COVID-19 outbreaks in five shelters in three US cities from March 28 to April
51 10, 2020. We estimated the probability of averting a COVID-19 outbreak in a representative
52 homeless shelter of 250 residents and 50 staff over 30 days under different infection control
53 strategies, including daily symptom-based screening, twice-weekly PCR testing and universal
54 mask wearing.

55
56 **Results:** Basic reproduction number (R_0) estimates for the observed outbreaks ranged from 2.9
57 to 6.2. The probability of averting an outbreak diminished with higher transmissibility (R_0)
58 within the simulated shelter and increasing incidence in the local community. With moderate
59 community incidence (~30 confirmed cases/1,000,000 people/day), the estimated probabilities of
60 averting an outbreak in a low-risk ($R_0=1.5$), moderate-risk ($R_0=2.9$), and high-risk ($R_0=6.2$)
61 shelter were: 0.33, 0.11 and 0.03 for daily symptom-based screening; 0.52, 0.27, and 0.04 for
62 twice-weekly PCR testing; 0.47, 0.20 and 0.06 for universal masking; and 0.68, 0.40 and 0.08 for
63 these strategies combined.

64

65 **Conclusions:** In high-risk homeless shelter environments and locations with high community
66 incidence of COVID-19, even intensive infection control strategies are unlikely to prevent
67 outbreaks, suggesting a need for non-congregate housing arrangements for people experiencing
68 homelessness. In lower-risk environments, combined interventions should be adopted to reduce
69 outbreak risk.
70

71 **Introduction**

72 The COVID-19 pandemic caused by infection with severe acute respiratory syndrome
73 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) poses great risk to people experiencing homelessness. Across the
74 US, the estimated 568,000 people who experience homelessness nightly [1] are likely to suffer a
75 disproportionate disease burden and need for hospitalization [2,3]. People experiencing
76 homelessness are on average older and have a high prevalence of comorbidities that are risk
77 factors for severe COVID-19 [2]. Multiple outbreaks in homeless shelters have occurred in
78 several cities including San Francisco, Boston, Seattle and Atlanta with attack rates of up to 67%
79 [4–7]. Homeless shelters have had to remain open in most cities despite high incidence of
80 infection in the community, concern about the risk of further outbreaks, and uncertainty over the
81 effectiveness of different infection control strategies. There is an immediate need to identify the
82 best infection control strategy to reduce the risk of outbreaks and assess the safety of continuing
83 to operate congregate shelters where transmission in the community is high.

84
85 The role of shelters and associated infection control practices in transmission of COVID-19
86 among people experiencing homelessness is still poorly understood. Given current understanding
87 that SARS-CoV-2 virus is transmitted predominantly through respiratory droplets, with some
88 airborne and fomite transmission [8], there is a need to consider policies to limit transmission
89 within high-density congregate living environments. Different infection control strategies are
90 currently recommended based on the level of transmission in the external community [9]. These
91 include routine symptom screening, polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing, universal mask
92 wearing, and relocation of individuals at high risk of severe disease to non-congregate settings
93 [10]. There is limited evidence on the effectiveness of strategies to reduce transmission in

94 congregate settings, and thus further research is urgently needed to guide city-level policy across
95 the US.

96
97 The goal of this study is to identify the most effective infection control strategy to slow the
98 spread of COVID-19 among people experiencing homelessness who reside in shelters. We
99 address this pressing question by estimating comparative health outcomes of key infection
100 control strategies using a simulation model calibrated to data on homeless shelter outbreaks.

101

102 **Methods**

103 Microsimulation model

104 We developed an individual-level stochastic susceptible-exposed-infectious-recovered (SEIR)
105 model [11] to simulate transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in a congregate shelter population
106 (Supplementary Figure 1). The model defines individuals as susceptible, exposed, infectious, or
107 immune to SARS-CoV-2 (Supplementary Table 1). We constructed the model to include
108 important aspects of the natural history of COVID-19, including sub-clinical infection, pre-
109 symptomatic transmission, and age-specific differences in risk of severe symptoms. In the
110 model, susceptible individuals become infected with SARS-CoV-2 at a rate proportional to the
111 prevalence of infectious individuals inside the shelter and their infectiousness (assuming
112 homogeneous mixing), plus a static force of infection based on the background infection
113 incidence in the community outside the shelter. Upon infection, individuals enter a latent
114 infection stage in which they incubate the virus but are not infectious. They then progress to
115 become infectious and contribute to ongoing transmission. An age-dependent fraction of infected
116 individuals develop clinical symptoms with associated risk of hospitalization and death

117 (Supplementary Table 2), while the remainder have sub-clinical infection. Individuals who
118 recover from infection are assumed to remain immune.

119

120 Data

121 The model was calibrated using aggregate data from PCR testing conducted during COVID-19
122 outbreaks in five shelters in three US cities – San Francisco (n=1), Boston (n=1) and Seattle
123 (n=3) [4,6,7] – from March 28–April 10, 2020. We obtained de-identified individual-level data
124 from the outbreak in the San Francisco shelter (see Supplementary Material and Supplementary
125 Table 3 for details), which is fully described elsewhere [5]. As of April 10, 2020, a total of 89
126 individuals (84 residents, 5 staff) of 175 tested (130 residents, 45 staff) in the shelter were PCR-
127 positive. We obtained aggregate data from the outbreaks in the Boston and Seattle shelters,
128 where identified COVID-19 cases triggered mass testing events [4,6,7]. In the Boston shelter,
129 147 of 408 residents and 15 of 50 staff were PCR-positive during testing conducted April 2–3,
130 2020. The numbers of residents and staff tested and positive in the three Seattle shelters (shelters
131 A, B and C) at two testing events conducted March 30–April 1 and April 7–8, 2020 are given in
132 Supplementary Table 4.

