

1 **High-resolution within-sewer SARS-CoV-2 surveillance facilitates informed intervention**

2 Katelyn Reeves¹, Jennifer Liebig², Antonio Feula², Tassa Saldi², Erika Lasda², William Johnson¹, Jacob
3 Lilienfeld¹, Juniper Maggi¹, Kevin Pulley¹, Paul J. Wilkerson¹, Breanna Real¹, Gordon Zak¹, Jack Davis²,
4 Morgan Fink², Patrick Gonzalez², Cole Hager², Christopher Ozeroff², Kimngan Tat², Michaela Alkire¹,
5 Claire Butler¹, Elle Coe¹, Jessica Darby¹, Nicholas Freeman¹, Heidi Heuer¹, Jeffery R. Jones¹, Madeline
6 Karr¹, Sara Key¹, Kiersten Maxwell¹, Lauren Nelson¹, Emily Saldana¹, Rachel Shea¹, Lewis Salveson¹,
7 Kate Tomlinson¹, Jorge Vargas-Barriga¹, Bailey Vigil¹, Gloria Brisson³, Roy Parker², Leslie A.
8 Leinwand^{2,4}, Kristen Bjorkman², & Cresten Mansfeldt^{1*}

- 9 1. University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Civil, Environmental, and Architectural
10 Engineering, Environmental Engineering Program, 1111 Engineering Drive, Boulder, CO 80309
11 2. University of Colorado Boulder, BioFrontiers Institute, 3415 Colorado Avenue, Boulder, CO
12 80303
13 3. University of Colorado Boulder, Medical Services, 1900 Wardenburg Drive, Boulder, CO 80309
14 4. University of Colorado Boulder, Department of Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology,
15 1945 Colorado Ave, Boulder, CO 80309

16 *Corresponding author, cresten.mansfeldt@colorado.edu


17 **Abstract.** To assist in the COVID-19 public health guidance on a college campus, daily composite
18 wastewater samples were withdrawn at 20 manhole locations across the University of Colorado Boulder
19 campus. Low-cost autosamplers were fabricated in-house to enable an economical approach to this
20 distributed study. These sample stations operated from August 25th until November 23rd during the fall
21 2020 semester, with 1,512 samples collected. The concentration of SARS-CoV-2 in each sample was
22 quantified through two comparative reverse transcription quantitative polymerase chain reactions (RT-
23 qPCRs). These methods were distinct in the utilization of technical replicates and normalization to an

24 endogenous control. (1) Higher temporal resolution compensates for supply chain or other constraints that
25 prevent technical or biological replicates. (2) The endogenous control normalized data agreed with the
26 raw concentration data, minimizing the utility of normalization. The raw wastewater concentration values
27 reflected SARS-CoV-2 prevalence on campus as detected by clinical services. Overall, combining the
28 low-cost composite sampler with a method that quantifies the SARS-CoV-2 signal within six hours
29 enabled actionable and time-responsive data delivered to key stakeholders. With daily reporting of the
30 findings, wastewater surveillance assisted in decision making during critical phases of the pandemic on
31 campus, from detecting individual cases within populations ranging from 109 to 2,048 individuals to
32 monitoring the success of on-campus interventions.

33 **Keywords.** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, wastewater surveillance, wastewater-based epidemiology, RT-
34 qPCR, composite sampler, building-scale monitoring

35 **Synopsis.** Tracking SARS-CoV-2 in on-campus wastewater informs and monitors public health decisions
36 and actions.

37 **TOC/Abstract Art.**



38

39

40 **Introduction.** On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared coronavirus disease
41 2019 (COVID-19) a pandemic (1). As of May 20, 2021, 165 million confirmed cases have resulted in
42 over three million deaths (2). Clinical testing of individuals is crucial for identifying infected persons,
43 understanding infection prevalence, and containing the disease, but supply chain limitations and logistical
44 challenges limit clinical testing capacity. Testing is therefore generally reserved for individuals either
45 showing symptoms or likely exposed to the disease (3). However, the etiologic agent responsible for
46 COVID-19, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has a significant
47 asymptomatic percentage (with some estimates of 50%) (4)-(6) and can be transmitted by pre-
48 symptomatic and asymptomatic persons (7)-(11). Further, symptoms may take up to two weeks to
49 develop post-infection (12)-(14), and even when symptomatic, individuals may not self-report. As a
50 result, clinical testing alone fails to identify many infected individuals before they transmit the disease to
51 others and under-represents caseload numbers utilized by officials to inform public health directives. The
52 need to address these shortcomings with a supplementary epidemiological tool was recognized early in
53 the pandemic with a global collaborative of researchers advocating for wastewater-based epidemiology
54 (WBE) (15).

55 WBE efficiently and non-invasively monitors community metrics by sampling generated wastewater and
56 screening for chemical and biological entities, with previous success demonstrated in tracking community
57 drug use (16),(17) and poliovirus circulation (18)-(20). Wastewater networks can be sampled at points at
58 which discharges from community members have combined, aggregating a semi-anonymous signal
59 representative of the upstream community. Analyzing aggregated wastewater for SARS-CoV-2 RNA
60 therefore provides an opportunity to test entire communities within a single sample. Moreover, as SARS-
61 CoV-2 RNA is present in the feces of both symptomatic (21)-(28) and asymptomatic (29)-(31) COVID-
62 19-infected individuals, wastewater analysis offers insight into infection prevalence unhindered by factors
63 such as symptom onset and the healthcare-seeking behavior of individuals. Further, whereas aggregated
64 testing cannot pinpoint infected individuals, this approach can allow for more effective use of clinical

65 testing resources. For example, WBE can quickly identify the regions and communities with the most
66 infections and allow for the targeted allocation of resources to those “hotspots” for early and
67 comprehensive testing of symptomatic and asymptomatic persons on a localized level (32). Although
68 SARS-CoV-2 RNA fecal shedding behavior has been reported as erratic (33), wastewater represents a
69 complex mixture of all liquid-conveyed waste exiting a premise, including urinary, respiratory, oral, and
70 hygiene-based discharges, composing multiple potential sources of viral RNA.

