

## **SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence among First Responders in the District of Columbia, May – July 2020**

Jacqueline Reuben<sup>1</sup>, Adrienne Sherman<sup>1,2</sup>, James A. Ellison<sup>3</sup>, Jayleen K. L. Gunn<sup>3,4</sup>, Anthony Tran<sup>5</sup>, Matthew McCarroll<sup>5</sup>, Pushker Raj<sup>5</sup>, Patricia Lloyd<sup>1</sup>, Preetha Iyengar<sup>1</sup>, Fern Johnson-Clarke<sup>1</sup>, John Davies-Cole<sup>1</sup>, LaQuandra Nesbitt<sup>1</sup>

### **Affiliations**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Health, Government of the District of Columbia, 899 North Capitol Street NE, Washington, DC 20002, USA

<sup>2</sup> Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists Applied Epidemiology Fellowship Program, CSTE, 2635 Century Parkway NE, Suite 700, Atlanta, GA 30345

<sup>3</sup> COVID-19 Response Team, 1600 Clifton RD NE, Mailstop H23-4, Atlanta, GA 30329, USA

<sup>4</sup> Commissioned Corps Activity, United States Public Health Service, 1600 Clifton RD NE, Atlanta, GA 30329, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Forensic Science, Public Health Laboratory, Government of the District of Columbia, 401 E Street SW, Washington, DC 20024, USA

**Correspondence for DC Health:** Jacqueline Reuben, DC Health, [Jacqueline.Reuben@dc.gov](mailto:Jacqueline.Reuben@dc.gov)

**Correspondence for CDC:** James Ellison, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, [JEllison@cdc.gov](mailto:JEllison@cdc.gov)

### **Summary**

Understanding occupational exposure to and infection with SARS-CoV-2 among first responders is important for workforce planning and emergency preparedness and response. Seroprevalence among first responders (3.5%; 11/310) who participated in a survey conducted by the District of Columbia Department of Health (DC Health) from May 28 – July 15 was 48% lower than reported in the DC community (6.7%; 876/12990). The lower prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 among first responders highlights the importance of continuous training on and reinforcement of the proper use of personal protective equipment (PPE). Proper use of PPE is a critical mitigation strategy to reduce transmission among and between first responders and the community.

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

27 **Abstract**

28 First responders are at increased risk of occupational exposure to SARS-CoV-2 while providing frontline support to  
29 communities during the COVID-19 pandemic. In the District of Columbia (DC), first responders were among the first  
30 people exposed to and infected with SARS-CoV-2, with over 200 first responders diagnosed with COVID-19 by May 15,  
31 2020. From June – July 2020, DC Health conducted a serologic survey to estimate SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and assess  
32 risk factors and occupational exposures among a convenience sample of first responders in DC. Of the 310 first responders  
33 tested, 3.5% (n = 11) had anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. Seropositivity varied by occupation, with 4.8% (3/62) of  
34 firefighters; 3.6% (8/220) of police officers; and no paramedics (0/10) or administration and support staff (0/18) testing  
35 positive. Type and consistency of personal protective equipment (PPE) use also varied: all paramedics (n=10) reported  
36 wearing a N95 respirator all or most of the time, compared to 83.3% of firefighters, 38.8% of police officers, and 23.5% of  
37 administration and support staff (p<0.001). All paramedics reported wearing gloves all or most of the time, compared to  
38 80.0% of firefighters, 27.8% of administration and support staff, and 24.3% of police (p<0.001). The relatively low  
39 seroprevalence among first responders highlights the benefits of continuous training on and reinforcement of the proper use  
40 of PPE while performing job duties to mitigate potential transmission within and between first responders and the  
41 community.