133

134 Model calibration

135 We calibrated the model to the aggregate numbers of individuals PCR-positive out of those
136 tested in each shelter (daily data for the San Francisco shelter, cross-sectional for the Seattle and
137 Boston shelters) using approximate Bayesian computation techniques (see Supplementary
138 Material). We fitted the following parameters: (i) the basic reproduction number R_0 (the average
139 number of secondary infections generated by the average infectious individual in an entirely

140 susceptible shelter population), (ii) the number of latently infected individuals who initially
141 entered the shelter E_0 , and (iii) the number of days before the first case was identified that these
142 individuals entered the shelter D (Table 1). The remaining parameters were sourced from
143 literature on natural history and epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 (Table 1 and Supplementary
144 Table 5).

145

146 Infection control strategies

147 We simulated six infection control strategies (Supplementary Table 6). 1) *Daily symptom-based*
148 *screening*: daily screening of all individuals in the shelter involving a temperature and symptom
149 survey. Individuals who screened positive were PCR tested, with 80% compliance, and isolated
150 for 1 day pending the test result; if negative, they returned to the population. We used published
151 data on the sensitivity of symptom-based screening with time since infection [12], which
152 suggests that close to 100% of symptomatic cases (a subset of all true cases) would eventually be
153 detected under repeated daily screening based on the definition of being symptomatic, even with
154 low sensitivity of symptom screening on any one occasion (here assumed to be 40% to give a
155 98% probability of detection after 8 days of daily symptom screening). Despite reports of low
156 specificity of symptom screening [13,14], a high specificity of 90% was assumed to prevent
157 unrealistic levels of PCR testing and isolation of symptom-positive individuals awaiting test
158 results. We assumed a minimum of 3 days between repeat PCR tests for the same individual
159 based on typical clinical practice and test turnaround times. 2) *Routine PCR testing*: twice-
160 weekly PCR testing of residents and staff based on prior literature analyzing reduction in
161 transmission and cost-effectiveness under different testing frequencies [15–17]. We assumed
162 75% sensitivity and 100% specificity of PCR testing based on published literature [18–21], a

163 mean duration of detectable viral load (starting prior to development of symptoms) of 20 days
164 (Supplementary Figure 3) [22–27], and 80% compliance with testing. We assumed test results
165 were returned in 1 day, after which time individuals who tested PCR-positive were removed
166 from the shelter population. 3) *Universal mask wearing*: wearing of surgical masks by all
167 persons within the shelter. We assumed that surgical mask wearing reduced the amount of
168 infectious SARS-CoV-2 material breathed into the air by infected individuals by 30% based on
169 literature estimates from household studies assuming high compliance and recent experimental
170 studies [28–33], and that 80% of individuals adhered to mask wearing [34–36]. 4) *Relocation of*
171 *“high-risk” individuals*: moving high-risk individuals (defined as those ≥ 60 years and/or with
172 co-morbidities) to single hotel rooms, modelled by replacing such individuals with lower-risk
173 individuals. 5) *Routine PCR testing of staff only*: twice-weekly testing of staff only, assuming
174 80% compliance. 6) *Combination strategy*: strategies 1–4 combined. Daily symptom screening
175 (strategy 1) was included in all strategies.

176

177 Prediction of impact of infection control strategies

178 For each intervention strategy we simulated transmission within a shelter of 250 residents and 50
179 staff (based on an average shelter size) over 30 days starting with one latently infected individual
180 1000 times (to account for stochastic uncertainty). The time period was chosen to capture the
181 trajectory of an outbreak and differential benefits of strategies. The primary outcome was the
182 probability of averting an outbreak (defined as 3 or more infections originating within the shelter
183 in any 14-day period [37,38]) under each strategy, with secondary outcomes of the proportional
184 reductions in the total numbers of COVID-19 infections and clinical cases, and total numbers of
185 hospitalizations, deaths and PCR tests used. Only individuals who tested positive were removed

186 from the shelter population. The initial population was chosen to have the same composition in
187 terms of proportions in different risk groups (by age and co-morbidity status) as the San
188 Francisco shelter. We estimated the probability of averting an outbreak under each intervention
189 strategy (compared with no interventions) for each calibrated R_0 value for a range of different
190 background infection rates estimated from recent incidence of confirmed cases in Seattle, Boston
191 and San Francisco (see Supplementary Material for details). To account for potential upward bias
192 in the estimated R_0 range due to fitting to data from shelters with high attack rates, we performed
193 the same simulations for a shelter environment with a low R_0 of 1.5. Analyzed data and model
194 code are available at https://github.com/LloydChapman/COVID_homeless_modelling. This
195 study was considered exempt non-human subject research based on use of de-identified
196 secondary data by the University of California, San Francisco Institutional Review Board.