71 An international network of researchers has detected SARS-CoV-2 RNA in their local wastewaters (34)-
72 (43). Their efforts establish proof of concept for WBE in the context of COVID-19 monitoring and work
73 to validate the utility of the approach. These previous studies primarily sampled from wastewater
74 treatment plants (WWTPs)/water resource recovery facilities (WRRFs), efficient locations for obtaining
75 population-level signals. Monitoring the upstream sewer network and sampling at the building- or
76 microsewershed-scale, however, enhances spatial resolution.

77 The ability to monitor individual buildings (e.g., university residence halls)/small groups of buildings
78 rather than entire municipalities is desirable for more targeted surveillance and response efforts. For
79 example, coupling building-level wastewater sampling two-to-three times per week with clinical testing
80 has been demonstrated as an effective approach at diverse institutions such as the University of Arizona
81 (Arizona, USA) (44), University of North Carolina at Charlotte (North Carolina, USA) (45), and Kenyon
82 College (Ohio, USA) (46). At Hope College (Michigan, USA), Travis et al. (47) implemented a higher
83 collection frequency by sampling from nine on-campus residential zones every weekday. In these
84 campaigns, wastewater samples indicating infection prevalence led to clinical testing of all individuals
85 associated with the flagged buildings/populations (subject to university-specific decision frameworks).
86 All found WBE to be a valuable tool for disease containment, often noting wastewater surveillance’s
87 utility for identifying and isolating asymptomatic individuals. In light of these successes, more experience
88 and guidance are desired to inform further implementation of building-level WBE campaigns (48).

89 Here, we report the WBE campaign conducted at the University of Colorado Boulder (Colorado, USA).
90 We sampled up to 20 manhole locations seven days per week between August 25th and November 23rd
91 to monitor on-campus residential buildings for the presence of COVID-19. To obtain economical 24-hour
92 composite samples, we designed, assembled, and deployed low-cost autosamplers. We tracked the
93 concentrations of SARS-CoV-2 RNA and control species in the wastewater using reverse transcription
94 quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) assays following best practices (49) and reported to
95 campus decision makers daily. This campaign was coupled with weekly saliva-monitoring RT-qPCR
96 testing of all asymptomatic on-campus residents (50),(51). The comprehensiveness of both the WBE
97 campaign and the clinical and monitoring testing services provides a unique opportunity to evaluate the
98 effectiveness of building-level wastewater surveillance and its required temporal frequency.

99 **Materials and Methods**

100 **Sample Locations.** Twenty sample locations targeting the wastewater outfall captured within surface-
101 accessible manholes were prioritized to discriminate the SARS-CoV-2 signals originating from the on-
102 campus residential buildings at the University of Colorado Boulder (**Figure 1 a, Supplemental Table 1**).
103 Twenty-three pumps (autosamplers) operated at these locations, with three sites discriminating two flows
104 within a single manhole. Overall, then, 23 flows originating from 20 manhole locations were monitored.
105 Each flow roughly corresponded to an individual residential structure. The university housed over 6,200
106 students in on-campus residential buildings during the semester, and each site on average accounted for
107 the wastewater generated by 450 residents (range extending from 109 to 2,048 residents), with select
108 residents being monitored at multiple sites. The targeted manholes ranged from approximately 1 to 7 m in
109 depth. To protect the privacy of residents, the presented data was anonymized with a unique label
110 assigned to each residential structure indicating its position and any other residential structure
111 contributing to its associated flow in parentheses: A, B(A), C, D, E(CBA), F, G(FEDCBA), H, I(H), J, K,
112 Admin, L(Admin), M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, and Isolation.

113 **Composite Autosampler.** The composite autosampler was assembled from readily available materials.
114 The main components were a 24-V Stenner pump (E10VXG; Stenner Pump Company, Jacksonville, FL,
115 USA; designed by DEWCO Pumps, Denver, CO, USA), a 300-Wh portable DC/AC power bank (R300;
116 GoLabs Inc., Carrollton, TX, USA), a 5-gal jerrycan (Uline, Pleasant Prairie, WI, USA), a 9-gal cooler,
117 gel ice packs, insulation, ¼-in. O.D. PVC tubing, and exterior casing (**Figure 1 b, Supplemental Figure**
118 **1, Supplemental Table 2**). The samplers were positioned above ground and next to each manhole
119 (**Figure 1 c**). The wastewater inflow and overflow tubing lines were fed through the D-pick of the
120 manhole cover, and the inlet strainer that resided in the underground wastewater stream was constructed
121 from either ¼-in. O.D. copper or ¼-in. O.D. steel tubing, with 0.157-in. holes drilled into the side.

122 The pumps were continuously operated at approximately 33% of full capacity, each scheduled to draw
123 about 10 L of wastewater per day. The actual wastewater withdrawn was monitored at the time of sample
124 collection by weighing the jerrycan mass with a luggage scale (**Supplemental Figure 2, Supplemental**
125 **Table 3**). Collection occurred daily between 7 AM and 12 PM, with power banks replaced every 48 hours
126 and ice packs replaced daily when ambient average temperatures exceeded 4°C. Samplers were only
127 turned off for the following three events: a September blizzard, a supply chain disruption in October, and
128 a cold event in October.

129 **Sample Collection.** Two 50-mL subsamples and one 40-mL subsample were collected from each sampler
130 daily. One 50-mL subsample was collected for RNA extraction and viral detection, and the second 50-mL
131 subsample was collected for determination of basic water quality parameters. The 40-mL subsample was
132 collected as a backup sample. Subsamples were poured from the 5-gal jerrycan after swirling the contents.
133 All samples were collected in pre-weighed sterile polypropylene tubes loaded with 500 µL of 10%
134 TweenTM 20 detergent (Thermo Fisher), which served to inactivate infectious agents for worker safety.
135 Samples were stored on ice immediately after collection and during transport back to the laboratory. After
136 sample collection at each sampler, ½-in. O.D. PVC tubing was connected to the jerrycan, fed through the
137 D-pick of the manhole cover, and used to drain excess withdrawn wastewater. Emptied jerrycans were

138 then briefly rinsed with dilute bleach solution and water before being repositioned to collect wastewater
139 over the next 24 hours.