42

43 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence, first responders, occupational health, personal protective equipment usage

## 44 **Background**

45 First responders, including personnel in law enforcement, fire and rescue, and emergency medical response, are on  
46 the frontlines of providing support and medical services to communities during the COVID-19 pandemic and are crucial to  
47 the public health and medical response. This close contact with community members, and with other first responders, places  
48 them at increased risk of occupational exposure to SARS-CoV-2 [1]. Proper use of personal protective equipment (PPE) is  
49 an important layer of defense that first responders have to protect themselves and to prevent the spread of COVID-19  
50 infection [2, 3]. This may be especially true when higher level controls to occupational exposure are not feasible in the  
51 specific work setting or situation. Understanding how first responders utilize available PPE ensures sufficient resources,  
52 training and attention are given to support first responders in safely providing essential services, while mitigating  
53 community spread of COVID-19.

54 Early cases of COVID-19 infection in the District of Columbia (DC) were identified among first responders, with  
55 104 fire and emergency medical services (FEMS) staff and 116 Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) staff diagnosed by  
56 nucleic acid testing between March 7 – May 15, 2020 [4]. It is not known, however, how many first responders have  
57 developed antibodies to SARS-CoV-2, and their use of PPE has not been described. The aims of this paper are to estimate  
58 the prevalence of seropositivity (i.e., presence of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2) and assess self-reported PPE use by  
59 occupation type among first responders in DC.

60

## 61 **Methods**

### 62 *Study Design and Participant Enrollment*

63 DC Health and the DC Department of Forensic Sciences Public Health Laboratory (DFS-PHL) partnered with  
64 Providence Health System, the District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (DC FEMS), and the  
65 Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia (DC MPD) to conduct a cross-sectional study to estimate the  
66 seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 among first responders, and assess risk factors and occupational exposures. Enrollment  
67 took place from May 18 – July 5, 2020. Participating agencies were responsible for recruiting their staff. DC FEMS  
68 distributed a mass email communication to the 1,934 operational members of their workforce informing them of this  
69 initiative and inviting them to participate. To recruit DC MPD staff, the Chief of Police emailed the 4,488 active MPD  
70 employees on four separate occasions to inform staff and encourage all to participate.

71 First responders were defined as any employee, staff, or volunteer working for or contracted by the District to  
72 perform fire safety and rescue, police, or any other function to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. This  
73 included personnel in law enforcement, fire and rescue, and emergency medical response. Only those serving as first  
74 responders in the District were eligible for inclusion. Otherwise eligible persons who reported having a positive COVID-19  
75 diagnostic test within the past 14 days or reported onset of symptoms consistent with COVID-19 in the past seven days of  
76 questionnaire administration were excluded. All participants provided informed consent. This activity was determined to  
77 meet the requirements of public health surveillance as defined in 45 CFR 46.102(l).

78

### 79 *Questionnaire*

80 Prior to serologic testing, participants were provided a link to complete an electronic questionnaire eliciting  
81 information on demographics, potential COVID-19 exposures, PPE use, medical history, and recent symptoms (Appendix  
82 A). Participants were asked to recall PPE use at work (while within 6 feet of a suspected or confirmed case of COVID-19),  
83 potential exposures, and symptom history dating back to March 1, 2020. Questionnaire data were collected and managed  
84 using the secure Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) application. Following completion of the questionnaire,  
85 eligible participants were asked to schedule an appointment for serologic testing at Providence Health System, a local urgent  
86 care facility located in Washington, DC.

87

### 88 *Serologic Testing*

89 Serum specimens were collected by healthcare providers employed by Providence Health System. Samples were centrifuged  
90 within one hour of collection, refrigerated, and transported to the DC DFS-PHL for testing. All testing was completed within  
91 48 hours of specimen receipt. Serologic testing was conducted using the DiaSorin LIAISON® XL assay (DiaSorin Inc.,  
92 Stillwater, MN), a qualitative chemiluminescent assay for determination of immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibodies to the spike  
93 protein (anti-S1 and anti-S2) of SARS-CoV-2. The assay has been determined to be highly sensitive (97%) for specimens  
94 collected over 14 days post positive diagnostic test (DiaSorin IFU) [5]. The assay was used under an Emergency Use  
95 Authorization (EUA) for COVID-19 *in vitro* diagnostics issued by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

96

### 97 *Statistical analysis*

98 The final analytic sample included only those who completed both the questionnaire and serology testing. Descriptive  
99 analyses were performed on the overall sample and reported by serological test result and by occupational group.  
100 Proportions were reported for categorical variables, and differences by seropositivity were tested using 2-tailed  $\chi^2$  tests for  
101 association with significance defined at the 0.05 level. Statistical analyses were performed using SAS software (version 9.4;  
102 SAS Institute).