197

198 *Sensitivity analysis*

199 We conducted a multi-way sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of uncertainty in key natural
200 history and intervention parameters (relative infectiousness of subclinical infection and the early
201 infectious stage, sensitivities and specificities of symptom screening and PCR tests, testing and
202 masking compliances, and mask effectiveness) on the results (Table 1). We explored the impact
203 of PCR testing frequency on the probability of averting an outbreak by varying the testing
204 frequency in strategy 2 from daily to monthly.

205

206 **Results**

207 *Model calibration*

208 The model reproduced the numbers of PCR-positive individuals in the cross-sectional surveys in
209 the Seattle and Boston shelters (Supplementary Figure 4) and the observed numbers of PCR-
210 positive individuals and symptomatic cases over time for the outbreak in the San Francisco
211 shelter (Supplementary Figures 4 and 5). The estimated R_0 values ranged from 2.9 (95% CI 1.1–
212 6.7) for Seattle shelter B to 6.2 (95% CI 4.0–7.9) for the San Francisco shelter (Supplementary
213 Table 7), with corresponding estimated cumulative infection incidences at the end of the testing
214 period of 14% (95% CI 1–41%) and 83% (95% CI 72–92%) (Supplementary Table 8). The
215 median estimated number of infections initially introduced was 3 for all shelters (95% CI 1–5).
216 The estimated date of introduction of infection ranged from 10 days (95% CI 7–14 days) before
217 the first case was identified for Seattle shelter B to 21 days (95% CI 17–26 days) before for San
218 Francisco.

219

220 Impact of infection control strategies

221 Table 2 shows the projected impact of the six infection control strategies considered, for
222 different transmission environments. Daily symptom screening performed poorly across different
223 transmissibilities (probability of averting an outbreak = 0.03 for San Francisco $R_0 = 6.2$, and
224 probability = 0.33 for $R_0 = 1.5$). Relocating individuals at high-risk of clinical symptoms
225 combined with symptom screening performed similarly to symptom screening alone (probability
226 of averting an outbreak = 0.03–0.33 for $R_0 = 6.2$ –1.5). Twice-weekly PCR testing of staff
227 provided some additional benefit over daily symptom screening at lower transmissibilities
228 (probability of averting an outbreak = 0.03–0.40 for $R_0 = 6.2$ –1.5). Universal masking and
229 twice-weekly PCR testing of all individuals yielded higher probabilities of averting an outbreak
230 of 0.06–0.47 and 0.04–0.52 for $R_0 = 6.2$ –1.5. The combination strategy involving daily

231 symptom screening, twice-weekly PCR testing of all individuals, universal masking, and
232 removal of high-risk individuals gave the highest probability of averting an outbreak (0.08–0.68
233 for $R_0 = 6.2$ –1.5).

234
235 The probability of averting an outbreak under each intervention strategy decreased with
236 increasing transmission potential (R_0) inside the shelter and with increasing infection incidence
237 in the community outside the shelter (Figure 1). Even under the combination strategy, the
238 probability of averting an outbreak in an average-transmission-potential shelter ($R_0 = 2.9$)
239 decreased from 0.58 to 0.07 as the background infection rate increased from 0 to 439 cases per 1
240 million person-days (the estimated background infection rate in San Francisco between June 27
241 and July 10, 2020).

242
243 The relative reduction in infection incidence under the different infection control strategies
244 followed the same pattern as the probability of averting an outbreak (Supplementary Table 10
245 and Figure 2).

246
247 PCR test requirements were approximately three times higher (at an average of 6.6 tests per
248 person per month) under twice-weekly PCR testing of all individuals than when only testing
249 individuals identified as symptomatic in daily symptom screening (2.0 tests/person/month), and
250 approximately two times higher than when only testing staff twice-a-week (2.8
251 tests/person/month) (Supplementary Table 11).

252
253 Sensitivity analysis

254 The probability of averting an outbreak was most sensitive to uncertainty in mask effectiveness
255 and relative infectiousness of the early infectious stage, followed by PCR sensitivity and
256 masking and testing compliances (Supplement Figure 9). Decreasing the frequency of PCR
257 testing from daily to monthly decreased the probability of averting an outbreak for $R_0 = 1.5, 2.9$
258 and 3.9 from 0.70 to 0.35 , 0.27 to 0.12 , and 0.23 to 0.08 respectively, but had little impact on the
259 already low probability of averting an outbreak for $R_0 = 6.2$ (Figure 3).

260

261 **Discussion**

262 Several outbreaks of COVID-19 with high attack rates have occurred in homeless shelters across
263 the US, and there remains uncertainty over the best infection control strategies to reduce
264 outbreak risk in shelters. In this study, we applied a simulation analysis to identify infection
265 control strategies to prevent future outbreaks. We found that in high-risk shelters that are unable
266 to maximize basic infection control practices that sufficiently reduce the transmissibility of
267 SARS-CoV-2 (e.g. social distancing, reduced living density), no additional infection control
268 strategy is likely to prevent outbreaks. In contrast, in lower-risk shelters with low background
269 community incidence, the implementation of strategies such as symptom screening, routine PCR
270 testing, and masking would help reduce outbreak risk.