140 **Sample Processing.** All samples were processed in the laboratory the same day as collection. Samples
141 that could not be processed upon immediate arrival at the laboratory were temporarily stored at 4°C.
142 Backup and RNA extraction/viral detection samples were processed within 4 hours of arrival; water
143 quality samples were processed within 9 hours of arrival. All samples were spiked with a known amount
144 of bovine coronavirus (Bovilis® Coronavirus; Merck Animal Health, NJ, USA) serving as the internal
145 process control.

146 *Water Quality Parameter Samples.* The pH (measured with accumet™ AB150 pH meter, Thermo Fisher)
147 and total suspended solids (TSS) values of each sample were measured following standard methods
148 (**Supplemental Figures 3, 4; Supplemental Tables 4, 5**).

149 *RNA Extraction/Viral Detection Samples.* Samples collected for the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA were
150 weighed and then centrifuged at 4,500 x g for 20 minutes at 4°C. Viruses were concentrated from
151 approximately 35 mL of each sample's supernatant using ultrafiltration pipettes (CP-Select™ using
152 Ultrafiltration PS Hollow Fiber Concentrating Pipette Tips; InnovaPrep, Drexel, MO, USA) following the
153 manufacturer's guidelines. Concentrate eluted from the ultrafiltration pipettes was captured and weighed
154 in pre-weighed 15-mL tubes. RNA was then extracted from the concentrate using RNA PureLink Mini
155 Kits (Thermo Fisher) according to the manufacturer's protocol (with the exception that Wash Buffer □
156 was not used). A 1-μL aliquot was taken from the extracted RNA of each sample and analyzed on a
157 Qubit™ 4 Fluorometer (Q33238, Thermo Fisher) using the High Sensitivity RNA Kit to quantify the total
158 RNA extracted and roughly assess the success of the extraction process (**Supplemental Table 6**).

159 *RT-qPCR.* Two separate RT-qPCR pipelines were then used to detect and quantify SARS-CoV-2 RNA.
160 The first RT-qPCR pipeline, entitled SURV1, was executed simultaneously with the sampling campaign.
161 Immediately after the RNA extraction step, a 5-μL aliquot of extracted RNA from each sample was

162 combined with 3- μ L of RNase-free water and transported on ice to the University of Colorado Boulder's
163 COVID Surveillance Laboratory. The remaining volume of extracted RNA was stored at -80°C. The
164 COVID Surveillance Laboratory tested saliva samples submitted by on-campus residents and employees
165 for the presence of SARS-CoV-2, and their team performed their RT-qPCR multiplex assay on the
166 extracted RNA wastewater samples in addition to processed saliva samples. SURV1 employed the
167 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) multiplex assay targeting the SARS-CoV-2
168 nucleocapsid (N) and envelope (E) genomic regions as well as the human RNaseP transcript
169 (**Supplemental Figures 5, 6**) (52)-(52). From August 28th to September 29th, the N1 primer and probe
170 set was used to detect the nucleocapsid region. After September 30th, the N2 primer and probe set was
171 used instead because of supply availability. Multiple technical replicates were not run. The wastewater
172 samples were analyzed by SURV1 the same day as sample collection.

173 The second RT-qPCR pipeline, entitled SENB+, was executed in December 2020 after the fall sampling
174 campaign had ended. In this second pipeline, the extracted RNA samples (frozen at -80°C) were
175 reevaluated for SARS-CoV-2 RNA using a wastewater-specific RT-qPCR multiplex assay detecting the
176 following targets: SARS-CoV-2 N (N2), SARS-CoV-2 E, the spiked internal control bovine coronavirus,
177 and genogroup II F+ RNA bacteriophage (**Supplemental Table 7**). Genogroup II F+ RNA bacteriophage
178 was targeted to serve as a human fecal indicator (53).

179 SENB+ RT-qPCR amplifications were performed in 20- μ L reactions including 5- μ L TaqPath™ One-Step
180 Multiplex Master Mix (Thermo Fisher), 0.015- μ L bovine coronavirus and 0.015- μ L F+ bacteriophage
181 primer from 200- μ M stock solutions, 0.045 μ L of each SARS-CoV-2 primer from 200- μ M stock
182 solutions, 0.02 μ L of each probe from 100- μ M stock solutions, 9.68- μ L RNase-free water, and 5- μ L
183 template RNA. These volumes created 150-nM bovine coronavirus primer, 150-nM F+ bacteriophage
184 primer, and 450 nM of both SARS-CoV-2 primers with 100 nM of each probe in each reaction. Primer
185 concentrations were chosen to limit amplification of bovine coronavirus and F+ bacteriophage RNA.
186 Each run was performed on a QuantStudio 3 (Thermo Fisher) according to the following program: UNG

187 incubation at 25°C for 2 minutes, reverse transcription at 53°C for 10 minutes, polymerase activation at
188 95°C for 2 minutes, and amplification in 40 cycles of 95°C for 3 seconds (denaturing step) and 60°C for
189 30 seconds (annealing and elongation step). Reactions were performed in triplicate. Each run included
190 between one and three triplicate negative control reactions (with 5 µL of RNase-free water instead of
191 template RNA) and a ten-fold serial dilution of single-stranded DNA (F+ bacteriophage (5'-
192 TCTATGTATGGATCGCACTCGCGATTGTGCTGTCCGATTTACGTCTATCTTCAGTCATTGGA
193 TTTGGGGTCTTCTGATCCTCTATCTCCAGACTTTGATGGACTTGCCTAC-3')); IDT Technologies,
194 Coralville, IA, USA) and RNA (SARS-CoV-2 (SARS-CoV-2 Jul-28-20 #2; Twist Biosciences, San
195 Francisco, CA, USA) and bovine coronavirus (direct extraction of the Bovilis® Coronavirus quantified
196 using a Qubit 4)) standards for standard curve quantification. The ten-fold dilutions ranged from 10⁵, 10⁶,
197 and 10⁶ copies to 1, 10, and 10 copies of SARS-CoV-2, bovine coronavirus, and F+ bacteriophage
198 standard per reaction, respectively (**Supplemental Figure 7**). The lower standard amount established the
199 limit of quantification (LOQ). The limit of detection (LOD) was set at amplification occurring before the
200 40th cycle and above the background amplifications in the extraction blank (**Supplemental Figure 8**) and
201 negative control reactions. Select runs included an additional standard dilution containing 1.53×10⁷ copies
202 of bovine coronavirus standard, assisting quantification when the bovine coronavirus spike-in amount was
203 increased from approximately 50,000 to 500,000 copies per reaction (**Supplemental Figure 9**).