103

## 104 **Results**

105 Between May 28 – July 15, 2020, a total of 399 eligible first responders completed the online questionnaire, of  
106 whom 310 (77.7%) also completed serology testing. No statistically significant differences were observed between those  
107 who completed the questionnaire only, and those who completed both serology testing and the questionnaire. Among the  
108 310 first responders tested, 3.5% (n = 11) had anti-SARS-COV-2 antibodies (Table 1). Seropositivity varied by self-reported  
109 occupation, with 4.8% (3/62) of firefighters, 3.6% (8/220) of police officers, no (0/10) paramedics, and no (0/18)  
110 administration and support staff testing positive. The mean age of participants was 42.5 years (range: 22–68 years) and  
111 76.5% (n=237) were male. The majority of participants reported identifying as White (53.6%; n=166) or Black/African  
112 American (29.4%; n=91). Nine percent (9%; n=28) identified as Hispanic/Latino. Self-reported Hispanic ethnicity was  
113 significantly associated with seropositivity (p=0.04). Over half of participants (52.9%; n=164) were residents of Maryland.  
114 No persons with SARS-COV-2 antibodies indicated a pre-existing medical condition (Table 1). As shown in Table 2, 64.8%  
115 (n=201) of participants had no prior SARS-CoV-2 test via nasal, throat or saliva sample. Testing behavior varied by  
116 serology test result with 45.5% (n=5) of seropositive participants reporting no previous test, compared to 65.6% (n=196) of  
117 seronegative participants. The most frequently reported symptoms (since March 1, 2020) among those who tested positive  
118 were: headache (72.7%; n=8), cough (63.6%; n=7), fever (54.6%; n=6), chills (54.6%; n=6), sore throat (54.6%; n=6), and  
119 muscle ache (54.6%; n=6). Seropositive first responders reported more frequent contact with patients with COVID-19, with  
120 85.7% (n=6) of seropositive first responders reporting exposure to a known positive, compared to 33.8% (n=49) of  
121 seronegative responders (p<0.01). More seropositive participants reported having a positive household member than  
122 seronegative participants (57.1% vs 4.0%, respectively; p<0.01).

123 The most frequently reported use of any PPE (Table 3) was an N95 respirator, with 49.2% reporting wearing a  
124 respirator all or most of the time, followed by 38.6% (n=112) reporting using gloves all or most of the time. Gown and

125 goggle/face shield use while on duty was lower, with 75.9% (n=221) of participants reporting never or rarely wearing a  
126 gown, and 70.9% (n=197) reporting never or rarely using goggles or a face shield. While there were no statistically  
127 significant differences in PPE use by serology test result, seropositive participants reported more consistent use of a  
128 respirator other than an N95 or surgical mask, with 18.2% (n=2) of seropositive individuals reporting use all or most of the  
129 time, compared to 3.9% (n=10) of seronegative individuals (p=0.07).

130 PPE use varied significantly by occupation (Table 4). All paramedics (100%; n=10), 83.3% (n=50) of firefighters  
131 and 38.8% (n=80) of police officers indicated that they wore an N95 respirator all or most of the time (p<0.01). Firefighters  
132 and paramedics reported more consistent gown use, with 61.7% (n=37) of firefighters and 50% (n=5) of paramedics  
133 reporting wearing a gown all or most of the time, compared to 2.1% (n=4) of police officers (p<0.01). Paramedics and  
134 firefighters reported more consistent glove use, with 100% (n=10) of paramedics and 80% (n=48) of firefighters reporting  
135 use all or most of the time, compared to 24.3% (n=49) of police officers. Goggle/face shield use varied across occupation,  
136 with 100% (n=10) of paramedics, 75% (n=45) of firefighters and only 4.2% (n=8) of police officers indicating they wore  
137 goggles/face shields all or most of the time.