271

272 We found a wide range of transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 based on observed outbreaks in
273 homeless shelters, which greatly affects intervention impact. Basic reproduction number (R_0)
274 estimates ranged from 2.9 to 6.2 , which is at the high end of estimates in the literature [39–42].
275 This likely reflects a high degree of heterogeneity in infectiousness between individuals [41,43–
276 46] and a highly conducive environment for transmission within these shelters due to lack of

277 existing infection control practices and high living density. Our R_0 estimates are also likely not
278 entirely representative of general transmission potential in shelters as non-outbreaks and smaller
279 outbreaks may go undetected or unreported, and some shelters have reported only low numbers
280 of infections [4,47]. For these R_0 values and current background infection rates, we found that
281 the infection control strategies considered are unlikely to prevent outbreaks (probability < 40%),
282 even when combined. Nevertheless, they do reduce incidence of infection and clinical disease
283 and slow the growth of the outbreak (Figure 2).

284
285 In a lower transmissibility setting, with $R_0 = 1.5$, e.g. where staff and clients are able to socially
286 distance, the considered intervention strategies are more likely to prevent outbreaks (probability
287 up to nearly 70% under combined interventions, for a moderate background infection rate
288 equivalent to that in Boston in early July of 122/1,000,000/day).

289
290 A key remaining issue is identifying the characteristics that distinguish low-risk shelters that can
291 be safely operated with implementation of infection control strategies. Data is limited, but
292 available evidence suggests that social distancing and reductions in super-spreading are likely to
293 be key factors [41,43,48–50]. Strategies that may achieve these goals include reducing living
294 density, spacing bedding, reducing communal activities, and adopting staffing models that limit
295 social contacts.

296
297 The fact that intervention impact and the probability of averting an outbreak decrease
298 significantly with increasing background infection rate in the community (Figure 1) suggests a
299 need for alternative housing arrangements for people experiencing homelessness in locations in

300 which community incidence is moderate to high – 100–500 infections/1,000,000/day, equivalent
301 to 25–125 confirmed cases/1,000,000/day (i.e. current San Francisco incidence) assuming four-
302 fold underreporting (see Supplementary Material). In lower background incidence settings,
303 combined daily symptom-based screening, twice-weekly PCR testing, universal masking and
304 relocation of high-risk individuals to non-congregate settings would reduce outbreak risk, and
305 limit incidence of infection and severe disease if outbreaks do occur.

306
307 Each infection control strategy is limited in some aspect [22,51–55]. Symptom-based screening
308 has very low sensitivity to detect infections early in the clinical course (when people are most
309 infectious), and poor specificity [12–14,56]. The impact of routine PCR testing is limited by
310 imperfect PCR sensitivity (~75%), especially early in the infection course [19], as well as need
311 for frequent testing and missing onset of infectiousness between testing periods. Other analyses
312 support our finding that testing less than once or twice weekly leaves a high risk of outbreaks
313 (e.g. testing once every two weeks gives a 30% lower probability of averting an outbreak than
314 twice-weekly testing, Figure 3) [15–17]. However, once- or twice-weekly testing may be
315 financially and logistically infeasible. Similarly, relocation of high-risk persons to independent
316 housing is resource intensive. Frequent testing and universal masking also suffer issues with
317 adherence, which constrains their effectiveness.

318
319 This study has a number of limitations. Due to limited data availability, we only calibrated the
320 model to a small number of shelter outbreaks, the R_0 estimates for which are likely to be higher
321 than for the average shelter due to larger outbreaks being more likely to be reported. The cross-
322 sectional aggregate nature of the majority of the data also led to wide uncertainty intervals

323 around the fitted parameters, without independent identifiability between them (Supplementary
324 Figure 10). Our estimate of the impact of masking is highly sensitive to the assumed
325 effectiveness of masking, which has mixed evidence [28,29,31]. Many uncertainties in the
326 biology of SARS-CoV-2 transmission remain, particularly regarding differential infectiousness
327 over time and by severity of illness, and the relationship of PCR positivity and infectiousness, for
328 which we had to make assumptions based on currently available evidence (see Supplementary
329 Material) [22,57,58].

330
331 This study defines conditions that would support safely operating homeless shelters with lower
332 risk of COVID-19 outbreaks and estimates the impact of various interventions on outbreak risk.
333 Our findings demonstrate the need for combined interventions (symptom-based screening, PCR
334 testing, and masking) and regular testing to protect persons experiencing homelessness from
335 COVID-19, while highlighting the limitations of these interventions in preventing outbreaks.
336

337 Funding:

338 This work was supported by the University of California, San Francisco and the UCSF Benioff
339 Homelessness and Housing Initiative.

340

341 Acknowledgements:

342 We sincerely appreciate the hard work and public health efforts of all those involved in the
343 collection of the data used in this article. LACC would like to thank Renata Retkute, Amanda
344 Minter, Simon Spencer and TJ McKinley for helpful discussions regarding Approximate
345 Bayesian Computation.

346

347 Disclosures:

348 The authors declare no conflicts of interest or disclosures. NCL has received funding from the
349 World Health Organization for unrelated work.