204 **SENB+ RT-qPCR Data Quality Control.** Any amplification with a Ct value roughly 2 or more cycle
205 numbers different than the Ct value of either of the other two amplifications in its triplicate was excluded
206 from the dataset. Amplifications indistinguishable from background drift were excluded from the dataset.
207 Standard dilutions were excluded from standard curve creation if any amplifications of a target observed
208 in the negative controls on the same plate had a lower Ct value than any one of the target's three standard
209 dilution amplifications in triplicate. Standard dilutions were also excluded from standard curve creation if
210 their amplifications were greatly displaced from their expected position. More specifically, ten-fold
211 standard dilutions amplified with 100% efficiency should be spaced 3.32 cycle numbers apart. Let n

212 represent the intervals between dilutions such that 10^6 and 10^5 dilutions are $n = 1$ interval apart and 10^6
213 and 10^4 dilutions are $n = 2$ intervals apart. A standard dilution was excluded from standard curve creation
214 if the average Ct of its amplifications was either less than $2n$ or greater than $5n$ cycle numbers apart from
215 the average Ct of the amplifications of the closest higher dilution accepted and positioned n before it.

216 **Data Normalization.** SARS-CoV-2 data from SURV1 was normalized by subtracting the RNaseP Ct
217 value from the SARS-CoV-2 E Ct value because these values are logarithmic in nature. The N gene was
218 utilized to confirm trends. Data from SENB+ was processed by calculating copies per liter of wastewater
219 using the recorded masses of sample concentrated and eluted (**Supplemental Table 10**) and the following
220 equation:

221 Equation 1.
$$\frac{\text{Gene Copies}}{5 \text{ uL Purified RNA}} * \frac{50 \text{ uL Purified RNA}}{230 \text{ uL Concentrate}} * \frac{X \text{ uL Concentrate}}{Y \text{ L Wastewater Sample Processed}}$$

222 The bovine coronavirus and F+ bacteriophage signals were used to track sample variability but not to
223 transform the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA. The bovine coronavirus recovery efficiency was
224 determined by comparing the RT-qPCR-obtained concentration value to the extracted RNA concentration
225 of the spiked-in control. Throughout the campaign, the recovery efficiency averaged $53 \pm 30\%$ S.D.
226 October 2nd samples are masked from this analysis because they were frozen prior to extraction and a key
227 intermediate weight was not recorded.

228 **Incorporation of Medical Services and Isolation Space Utilization Data.** On-campus medical services
229 in Wardenburg Health performed nasal-swab Lyra® Direct SARS-CoV-2 assays (Quidel Corporation,
230 San Diego, CA, USA) to confirm suspected cases within the community. These data are considered as
231 “positive detections” within the residential structures, and the date of each positive is used to denote the
232 case (though that date is not the date of actual infection) (**Supplemental Table 11**). Isolation space
233 utilization tracks the number of beds in designated isolation spaces occupied on a given day
234 (**Supplemental Table 12**).

235 **Results and Discussion**

236 **Performance of the Composite Samplers.** In general, the composite samplers performed well, reliably
237 withdrawing sample mass. The design achieved the objectives and provided an economical sampling unit.
238 Additionally, if a source of electricity is near the sample point, then the cost decreases with removing the
239 necessity of the power bank. Throughout the campaign, concerns were noted over (1) leakage through the
240 small sampling port on the jerrycan and (2) the inlet strainer either clogging or being knocked offline
241 because of toilet paper accumulation during low-flow conditions. To prevent further leakage, a short PVC
242 tube was epoxied to the small sampling port and positioned such that the free end of the tube sat (with a
243 removable cap) above the jerrycan. Several redesigns of the inlet strainer suffered similar issues as the
244 primary design, exacerbated by the increasing prevalence of “flushable” wipes. Manually unclogging and
245 redeploying the inlet strainers remained the primary maintenance demand. Future surveillance campaigns
246 may consider more permanent modifications to the flow path to enable ease of sample collection.

247 **Dataset Summary.** Prior to resumption of on-campus activities, incoming on-campus residents were
248 required to test five days prior to the scheduled move-in (August 17th -21st), establishing the baseline. An
249 initial surge in SARS-CoV-2 RNA wastewater concentrations was detected at the beginning of the
250 campaign (**Figure 2**). This event fell two weeks after the Labor Day holiday in the USA, with many
251 traced large off-campus gatherings. The wastewater concentrations plateaued the week of September 15th
252 and were in decline prior to Boulder County enacting aggressive social distancing policies on September
253 24th (**Figure 2 a**). That concentrations were already decreasing before these policies were enacted likely
254 reflects the success of on-campus testing, tracing, and isolation efforts. The September 24th orders were
255 enforced until October 13th and prohibited (1) anyone aged 18 to 22 years old in the City of Boulder from
256 engaging in gatherings and (2) residents in 36 nearby off-campus buildings from leaving their place of
257 residence to the maximum extent possible (“stay-at-home” order) (54). Those 36 buildings were identified
258 as likely large-gathering areas. The higher SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentrations noted on September
259 27th appear to be a true signal, with both the bovine coronavirus and F+ bacteriophage targets displaying

260 similar abundance ranges to surrounding dates, highlighting the need and utility of multiplexed controls.
261 This peak occurred on a Sunday 24 hours after the identification and isolation of numerous cases at the
262 end of the September surge (**Figure 2 f, h**) and is notable when isolation building inputs are excluded
263 from the wastewater concentration data.