138

## 139 **Discussion**

140 In a convenience sample of 310 first responders in the District, 3.5% (n=11) had detectable levels of IgG SARS-  
141 CoV-2 antibodies at the time of serologic testing. Initial estimates among U.S. healthcare personnel have suggested that  
142 frontline healthcare workers (HCWs) account for 10–20% of all diagnoses [6]. These reports, however, did not differentiate  
143 by specific occupation type or potential source of exposure. We found that seroprevalence among first responders in DC  
144 (3.5%) was 48% lower than the seroprevalence in the general population (6.7%) tested by the DC PHL during this time  
145 period. The seropositivity observed in this sample of first responders was comparable to the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2  
146 IgG antibodies observed in a sample of 203 firefighters/paramedics in South Florida (3.9%) [7]. No prior studies, however,  
147 have reported risk among law enforcement, although they may interface closely with communities where ongoing  
148 transmission from asymptomatic individuals has been documented [8].

149 At the time of survey, FEMS PPE policies required members to wear a N95 respirator, gloves, and face shield for  
150 every patient encounter within six feet, and an N95 respirator, gloves, face shield, gown, bouffant head covering, and shoe  
151 coverings when encountering any patient with confirmed or suspected COVID-19. MPD PPE policies required all members  
152 to wear a cloth or surgical mask while on duty, and a minimum of an N95 respirator and gloves when encountering any

153 patient with confirmed or suspected COVID-19 or responding to any medical emergency call. Both FEMS and MPD  
154 reported having no shortages of PPE supplies during this time. Per DC FEMS and DC MPD protocols, all occupations  
155 should consistently wear PPE that is appropriate for the context of their exposures. CDC guidelines for first responders  
156 recommend at minimum use of an N95 respirator or face mask when interacting with a suspected or confirmed patient with  
157 COVID-19 [1]. Consistent use of N95 respirators and surgical masks among this sample of first responders may account for  
158 the relatively low seropositivity compared to the general population. Use of certain PPE varied by occupation, as different  
159 types of PPE may be necessary to perform required duties and guidance on use varies by occupation. This survey found that  
160 among police officers, less than half reported wearing an N95 respirator all or most of the time, and less than 25% reported  
161 wearing gloves all or most of the time while at work and within six feet of a person with suspected or confirmed COVID-19.  
162 A study of EMS encounters with patients with COVID-19 found that only 0.4% of providers tested positive during the 14  
163 days following an encounter when 67% of EMS used full PPE including mask, eye protection, gown, and gloves [9]. These  
164 results suggest that continual training on the importance of consistent and proper PPE use may be needed among first  
165 responders to ensure protocols continue to be followed correctly over time.

166 This study was limited by its non-random convenience-based sampling strategy. Given the low response rate and  
167 small sample size, particularly among paramedics, these estimates may not be generalizable to the entire first responder  
168 workforce in DC. Retrospective self-report of exposures and PPE use is subject to bias, and PPE availability was not  
169 assessed through the questionnaire. The study population was limited to active members of the DC MPD and FEMS  
170 workforces and excluded any individuals with suspected active COVID-19 infection as indicated by a positive PCR test in  
171 the past 14 days or onset of COVID-like symptoms in the past seven days.