350

351 Author Contributions:

352 Conceptualization: NCL, LACC

353 Data Curation: LACC, SNC, AS, CC, TN, EI

354 Formal Analysis: LACC, NCL

355 Funding Acquisition: NCL, MK

356 Investigation: LACC, NCL

357 Methodology: LACC, NCL

358 Project Administration: NCL

359 Resources: NCL

360 Software: LACC

361 Supervision: NCL, MK

362 Visualization: LACC, NCL

363 Writing – Original Draft Preparation: LACC, NCL

364 Writing – Review & Editing: All authors

365 Drs. Lloyd A.C. Chapman and Nathan C. Lo had full access to all of the data in the study and
366 take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

367

368 **References**

- 369 1. Henry M, Watt R, Mahathey A, et al. The 2019 Annual Homeless Assessment Report
370 (AHAR) to Congress. Washington, DC: 2020.
- 371 2. Perri M, Dosani N, Hwang SW. COVID-19 and people experiencing homelessness:
372 challenges and mitigation strategies. *CMAJ* **2020**; 192:E716–E719.
- 373 3. Culhane D, Treglia D, Steif K, Kuhn R, Byrne T. Estimated Emergency and
374 Observational/Quarantine Capacity Need for the US Homeless Population Related to
375 COVID-19 Exposure by County; Projected Hospitalizations, Intensive Care Units and
376 Mortality. 2020. Available at: https://works.bepress.com/dennis_culhane/237/.
- 377 4. Mosites E, Parker EM, N Clarke KE, et al. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Infection
378 Prevalence in Homeless Shelters — Four U.S. Cities, March 27–April 15, 2020. **2019**; 69.
379 Available at: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.12.20059618v1>.
- 380 5. Imbert E, Kinley PM, Scarborough A, et al. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
381 Outbreak in a San Francisco Homeless Shelter. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; Available at:
382 <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1071/5879965>.
383 Accessed 21 August 2020.
- 384 6. Baggett TP, Keyes H, Sporn N, Gaeta JM. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in
385 Residents of a Large Homeless Shelter in Boston. *JAMA - J Am Med Assoc* **2020**;
386 323:2191–2192.
- 387 7. Tobolowsky FA, Gonzales E. COVID-19 Outbreak Among Three Affiliated Homeless
388 Service Sites — King County, Washington, 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2020**; 69:523–
389 526.
- 390 8. World Health Organization. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: implications for infection
391 prevention precautions. 2020. Available at:
392 [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/modes-of-transmission-of-virus-causing-covid-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/modes-of-transmission-of-virus-causing-covid-19-implications-for-ipc-precaution-recommendations)
393 [19-implications-for-ipc-precaution-recommendations](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/modes-of-transmission-of-virus-causing-covid-19-implications-for-ipc-precaution-recommendations). Accessed 11 August 2020.
- 394 9. Centers for Disease Control. Interim Considerations for Health Departments for SARS-
395 CoV-2 Testing in Homeless Shelters and Encampments. 2020. Available at:
396 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/homeless-shelters/testing.html>.
397 Accessed 11 August 2020.
- 398 10. Centers for Disease Control. Investigating and responding to COVID-19 cases at homeless
399 service provider sites. 2020. Available at: [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/investigating-cases-homeless-shelters.html)
400 [ncov/php/investigating-cases-homeless-shelters.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/investigating-cases-homeless-shelters.html). Accessed 11 August 2020.
- 401 11. Bertozzi AL, Franco E, Mohler G, Short MB, Sledge D. The challenges of modeling and
402 forecasting the spread of COVID-19. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* **2020**; :202006520.
- 403 12. Gostic KM, Gomez ACR, Mummah RO, Kucharski AJ, Lloyd-Smith JO. Estimated
404 effectiveness of symptom and risk screening to prevent the spread of COVID-19. *Elife*
405 **2020**; 9:1–18.
- 406 13. Roxby AC, Greninger AL, Hatfield KM, et al. Outbreak Investigation of COVID-19
407 among Residents and Staff of an Independent and Assisted Living Community for Older
408 Adults in Seattle, Washington. *JAMA Intern Med* **2020**; 98104.
- 409 14. Kimball A, Hatfield KM, Arons M, et al. Asymptomatic and Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-
410 2 Infections in Residents of a Long-Term Care Skilled Nursing Facility — King County,
411 Washington, March 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2020**; 69:377–381.
- 412 15. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, et al. Test sensitivity is secondary to frequency and
413 turnaround time for COVID-19 surveillance. *medRxiv* **2020**; :2020.06.22.20136309.