264 Well after the expiration of those public health orders, another increase in wastewater concentrations was
265 detected after October 31st (the Halloween holiday in the USA). Clinical services detected fewer cases
266 on-campus during this event as compared to the September event, and this lower prevalence was reflected
267 in the lower SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentrations. The similar dynamics emphasize a quantitative
268 relationship, not simply a presence or absence of viral RNA correlation, between the SARS-CoV-2
269 prevalence and the wastewater concentrations. Finally, students vacated campus prior to November 23rd
270 for the scheduled end of in-person instruction. The SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentration averages
271 taken over the monitoring campaign (**Figure 2 c**) largely reflected on-campus prevalence (**Figure 2 g**)
272 (number of reported infections within a residential structure divided by the initial census data, **Figure 2 e**)
273 when masking those sample sites that were activated later in the semester.

274 Both the SURV1 data and the SENB+ data reflected the medical services data throughout the campaign
275 (**Figure 2 b, d; Supplemental Tables 8, 9**). Overall, the data from the SURV1 and SENB+ pipelines are
276 consistent, suggesting that a single technical replicate (the SURV1 dataset) is admissible when
277 performing a daily monitoring campaign and when resources become limited resulting from either supply
278 chain disruptions or rapid campaign expansions designed to meet the pace of emerging pandemics.
279 Technical replicates are still recommended when available (the SENB+ dataset), though, to avoid false
280 reporting. Additionally, the SARS-CoV-2 E and N2 targets displayed a linear correlation of 0.97 in the
281 SENB+ data (**Supplemental Figure 10**), confirming that both are suitable to track the prevalence of the
282 virus. However, especially considering the detection of SARS-CoV-2 variants in wastewater (55),
283 continuing to track multiple locations along the SARS-CoV-2 genome provides critical robustness against
284 false negative and positive events. The quantitative range of the predicted concentrations (in terms of

285 genome copies per liter of wastewater) was also similar for both targets. The E target, however, reported
286 fewer non-detects and thus displayed a higher sensitivity than the N2 target. The E target was therefore
287 utilized as the primary dataset considered daily, with the N2 target serving a confirmatory function.

288 Relating the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in wastewater to the medical services data was
289 importantly influenced by the isolation strategy used on campus. The majority of positive individuals
290 received temporary housing in the primary isolation building up until September 18th and after October 6th
291 and were assigned to a secondary building between September 18th and October 5th (**Figure 3**). However,
292 select students were allowed to isolate in place (structures A and B). Isolation in these alternate structures
293 complicated the signal in their associated wastewater flows as well as in the combined G(FEDCBA) flow
294 (the E2(CBA) flow is not noted given the sampler serving that structure primarily operated after October
295 5th). Additionally, such combined flows bias the median data (**Figure 2 a**), with the contribution of a
296 single infection potentially detected in, at the maximum, four sites. This complication emphasizes the
297 importance of quantifying the signal for these locations rather than relying on binary presence/absence of
298 virus determinations. Quantification enables the detection of temporal trends such as increasing SARS-
299 CoV-2 RNA concentrations above the expected baseline. Additionally, students do not proceed through
300 the entire course of infection profiled within a given residence and shift their contribution to the isolation
301 structures (**Figure 3**). A similar behavior must be accounted for within broader wastewater networks, in
302 which movement of individuals seeking medical services and requiring longer stays within hospitals and
303 long-term care facilities potentially decouples the wastewater signal from the served residential units.

304 The primary isolation building maintained a unique wastewater in which the flow did not represent a
305 fluctuating proportion of infected individuals amongst non-infected individuals. The building was instead
306 occupied entirely by individuals progressing through the course of the viral infection, remaining empty
307 otherwise. The wastewater concentrations from this building peaked in mid-September and again in mid-
308 November at approximately 10^7 SARS-CoV-2 copies/L wastewater (**Figure 3**). These peaks resulted
309 from the co-occurrence of disease progression and virus/viral RNA shedding in stool, explaining the two

310 peaks' nearly identical wastewater concentrations despite substantially different infected resident
311 numbers. In this building, the viral wastewater inputs of a smaller number of infected individuals were not
312 more diluted by the inputs of a corresponding larger proportion of non-infected residents; the isolated
313 individuals' wastewater mixed only with idle plumbing and appliance flows. The peaks noted over
314 October reflect the progression of viral shedding from individual contributions. Although this value will
315 vary with the underlying characteristics of the idle flow emanating from each building, from the presented
316 data, the expected maximum concentrations of detectable SARS-CoV-2 within domestic wastewater in
317 the USA should be near 10^7 genome copies/L. Considering that individuals in residences are expected to
318 produce between 100-250 L of wastewater per day, the maximum shedding per person is on the order of
319 10^{10} SARS-CoV-2 genome copies/day, in agreement with Schmitz et al. (56). This number additionally
320 aligns with the upper-end of identified fecal concentration ranges, suggesting that individuals within these
321 structures likely produce between 100-1,000 mL of feces per day ($5 \times 10^3 - 10^{7.6}$ copies/mL feces) (57). The
322 campus additionally relied on a secondary isolation building during the peak of infections in September
323 (**Figure 3**). Notably, this structure displayed a similar maximum SARS-CoV-2 wastewater concentration.

324 The concentration of fecal matter becomes more critical when considering wider communities with
325 industrial, infiltration, and other diluting contributions to wastewater. In initial attempts to normalize to
326 the varying concentrations of fecal matter within the wastewater samples, the genogroup II F+
327 bacteriophage was selected as an internal reference marker for the fall campaign to align with other
328 sampling efforts ongoing within Colorado. At the micro-sewershed level, the F+ bacteriophage signal
329 displayed inconsistent geographical and temporal trends (**Figure 4**). Select sites (e.g., R, Q, and O)
330 displayed consistently low signals, within the range of 10^4 to 10^6 copies/L, whereas other sites (e.g.,
331 G(FEDCBA), J, and L(Admin)) displayed signals often approaching 10^9 copies/L. Even more concerning,
332 sites such as C, F, H, M, and N display inconsistent temporal trends, fluctuating over five orders of
333 magnitude during the fall campaign. These shifts potentially result from changes in resident diet or

334 interpersonal fluctuations in the gut virome (58). The F+ bacteriophage was therefore replaced by the
335 pepper mild mottle virus (PMMoV) for the spring 2021 monitoring campaign (59).