172 Despite these limitations, to our knowledge this is one of the first SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence surveys conducted  
173 specifically among a cohort of first responders including law enforcement, thus providing valuable information to the  
174 agencies responding to the pandemic in the District of Columbia and adding to the limited literature surrounding PPE use  
175 and SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence in this population. In recognition of the important role that face coverings play in reducing  
176 the spread of COVID-19, DC Mayor Bowser issued Mayor's Order 2020-080 on July 22, 2020, mandating face masks  
177 or face coverings to be worn outside the home by all individuals in the District. This mandate requires not only DC  
178 residents, but also visitors and employees (inclusive of first responders) working in the District to wear a face covering at all  
179 times when not at home.

180

181 **Conclusion**

182 Estimating the seroprevalence of COVID-19 among first responders helps inform adequate emergency preparedness  
183 and workforce safety. First responders are at high risk for acquiring infections during novel disease outbreaks. The relatively  
184 high proportion of participants reporting using N95 respirators or surgical face masks may help explain the lower  
185 seropositivity despite the high risk of occupational exposure. While recommended PPE use in CDC guidelines varies by  
186 occupation and setting, the significant differences in PPE use across occupation types in this study suggests the need to  
187 assess consistent use of PPE in the context of an ongoing pandemic [1]. Additional training on the importance of wearing  
188 appropriate PPE while performing job duties may be needed to ensure workforce safety and mitigate the spread of COVID-  
189 19.

190  
191 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank the invaluable contributions and assistance of members of the CDC  
192 EOC and DC Health COVID-19 response teams, and laboratorians at the DC DFS-PHL who have worked tirelessly to  
193 ensure prompt and accurate test results, as well as Dr. Senai Medhani, Dr. Shadi Soufi and their clinical team at Providence  
194 Health System for their support and assistance in the collection of serum specimens.

195  
196 **Conflicts of Interest:** CDC authors declare no conflicts of interest.

197  
198 **Funding:** This report was supported in part by an appointment to the Applied Epidemiology Fellowship Program  
199 administered by the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists (CSTE) and funded by the Centers for Disease Control  
200 and Prevention (CDC) Cooperative Agreement Number 1NU38OT000297-01-00.

201  
202 **Disclaimer:** Use of trade names and commercial sources are for identification only and do not imply endorsement by the  
203 US Department of Health and Human Services nor the Government of the District of Columbia. The findings and  
204 conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of their institutions.

205  
206 **References:**

207 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim Recommendations for Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Systems  
208 and 911 Public Safety Answering Points/Emergency Communication Centers (PSAP/ECCS) in the United States During the



- 209 Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Pandemic. In: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US). Centers for Disease  
210 Control and Prevention (US). <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/guidance-for-ems.html>
- 211 2. World Health Organization. Rational use of personal protective equipment (PPE) for coronavirus disease (COVID-19):  
212 interim guidance, 19 March 2020: World Health Organization, **2020**.
- 213 3. Murphy DL, Barnard LM, Drucker CJ, et al. Occupational exposures and programmatic response to COVID-19  
214 pandemic: an emergency medical services experience. *Emerg Med J* **2020**; 37(11); 707-714.
- 215 4. Health D. COVID-19 surveillance response data. Available at: <https://coronavirus.dc.gov/data>. Accessed 8/27/2020.
- 216 5. Liu W, Liu L, Kou G, et al. Evaluation of Nucleocapsid and Spike Protein-Based Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assays  
217 for Detecting Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. *Journal of clinical microbiology* **2020**; 58:e00461-20.
- 218 6. Burrer SL, de Perio MA, Hughes MM, et al. Characteristics of health care personnel with COVID-19—United States,  
219 February 12–April 9, 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* **2020**; 69:477-81.
- 220 7. Caban-Martinez AJ, Schaefer-Solle N, Santiago K, et al. Epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among  
221 firefighters/paramedics of a US fire department: a cross-sectional study. *Occupational and environmental medicine* **2020**;  
222 10.1136/oemed-2020-106676.
- 223 8. Bai Y, Yao L, Wei T, et al. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA* **2020**; 323:1406-7.
- 224 9. Murphy DL, Barnard LM, Drucker CJ, et al. Occupational Exposures and Programmatic Response to COVID-19  
225 Pandemic: An Emergency Medical Services Experience. *medRxiv* **2020**:2020.05.22.20110718.
- 226 **Supplemental Information:**
- 227 <https://coronavirus.dc.gov/maskorder>
- 228 <https://www.acludc.org/en/letter-mayor-bowser-requesting-mandatory-use-face-masks-all-dc-police-officers>
- 229 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/organizations/firefighter-EMS.html>
- 230 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/guidance-law-enforcement.html>
- 231 <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/hierarchy/default.html>