- 414 Available at:
415 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.22.20136309v2%0Ahttps://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.22.20136309v2.abstract>.
416
- 417 16. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to
418 Permit the Safe Reopening of College Campuses in the United States. *JAMA Netw Open*
419 **2020**; 3:e2016818. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32735339>.
 - 420 17. Chin ET, Huynh BQ, Murrill M, Basu S, Lo NC. Frequency of routine testing for COVID-
421 19 in high-risk environments to reduce workplace outbreaks. *medRxiv* **2020**;
422 :2020.04.30.20087015. Available at:
423 <http://medrxiv.org/content/early/2020/06/22/2020.04.30.20087015.abstract>.
 - 424 18. Arevalo-Rodriguez I, Buitrago-Garcia D, Simancas-Racines D, et al. False-Negative
425 Results of Initial RT-PCR Assays for Covid-19: a Systematic Review. **2020**; :1–26.
 - 426 19. Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J. Variation in False-Negative
427 Rate of Reverse Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction–Based SARS-CoV-2 Tests by
428 Time Since Exposure. *Ann Intern Med* **2020**;
 - 429 20. Watson J, Whiting PF, Brush JE. Interpreting a covid-19 test result. *BMJ* **2020**; 369:1–7.
430 Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1136/bmj.m1808>.
 - 431 21. Padhye NS. Reconstructed diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of the RT-PCR test for
432 COVID-19. *medRxiv* **2020**; 19:2020.04.24.20078949. Available at:
433 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.04.24.20078949>.
 - 434 22. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of
435 COVID-19. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:672–675.
 - 436 23. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized
437 patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* **2020**; 581:465–469.
 - 438 24. To KKW, Tsang OTY, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior
439 oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-
440 CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* **2020**; 20:565–574. Available at:
441 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30196-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30196-1).
 - 442 25. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients
443 with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* **2020**; 395:1054–
444 1062. Available at: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30566-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3).
 - 445 26. Xiao AT, Tong YX, Gao C, Zhu L, Zhang YJ, Zhang S. Dynamic profile of RT-PCR
446 findings from 301 COVID-19 patients in Wuhan, China: A descriptive study. *J Clin Virol*
447 **2020**; 127:0–6.
 - 448 27. Zou L, Ruan F, Huang M, et al. SARS-CoV-2 viral load in upper respiratory specimens of
449 infected patients. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:1177–1179.
 - 450 28. Leung NHL, Chu DKW, Shiu EYC, et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath
451 and efficacy of face masks. *Nat Med* **2020**; 26:676–680. Available at:
452 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0843-2>.
 - 453 29. MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. Facemasks for the prevention of infection in healthcare and
454 community settings. *BMJ* **2015**; 350:1–12.
 - 455 30. MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. A rapid systematic review of the efficacy of face masks and
456 respirators against coronaviruses and other respiratory transmissible viruses for the
457 community, healthcare workers and sick patients. *Int J Nurs Stud* **2020**; 108:0–5.
 - 458 31. Brainard JS, Jones N, Lake I, Hooper L, Hunter P. Facemasks and similar barriers to
459 prevent respiratory illness such as COVID-19: A rapid systematic review. **2020**;

- 460 32. Chan JF-WW, Yuan S, Zhang AJ, et al. Surgical mask partition reduces the risk of non-
461 contact transmission in a golden Syrian hamster model for Coronavirus Disease 2019
462 (COVID-19). *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; Available at: [https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-](https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa644/5848814)
463 [article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa644/5848814](https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa644/5848814). Accessed 11 August 2020.
- 464 33. Mueller A, Eden M, Oakes J, Bellini C, Fernandez L. Quantitative Method for
465 Comparative Assessment of Particle Removal Efficiency of Fabric Masks as Alternatives
466 to Standard Surgical Masks for PPE. *Matter* **2020**; Available at:
467 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matt.2020.07.006>.
- 468 34. Axios, Ipsos. Axios/Ipsos Poll Wave 14. **2020**; Available at: [https://www.ipsos.com/en-](https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/news-polls/axios-ipsos-coronavirus-index)
469 [us/news-polls/axios-ipsos-coronavirus-index](https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/news-polls/axios-ipsos-coronavirus-index).
- 470 35. Betsch C, Korn L, Sprengholz P, et al. Social and behavioral consequences of mask
471 policies during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **2020**; 117:21851–
472 21853.
- 473 36. Haischer MH, Beilfuss R, Rose Hart M, et al. Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and
474 location-related differences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv* **2020**;
475 :2020.07.13.20152736. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.13.20152736>.
- 476 37. Managing Investigations During an Outbreak | CDC. Available at:
477 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-plan/outbreaks.html)
478 [plan/outbreaks.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-plan/outbreaks.html). Accessed 11 August 2020.
- 479 38. Patel M, Lee AD, Clemmons NS, et al. National Update on Measles Cases and Outbreaks
480 — United States, January 1–October 1, 2019. Available at:
481 <https://www.who.int/immunization/policy/>.
- 482 39. Liu Y, Gayle AA, Wilder-Smith A, Rocklöv J. The reproductive number of COVID-19 is
483 higher compared to SARS coronavirus. *J Travel Med* **2020**; 27:1–4.
- 484 40. Davies NG, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, et al. Effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions
485 on COVID-19 cases, deaths, and demand for hospital services in the UK: a modelling
486 study. *Lancet Public Heal* **2020**; :e375–e385.
- 487 41. Endo A, Abbott S, Kucharski AJ, Funk S. Estimating the overdispersion in COVID-19
488 transmission using outbreak sizes outside China. **2020**; :1–13.
- 489 42. MIDAS Network. COVID-19 parameter estimates. Available at:
490 [https://github.com/midas-network/COVID-](https://github.com/midas-network/COVID-19/tree/master/parameter_estimates/2019_novel_coronavirus)
491 [19/tree/master/parameter_estimates/2019_novel_coronavirus](https://github.com/midas-network/COVID-19/tree/master/parameter_estimates/2019_novel_coronavirus). Accessed 11 August 2020.
- 492 43. Lau MS, Grenfell B, Nelson K, Lopman B. Characterizing super-spreading events and
493 age-specific infectivity of COVID-19 transmission in Georgia, USA. *medRxiv* **2020**;
494 :2020.06.20.20130476. Available at:
495 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.20.20130476v2%0Ahttps://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.20.20130476v2.abstract>.
- 496 44. Szablewski CM, Chang KT, Brown MM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission and Infection
497 Among Attendees of an Overnight Camp - Georgia, June 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*
498 **2020**; 69:1023–1025. Available at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32759921>.
- 499 45. James A, Eagle L, Phillips C, et al. High COVID-19 Attack Rate Among Attendees at
500 Events at a Church — Arkansas, March 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2020**; 69:632–635.
- 501 46. County S, Hamner L, Dubbel P, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 Attack Rate Following
502 Exposure at a Choir Practice. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2020**; 69:606–610. Available at:
503 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6919e6.htm>.
- 504 47. City of San Diego. Operation Shelter to Home. 2020. Available at:
505