336 **Utility and Consideration of the Data.** Throughout the fall monitoring campaign, the interpretation and
337 utility of the data varied with the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 within the community. Considering six
338 scenarios in which the concentration of SARS-CoV-2 is (1) absent, (2) low and stable, (3) low and
339 increasing, (4) high and increasing/stable, (5) high and decreasing, and (6) decreasing to absent, the daily
340 monitoring campaign provided varying levels of support to the pandemic response. The utility as an early
341 warning signal is primarily experienced in scenarios (1), (2), and (3), in which early detections are the
342 most critical for preventing or halting community spread. This prevention requires a robust and well-
343 connected testing, contact tracing, and isolation infrastructure. When entering either scenario (4) or (5),
344 the primary utility in WBE is in monitoring the effectiveness of public health intervention strategies
345 employed. The fall campaign provided an example, in which the peak in SARS-CoV-2 wastewater
346 concentrations occurred before the social distancing order imposed by the county. Therefore, the on-
347 campus mechanism of testing, tracing, and isolation was demonstrated as effective prior to a more robust
348 and stringent social distancing order being put in-place. This monitoring better equips public health
349 officials to determine appropriate responses with the infrastructure at hand, with more stringent control
350 measures likely leading to migration from campus and potentially transporting viral infections further
351 abroad and/or allowing reentry of the virus from broader community-acquired infections when social
352 distancing requirements ease. After the public health orders were enacted in Boulder, Wi-Fi connections
353 within residence halls decreased by 33%. Additionally, clinical testing data later in the semester identified
354 cases with low viral loads without an active infection, highlighting cases in which progression through the
355 disease profile occurred off campus. Finally, during scenario (6), wastewater data also effectively
356 monitors individuals as they exit the infectious period but may still be shedding viral RNA. On campus,
357 students were permitted to leave the isolation structure and return to their residences after ten days. These
358 reentry events could be detected in the wastewater (e.g., see site O, **Figure 2**). Reentries thus must also be

359 taken into consideration to prevent shifts in policy based on a true detected signal that is not reflective of
360 a case of concern.

361 **Conclusions.** With the wide range of fluctuations in daily habits surrounding toilet flushes and personal
362 hygiene behaviors combined with rapid changes in viral loads, daily monitoring becomes critical to track
363 the prevalence of pathogens within building-scale wastewater. The presented monitoring campaign is
364 distinguished by high temporal and geographical resolution over a university campus. However, a
365 tradeoff emerges considering the commitment of resources versus the action items taken surrounding the
366 usage and monitoring of the data. The demonstrated monitoring campaign informed on the emergence of
367 likely new infections within given residential structures, notably during the first two weeks of operation,
368 and the effectiveness of on-campus interventions. The utility of these data relied on being in concert with
369 robust medical services and monitoring testing data, providing the ability to translate from community
370 monitoring to intervention. Across university campuses scattered globally, and reported within this study,
371 the utility of wastewater monitoring to support public health has been demonstrated. This study concluded
372 that (1) economical solutions are readily assembled for operating composite samplers, (2) daily samples
373 enable informed decisions and monitoring of the success of interventions on-campus, and (3) wastewater
374 data provides substantial and unique benefit when surveying community health at multiple stages in a
375 disease outbreak. Combined, wastewater monitoring provides a flexible and effective public-health
376 technique when deployed at the building-level scale.

377 **Acknowledgements.** We thank Brian Graham, Gary Low, Jonathan Akins, Chris Busch, and David
378 Lawson at the University of Colorado Boulder in assisting with site selection and deployment. Holly
379 Gates-Mayer (University of Colorado Boulder) assisted with the safety assessment and PPE assignment.
380 We thank Susan De Long (Colorado State University), Carol Wilusz (Colorado State University), and
381 Rebecca Ferrell (Metropolitan State University of Denver) for assistance in the development of the in-
382 house extraction and molecular methods. Additionally, John Spear (Colorado School of Mines), Tzahi
383 Cath (Colorado School of Mines), Kari Sholtes (Colorado Mesa University), and Keith Miller (University

384 of Denver) provided valuable feedback into the design and operation of the campaign. Funding for this
385 project was provided by the CARES Act, administered by the Office of Equity, Compliance, and Integrity
386 at the University of Colorado Boulder, and overseen by a collaborative effort through the Scientific
387 Steering Committee, notably Matt McQueen, Jennifer McDuffie, Mark Kavanaugh, and Melanie Parra.
388 We also wish to thank the broader wastewater surveillance community for rapid collaborations and
389 sharing of ideas and techniques and the operators, engineers, and managers at the Boulder Water
390 Resource Recovery Facility. Finally, we thank all of the students who resided on campus.

391 **Supporting Information.** The supporting information is available free of charge at: [HTML]

392 The supporting tables contain the sample location details, component list for the sampler design, daily
393 mass of wastewater collected, daily wastewater pH, daily wastewater total suspended solids (TSS),
394 concentration of total RNA extracted, primers and probes used in the SENB+ multiplex, SURV1 RT-
395 qPCR Ct data, SENB+ RT-qPCR concentration values, processing data required to back-calculate to
396 copies per L of wastewater, medical services determined positives per manhole, and residency within
397 isolation structures. The supporting figures contain the schematic of the sampler design, daily wastewater
398 mass, daily wastewater pH, daily wastewater TSS, processing controls, standard curves, extraction blanks,
399 bovine coronavirus recovery, and comparison between the nucleocapsid (N) and envelope (E) targets. A
400 supplemental compressed file contains the required script and files to generate the presented data analysis
401 and statistical graphics.