232 [https://www.diasorin.com/sites/default/files/allegati/liaisonr\\_sars-cov-2\\_s1s2\\_igg\\_brochure.pdf.pdf](https://www.diasorin.com/sites/default/files/allegati/liaisonr_sars-cov-2_s1s2_igg_brochure.pdf.pdf)

233

234 Table 1: Characteristics of first responders who obtained testing for COVID-19 antibodies between May 28 – July 15, 2020  
 235 in Washington DC.  
 236

<b>Demographics</b>	Antibody Negative N (%) <sup>a</sup> or Mean (SD)	Antibody Positive N (%) <sup>a</sup> or Mean (SD)	Total N (%) <sup>a</sup> or Mean (SD)
Total	299	11	310
Age, years (SD)	42.60 (8.96)	41.09 (12.21)	42.55 (9.07)
Sex at Birth			
Female	69 (23.08)	4 (36.36)	73 (23.55)
Male	230 (76.92)	7 (63.64)	237 (76.45)
Race			
White	162 (54.18)	4 (36.36)	166 (53.55)
Black/African American	87 (29.10)	4 (36.36)	91 (29.35)
Asian	11 (3.68)	0 (0.0)	11 (3.55)
American Indian/Alaska Native	2 (0.67)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.65)
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	2 (0.67)	1 (9.09)	3 (0.97)
Other/Multi-racial	20 (6.69)	2 (18.18)	22 (7.10)
Declined to Answer	15 (5.02)	0 (0.0)	15 (4.84)
Ethnicity <sup>*</sup>			
Hispanic/Latino	25 (8.80)	3 (27.27)	28 (9.49)
Non-Hispanic/Non-Latino	259 (91.20)	8 (72.73)	267 (90.51)
State of Residence			
District of Columbia	84 (28.09)	3 (27.27)	87 (28.06)
Maryland	158 (52.84)	6 (54.55)	164 (52.90)
Virginia	52 (17.39)	1 (9.09)	53 (17.10)
Other	5 (1.67)	1 (9.09)	6 (1.94)
Occupation			
Police Office	212 (70.90)	8 (72.73)	220 (70.97)
Firefighter	59 (19.73)	3 (27.27)	62 (20.00)
Paramedic	10 (3.34)	0 (0.0)	10 (3.23)
Other <sup>b</sup>	18 (6.02)	0 (0.0)	18 (5.81)

237 <sup>\*</sup> p<0.05

238 <sup>a</sup> Numbers may not sum to total due to missing values. Percentages are column percentages.

239 <sup>b</sup> Other: administration and support staff

<b>Self-Reported Medical History</b>	<b>Negative N (%)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Positive N (%)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Total N (%)<sup>a</sup></b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>310</b>
<b>Diabetes</b>			
Yes	15 (5.15)	0 (0.0)	15 (4.97)
No	276 (94.85)	11 (100.0)	287 (95.03)
<b>Hypertension</b>			
Yes	43 (14.78)	0 (0.0)	43 (14.24)
No	248 (85.22)	11 (100.0)	259 (85.76)
<b>Chronic Heart Disease</b>			
Yes	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
No	287 (100.0)	11 (100.0)	298 (100.0)
<b>Chronic Kidney Disease</b>			
Yes	2 (0.69)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.67)
No	287 (99.31)	11 (100.0)	298 (99.33)
<b>Chronic Liver Disease</b>			
Yes	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
No	289 (100.0)	11 (100.0)	300 (100.0)
<b>Asthma</b>			
Yes	23 (8.01)	0 (0.0)	23 (7.72)
No	264 (91.99)	11 (100.0)	275 (92.28)
<b>COPD<sup>c</sup></b>			
Yes	2 (0.69)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.67)
No	286 (99.31)	11 (100.0)	297 (99.33)
<b>Immunosuppressed Condition</b>			
Yes	4 (1.38)	0 (0.0)	4 (1.33)
No	285 (98.62)	11 (100.0)	296 (98.67)