- 506 <https://www.sandiego.gov/coronavirus/sheltertohome>. Accessed 21 August 2020.
- 507 48. Courtemanche C, Garuccio J, Le A, Pinkston J, Yelowitz A. Strong Social Distancing
508 Measures In The United States Reduced The COVID-19 Growth Rate. *Health Aff* **2020**;
509 39:1237–1246.
- 510 49. Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, et al. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing
511 on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *Lancet*
512 *Public Heal* **2020**; 5:e261–e270.
- 513 50. Jarvis CI, Van Zandvoort K, Gimma A, et al. Quantifying the impact of physical distance
514 measures on the transmission of COVID-19 in the UK. *BMC Med* **2020**; 18:1–10.
- 515 51. Furukawa NW, Furukawa NW, Brooks JT, Sobel J. Evidence Supporting Transmission of
516 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 while Presymptomatic or
517 Asymptomatic. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**; 26:E1–E6.
- 518 52. Arons MM, Hatfield KM, Reddy SC, et al. Presymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections and
519 transmission in a skilled nursing facility. *N Engl J Med* **2020**; 382:2081–2090.
- 520 53. Tindale LC, Stockdale JE, Coombe M, et al. Evidence for transmission of COVID-19
521 prior to symptom onset. *Elife* **2020**; 9:1–34.
- 522 54. Casey M, Griffin J, McAloon CG, et al. Estimating pre-symptomatic transmission of
523 COVID-19: a secondary analysis using published data. *medRxiv* **2020**;
524 :2020.05.08.20094870. Available at:
525 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.05.08.20094870>.
- 526 55. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid
527 dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* (80-) **2020**; 368:489–493.
- 528 56. Arima Y, Kutsuna S, Shimada T, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
529 Infection among Returnees to Japan from Wuhan, China, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**;
530 26:1596–1600. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2001899>. Accessed 11 August
531 2020.
- 532 57. Bullard J, Dust K, Funk D, et al. Predicting infectious SARS-CoV-2 from diagnostic
533 samples. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; Available at: [https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-](https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa638/5842165)
534 [article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa638/5842165](https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa638/5842165). Accessed 11 August 2020.
- 535 58. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of
536 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med* **2020**;
- 537 59. Chang D, Mo G, Yuan X, et al. Time Kinetics of Viral Clearance and Resolution of
538 Symptoms in Novel Coronavirus Infection. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* **2020**; 201:1150–
539 1152.
- 540 60. Chen Y, Wang A, Yi B, et al. Epidemiological characteristics of infection in COVID-19
541 close contacts in Ningbo city. *Chinese J Epidemiol* **2020**; 41:667–671.
- 542 61. Davies NG, Klepac P, Liu Y, Prem K, Jit M, Eggo RM. Age-dependent effects in the
543 transmission and control of COVID-19 epidemics. *medRxiv* **2020**;
- 544 62. King County Department of Public Health. Daily COVID-19 outbreak summary - King
545 County. 2020. Available at: [https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/health/covid-19/data/daily-](https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/health/covid-19/data/daily-summary.aspx)
546 [summary.aspx](https://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/health/covid-19/data/daily-summary.aspx). Accessed 13 August 2020.
- 547 63. City of Boston. COVID-19 Case Tracker. 2020. Available at:
548 [https://dashboard.cityofboston.gov/t/Guest_Access_Enabled/views/COVID-](https://dashboard.cityofboston.gov/t/Guest_Access_Enabled/views/COVID-19/Dashboard1?showAppBanner=false&:display_count=n&:showVizHome=n&:origin=viz_share_link&:isGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&:embed=y)
549 [19/Dashboard1?showAppBanner=false&:display_count=n&:showVizHome=n&:origin=](https://dashboard.cityofboston.gov/t/Guest_Access_Enabled/views/COVID-19/Dashboard1?showAppBanner=false&:display_count=n&:showVizHome=n&:origin=viz_share_link&:isGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&:embed=y)
550 [viz_share_link&:isGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&:embed=y](https://dashboard.cityofboston.gov/t/Guest_Access_Enabled/views/COVID-19/Dashboard1?showAppBanner=false&:display_count=n&:showVizHome=n&:origin=viz_share_link&:isGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&:embed=y). Accessed 13 August 2020.
- 551 64. San Francisco Department of Public Health. COVID-19 Cases Summarized by Date,

552 Transmission and Case Disposition - City and County of San Francisco. 2020. Available
553 at: [https://data.sfgov.org/COVID-19/COVID-19-Cases-Summarized-by-Date-](https://data.sfgov.org/COVID-19/COVID-19-Cases-Summarized-by-Date-Transmission-and/tvq9-ec9w)
554 Transmission-and/tvq9-ec9w. Accessed 13 August 2020.