402 **References**

- 403 (1) WHO Director-General’s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020
404 [https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
405 [at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020) (accessed Dec 10, 2020).
- 406 (2) World Health Organization (WHO). WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard
407 <https://covid19.who.int> (accessed May 21, 2021).
- 408 (3) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). COVID-19 and Your Health
409 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/testing/diagnostic-testing.html> (accessed May 7,
410 2021).
- 411 (4) Mizumoto, K.; Kagaya, K.; Zarebski, A.; Chowell, G. Estimating the Asymptomatic Proportion of
412 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Cases on Board the Diamond Princess Cruise Ship,
413 Yokohama, Japan, 2020. *Eurosurveillance* **2020**, *25* (10), 2000180.
414 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.10.2000180>.
- 415 (5) Nishiura, H.; Kobayashi, T.; Miyama, T.; Suzuki, A.; Jung, S.; Hayashi, K.; Kinoshita, R.; Yang,
416 Y.; Yuan, B.; Akhmetzhanov, A. R.; Linton, N. M. Estimation of the Asymptomatic Ratio of
417 Novel Coronavirus Infections (COVID-19). *Int J Infect Dis* **2020**, *94*, 154–155.
418 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.020>.
- 419 (6) Oran, D. P.; Topol, E. J. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Narrative Review.
420 *Ann Intern Med* **2020**, *173* (5), 362–367. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-3012>.
- 421 (7) Yu, P.; Zhu, J.; Zhang, Z.; Han, Y. A Familial Cluster of Infection Associated With the 2019 Novel
422 Coronavirus Indicating Possible Person-to-Person Transmission During the Incubation Period.
423 *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* **2020**, *221* (11), 1757–1761.
424 <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiaa077>.
- 425 (8) Hu, Z.; Song, C.; Xu, C.; Jin, G.; Chen, Y.; Xu, X.; Ma, H.; Chen, W.; Lin, Y.; Zheng, Y.; Wang,
426 J.; Hu, Z.; Yi, Y.; Shen, H. Clinical Characteristics of 24 Asymptomatic Infections with COVID-

- 427 19 Screened among Close Contacts in Nanjing, China. *Sci. China Life Sci.* 2020, 63 (5), 706–
428 711. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11427-020-1661-4>.
- 429 (9) Bai, Y.; Yao, L.; Wei, T.; Tian, F.; Jin, D.-Y.; Chen, L.; Wang, M. Presumed Asymptomatic Carrier
430 Transmission of COVID-19. *JAMA* 2020, 323 (14), 1406–1407.
431 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2565>.
- 432 (10) Wei, W. E.; Li, Z.; Chiew, C. J.; Yong, S. E.; Toh, M. P.; Lee, V. J. Presymptomatic Transmission
433 of SARS-CoV-2 — Singapore, January 23–March 16, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*
434 2020, 69 (14), 411–415. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6914e1>.
- 435 (11) Rothe, C.; Schunk, M.; Sothmann, P.; Bretzel, G.; Froeschl, G.; Wallrauch, C.; Zimmer, T.; Thiel,
436 V.; Janke, C.; Guggemos, W.; Seilmaier, M.; Drosten, C.; Vollmar, P.; Zwirgmaier, K.; Zange,
437 S.; Wölfel, R.; Hoelscher, M. Transmission of 2019-NCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic
438 Contact in Germany. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020, 382 (10), 970–971.
439 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2001468>.
- 440 (12) Linton, N. M.; Kobayashi, T.; Yang, Y.; Hayashi, K.; Akhmetzhanov, A. R.; Jung, S.; Yuan, B.;
441 Kinoshita, R.; Nishiura, H. Incubation Period and Other Epidemiological Characteristics of 2019
442 Novel Coronavirus Infections with Right Truncation: A Statistical Analysis of Publicly
443 Available Case Data. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 2020, 9 (2), 538.
444 <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm9020538>.
- 445 (13) Backer, J. A.; Klinkenberg, D.; Wallinga, J. Incubation Period of 2019 Novel Coronavirus (2019-
446 NCoV) Infections among Travellers from Wuhan, China, 20-28 January 2020. *Euro Surveill*
447 2020, 25 (5). <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.5.2000062>.
- 448 (14) Lauer, S. A.; Grantz, K. H.; Bi, Q.; Jones, F. K.; Zheng, Q.; Meredith, H. R.; Azman, A. S.; Reich,
449 N. G.; Lessler, J. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From
450 Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Ann Intern Med* 2020, 172 (9),
451 577–582. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-0504>.

- 452 (15) Bivins, A.; North, D.; Ahmad, A.; Ahmed, W.; Alm, E.; Been, F.; Bhattacharya, P.; Bijlsma, L.;
453 Boehm, A. B.; Brown, J.; Buttiglieri, G.; Calabro, V.; Carducci, A.; Castiglioni, S.; Cetecioglu
454 Gurol, Z.; Chakraborty, S.; Costa, F.; Curcio, S.; de los Reyes, F. L.; Delgado Vela, J.; Farkas,
455 K.; Fernandez-Casi, X.; Gerba, C.; Gerrity, D.; Girones, R.; Gonzalez, R.; Haramoto, E.; Harris,
456 A.; Holden, P. A.; Islam, Md. T.; Jones, D. L.; Kasprzyk-Hordern, B.; Kitajima, M.; Kotlarz, N.;
457 Kumar, M.; Kuroda, K.; La Rosa, G.; Malpei, F.; Mautus, M.; McLellan, S. L.; Medema, G.;
458 Meschke, J. S.; Mueller, J.; Newton, R. J.; Nilsson, D.; Noble, R. T.; van Nuijs, A.; Peccia, J.;
459 Perkins, T. A.; Pickering, A. J.; Rose, J.; Sanchez, G.; Smith, A.; Stadler, L.; Stauber, C.;
460 Thomas, K.; van der Voorn, T.; Wigginton, K.; Zhu, K.; Bibby, K. Wastewater-Based
461 Epidemiology: Global Collaborative to Maximize Contributions in the Fight Against COVID-
462 19. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2020**, *54* (13), 7754–7757. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.0c02388>.
- 463 (16) Daughton, C. G. Illicit Drugs in Municipal Sewage. In *Pharmaceuticals and Care Products in the*
464 *Environment*; ACS Symposium Series; American Chemical Society, **2001**; Vol. 791, pp 348–
465 364. <https://doi.org/10.1021/bk-2001-0791.ch020>.
- 466 (17) Choi, P. M.; Tschärke, B. J.; Donner, E.; O'Brien, J. W.; Grant, S. C.; Kaserzon, S. L.; Mackie, R.;
467 O'Malley, E.; Crosbie, N. D.; Thomas, K. V.; Mueller, J. F. Wastewater-Based Epidemiology
468 Biomarkers: Past, Present and Future. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry* **2018**, *105*, 453–469.
469 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2018.06.004>.
- 470 (18) Asghar, H.; Diop, O. M.; Weldegebriel, G.; Malik, F.; Shetty, S.; El Bassioni, L.; Akande, A. O.; Al
471 Maamoun, E.; Zaidi, S.; Adeniji, A. J.; Burns, C. C.; Deshpande, J.; Oberste, M. S.; Lowther, S.
472 A. Environmental Surveillance for Polioviruses in the Global Polio Eradication Initiative. *The*
473 *Journal of Infectious Diseases* **2014**, *210* (suppl_1), S294–S303.
474 <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiu384>.
- 475 (19) World Health Organization (WHO). Guidelines for Environmental Surveillance of Poliovirus
476 Circulation. **2003**.