240 COPD = Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

241 <sup>a</sup> Numbers may not sum to total due to missing values. Percentages are column percentages.

242 <sup>b</sup> Other: administration and support staff

243

244 Table 2: COVID-19 testing behavior, symptoms experienced, and exposure related information of first responders between  
 245 May 28 – July 15, 2020 in Washington DC.  
 246

	Negative N (%) <sup>a</sup>	Positive N (%) <sup>a</sup>	Total N (%) <sup>a</sup>
Total	299	11	310
<hr/>			
Number of Times Previously Tested			
0	196 (65.55)	5 (45.45)	201 (64.84)
≥ 1	103 (34.45)	6 (54.55)	109 (35.16)
<hr/>			
Fever*			
Yes	40 (14.8)	6 (60.00)	46 (15.75)
No	242 (85.82)	4 (40.40)	246 (84.25)
<hr/>			
Chills*			
Yes	32 (11.43)	6 (54.55)	38 (13.06)
No	248 (88.57)	5 (45.45)	253 (86.94)
<hr/>			
Cough*			
Yes	57 (20.14)	7 (63.64)	64 (21.77)
No	226 (79.86)	4 (36.36)	230 (78.23)
<hr/>			
Sore Throat*			
Yes	57 (20.28)	6 (54.55)	63 (21.58)
No	224 (79.72)	5 (45.45)	229 (78.42)
<hr/>			
Shortness of Breath*			
Yes	23 (8.10)	5 (45.45)	28 (9.49)
No	261 (91.90)	6 (54.55)	267 (90.51)
<hr/>			
Vomiting			
Yes	6 (2.17)	0 (0.00)	6 (2.10)
No	270 (97.83)	10 (100.00)	280 (97.90)
<hr/>			
Diarrhea			
Yes	47 (16.85)	3 (27.27)	50 (17.24)
No	232 (81.15)	8 (72.73)	240 (82.76)
<hr/>			
Muscle Aches*			
Yes	61 (21.79)	6 (54.55)	67 (23.02)
No	219 (78.21)	5 (45.45)	224 (76.98)
<hr/>			
Loss of Smell or Taste*			
Yes	6 (1.17)	2 (20.00)	8 (2.79)
No	271 (97.83)	8 (80.00)	279 (97.21)
<hr/>			
Headache*			
Yes	75 (26.60)	8 (72.73)	83 (28.33)
No	207 (73.40)	3 (27.27)	210 (71.67)

<hr/>			
Positive Coworker			
Yes	97 (52.15)	6 (75.00)	103 (53.09)
No	89 (47.85)	2 (25.00)	91 (46.91)
<hr/>			
Positive Household Member <sup>*</sup>			
Yes	10 (3.95)	4 (36.36)	14 (5.30)
No	243 (96.05)	7 (63.67)	250 (94.70)
<hr/>			
Other Known Positive Individuals <sup>*</sup>			
Yes	49 (33.79)	6 (85.71)	55 (36.18)
No	96 (66.21)	1 (14.29)	97 (63.82)
<hr/>			

247 \*p<0.01

248 <sup>a</sup> Numbers may not sum to total due to missing values. Percentages are column percentages.

249 Table 3: Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) use among first responders by serology outcome between May 28 – July 15,  
250 2020 in Washington DC.