555
556

557 **Tables and Figures**

558

559 **Table 1. Microsimulation input parameters based on observed outbreak data from**
 560 **homeless shelters in Seattle, Boston and San Francisco**

Parameter	Base case value	Range in sensitivity analysis*	References
<i>Natural history</i>			
Mean duration of latent infection period, days	3	-	[22]
Mean duration of early infectious stage (subclinical/clinical), days	2.3	-	[22]
Mean duration of late infectious stage (subclinical/clinical), days	8	-	[22,23,57,59]
Relative infectiousness of subclinical infection to clinical infection	1	0.5–1	[55,58,60]
Relative infectiousness of early infectious stage to late infectious stage	2	1–3	[22,54]
Probability of developing clinical symptoms	Age-dependent (see Supplementary Table 2)	-	[61]
Background infection rate in community outside shelter, infections/1,000,000 person-days	Shelter-specific (see Supplementary Material)	0–439	[62–64]
Basic reproduction number, R_0	Variable	1.5–6.2	Estimated
<i>Intervention</i>			
Symptom screening			
Sensitivity	0.4	0.3–0.5	Assumed based on [12]
Specificity	0.9	0.8–0.9	Assumed
Compliance of symptomatic individuals with PCR testing, %	80	50–100	Assumed
PCR testing			
Sensitivity	0.75	0.6–0.9	[18–21]
Specificity	1	0.95–1	[19,21]
Frequency	Twice weekly	Daily–Monthly	[15–17]
Compliance, %	80	50–100	Assumed
Masks			
Effectiveness (reduction in transmission)	30	10–50	[28–33]
Compliance, %	80	50–100	Assumed

561 * In the sensitivity analysis, each intervention strategy was simulated with all combinations of the minimum and
 562 maximum values of the ranges for the indicated parameters to generate the uncertainty intervals around the
 563 probability of averting an outbreak in Table 2.

564 See Supplementary Table 5 for complete list of all parameters used in model calibration and intervention

565 simulations.
566

Table 2. Probability of averting an outbreak* over a 30-day period in a generalized homeless shelter† with simulated infection control strategies

Infection control strategy‡	Probability of averting an outbreak (UI)§			
	$R_0 = 1.5$ (low-risk)	$R_0 = 2.9$ (Seattle)	$R_0 = 3.9$ (Boston)	$R_0 = 6.2$ (San Francisco)
1) Symptom screening	0.33 (0.22–0.61)	0.11 (0.07–0.35)	0.07 (0.03–0.24)	0.03 (0.01–0.13)
2) Routine twice-weekly PCR testing	0.52 (0.38–0.81)	0.27 (0.14–0.56)	0.18 (0.08–0.42)	0.04 (0.02–0.26)
3) Universal mask wearing	0.47 (0.24–0.88)	0.20 (0.08–0.64)	0.11 (0.04–0.52)	0.06 (0.01–0.32)
4) Relocation of high-risk individuals	0.33 (0.22–0.63)	0.10 (0.07–0.35)	0.06 (0.04–0.24)	0.03 (0.01–0.13)
5) Routine twice-weekly PCR testing of staff only	0.40 (0.29–0.69)	0.16 (0.08–0.36)	0.10 (0.04–0.26)	0.03 (0.01–0.13)
6) Combination strategy	0.68 (0.44–0.95)	0.40 (0.16–0.83)	0.28 (0.09–0.73)	0.08 (0.03–0.53)

UI = uncertainty interval; R_0 = basic reproduction number.

* Outbreak defined as ≥ 3 infections originating within the shelter in any 14-day period.

† Generalized homeless shelter defined as 250 residents and 50 staff with a background infection rate estimated from recent data ($\sim 120/1,000,000$ person-days).

‡ All strategies included daily symptom screening.

§ UI generated from parameter sensitivity analysis (see text and Table 1).

See Supplementary Table 9 and Figure 1 for results for other background infection rates, and Supplementary Table 10 for reductions in infections and symptomatic cases. See Supplementary Figures 6–8 for the outbreak size distributions for the different R_0 values.




Figure 1. Impact of incidence of infection in the community on the probability of averting an outbreak in a generalized homeless shelter under different intervention strategies for different R_0 values. The probability of averting an outbreak (≥ 3 infections over any 14-day period) in a generalized homeless shelter of 250 residents and 50 staff over 30 days was estimated for different infection incidences in the community using the microsimulation model described in the text. SF = San Francisco.




Figure 2. Predicted number of COVID-19 infections over a 30-day period in a generalized homeless shelter under different infection control strategies for different R_0 values. Solid lines show mean daily numbers of new infections and shaded areas show minimum and maximum daily numbers over 1000 simulations. Background infection rate in the community outside the shelter of approximately 120 infections/1,000,000 person-days. SF = San Francisco.




Figure 3. Impact of varying the frequency of routine PCR testing of residents and staff on the probability of averting an outbreak in a generalized homeless shelter for different R_0 values. The probability of averting an outbreak (≥ 3 infections over any 14-day period) over 30 days was estimated for different frequencies of routine PCR testing from daily (1 day between tests) to monthly (30 days between tests). Background infection rate in the local community of approximately 120 infections/1,000,000 person-days. SF = San Francisco.