	Negative N (%) <sup>a</sup>	Positive N (%) <sup>a</sup>	Total N (%) <sup>a</sup>
Total	299	11	310
<b>N95 Respirator</b>			
All/most of the time	139 (49.12)	5 (50.00)	144 (49.15)
Sometimes	65 (22.97)	2 (20.00)	67 (22.87)
Rarely/Never	79 (27.92)	3 (30.00)	82 (27.99)
<b>Surgical Mask</b>			
All/most of the time	99 (36.00)	4 (36.36)	103 (36.01)
Sometimes	70 (25.45)	2 (18.18)	72 (25.17)
Rarely/Never	106 (38.55)	5 (45.45)	111 (38.81)
<b>Goggles/Face Shield</b>			
All/most of the time	61 (22.85)	2 (18.18)	63 (22.66)
Sometimes	18 (6.74)	0 (0.00)	18 (6.47)
Rarely/Never	188 (70.41)	9 (81.82)	197 (70.86)
<b>Gloves</b>			
All/most of the time	108 (38.71)	4 (36.36)	112 (38.62)
Sometimes	80 (28.67)	4 (36.36)	84 (28.97)
Rarely/Never	91 (32.62)	3 (27.27)	94 (32.41)
<b>Gown</b>			
All/most of the time	44 (16.48)	2 (18.18)	46 (16.55)
Sometimes	21 (7.87)	0 (0.0)	21 (7.55)
Rarely/Never	202 (75.66)	9 (81.82)	211 (75.90)

<sup>a</sup> Numbers may not sum to total due to missing values. Percentages are column percentages.

251

252 Table 4: Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) by occupation type between May 28 – July 15, 2020 in Washington DC.

	Police Officer N (%) <sup>a</sup>	Firefighter N (%) <sup>a</sup>	Paramedic N (%) <sup>a</sup>	Other N (%) <sup>a, b</sup>	Total N (%) <sup>a</sup>
Total	220	62	10	18	310
<b>N95 Respirator*</b>					
All/most of the time	80 (38.83)	50 (83.33)	10 (100.0)	4 (23.53)	144 (49.15)
Sometimes	60 (29.13)	3 (5.00)	0 (0.0)	4 (23.53)	67 (22.87)
Rarely/Never	66 (32.04)	7 (11.67)	0 (0.0)	9 (52.94)	82 (27.99)
<b>Surgical Mask*</b>					
All/most of the time	70 (34.83)	21 (36.21)	2 (22.22)	10 (55.56)	103 (36.01)
Sometimes	64 (31.84)	5 (8.62)	0 (0.00)	3 (16.67)	72 (25.17)
Rarely/Never	67 (33.33)	32 (55.17)	7 (77.78)	5 (27.78)	111 (38.81)
<b>Goggles/Face Shield*</b>					
All/most of the time	8 (4.19)	45 (75.00)	10 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	63 (22.66)
Sometimes	14 (7.33)	4 (6.67)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	18 (6.47)
Rarely/Never	169 (88.48)	11 (18.33)	0 (0.0)	17 (100.0)	197 (70.86)
<b>Gloves*</b>					
All/most of the time	49 (24.26)	48 (80.00)	10 (100.0)	5 (27.78)	112 (38.62)
Sometimes	73 (36.14)	5 (8.33)	0 (0.0)	6 (33.33)	84 (28.97)
Rarely/Never	80 (39.60)	7 (11.67)	0 (0.0)	7 (38.89)	94 (32.41)
<b>Gown*</b>					
All/most of the time	4 (2.08)	37 (61.67)	5 (50.00)	0 (0.0)	46 (16.55)
Sometimes	10 (5.21)	7 (11.67)	4 (40.00)	0 (0.0)	21 (7.55)
Rarely/Never	178 (92.17)	16 (26.67)	1 (10.00)	16 (100.0)	211 (75.90)

253 \*p<0.001

254 <sup>a</sup> Numbers may not sum to total due to missing values. Percentages are column percentages.

255 <sup>b</sup> Other: administration and support staff