- 477 (20) Hovi, T.; Shulman, L. M.; Avoort, H. V. D.; Deshpande, J.; Roivainen, M.; Gourville, E. M. D.
478 Role of Environmental Poliovirus Surveillance in Global Polio Eradication and Beyond.
479 *Epidemiology & Infection* **2012**, *140* (1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095026881000316X>.
- 480 (21) Jiehao, C.; Jin, X.; Daojiong, L.; Zhi, Y.; Lei, X.; Zhenghai, Q.; Yuehua, Z.; Hua, Z.; Ran, J.;
481 Pengcheng, L.; Xiangshi, W.; Yanling, G.; Aimei, X.; He, T.; Hailing, C.; Chuning, W.;
482 Jingjing, L.; Jianshe, W.; Mei, Z. A Case Series of Children With 2019 Novel Coronavirus
483 Infection: Clinical and Epidemiological Features. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2020**, *71* (6),
484 1547–1551. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa198>.
- 485 (22) Wang, W.; Xu, Y.; Gao, R.; Lu, R.; Han, K.; Wu, G.; Tan, W. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
486 Different Types of Clinical Specimens. *JAMA* **2020**, *323* (18), 1843–1844.
487 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3786>.
- 488 (23) Xiao, F.; Tang, M.; Zheng, X.; Liu, Y.; Li, X.; Shan, H. Evidence for Gastrointestinal Infection of
489 SARS-CoV-2. *Gastroenterology* **2020**, *158* (6), 1831-1833.e3.
490 <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2020.02.055>.
- 491 (24) Zhang, J.; Wang, S.; Xue, Y. Fecal Specimen Diagnosis 2019 Novel Coronavirus–Infected
492 Pneumonia. *Journal of Medical Virology* **2020**, *92* (6), 680–682.
493 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25742>.
- 494 (25) Holshue, M. L.; DeBolt, C.; Lindquist, S.; Lofy, K. H.; Wiesman, J.; Bruce, H.; Spitters, C.;
495 Ericson, K.; Wilkerson, S.; Tural, A.; Diaz, G.; Cohn, A.; Fox, L.; Patel, A.; Gerber, S. I.; Kim,
496 L.; Tong, S.; Lu, X.; Lindstrom, S.; Pallansch, M. A.; Weldon, W. C.; Biggs, H. M.; Uyeki, T.
497 M.; Pillai, S. K. First Case of 2019 Novel Coronavirus in the United States. *New England*
498 *Journal of Medicine* **2020**. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001191>.
- 499 (26) Zhang, W.; Du, R.-H.; Li, B.; Zheng, X.-S.; Yang, X.-L.; Hu, B.; Wang, Y.-Y.; Xiao, G.-F.; Yan,
500 B.; Shi, Z.-L.; Zhou, P. Molecular and Serological Investigation of 2019-NCov Infected
501 Patients: Implication of Multiple Shedding Routes. *Emerging Microbes & Infections* **2020**, *9* (1),
502 386–389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1729071>.

- 503 (27) Wu, Y.; Guo, C.; Tang, L.; Hong, Z.; Zhou, J.; Dong, X.; Yin, H.; Xiao, Q.; Tang, Y.; Qu, X.;
504 Kuang, L.; Fang, X.; Mishra, N.; Lu, J.; Shan, H.; Jiang, G.; Huang, X. Prolonged Presence of
505 SARS-CoV-2 Viral RNA in Faecal Samples. *The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology* **2020**,
506 *5* (5), 434–435. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253\(20\)30083-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30083-2).
- 507 (28) Wölfel, R.; Corman, V. M.; Guggemos, W.; Seilmaier, M.; Zange, S.; Müller, M. A.; Niemeyer, D.;
508 Jones, T. C.; Vollmar, P.; Rothe, C.; Hoelscher, M.; Bleicker, T.; Brünink, S.; Schneider, J.;
509 Ehmann, R.; Zwirgmaier, K.; Drosten, C.; Wendtner, C. Virological Assessment of
510 Hospitalized Patients with COVID-2019. *Nature* **2020**, *581* (7809), 465–469.
511 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x>.
- 512 (29) Tang, A.; Tong, Z.-D.; Wang, H.-L.; Dai, Y.-X.; Li, K.-F.; Liu, J.-N.; Wu, W.-J.; Yuan, C.; Yu, M.-
513 L.; Li, P.; Yan, J.-B. Detection of Novel Coronavirus by RT-PCR in Stool Specimen from
514 Asymptomatic Child, China. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**, *26* (6), 1337–1339.
515 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2606.200301>.
- 516 (30) Lo, I. L.; Lio, C. F.; Cheong, H. H.; Lei, C. I.; Cheong, T. H.; Zhong, X.; Tian, Y.; Sin, N. N.
517 Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 RNA Shedding in Clinical Specimens and Clinical Characteristics
518 of 10 Patients with COVID-19 in Macau. *Int J Biol Sci* **2020**, *16* (10), 1698–1707.
519 <https://doi.org/10.7150/ijbs.45357>.
- 520 (31) Han, M. S.; Seong, M.-W.; Kim, N.; Shin, S.; Cho, S. I.; Park, H.; Kim, T. S.; Park, S. S.; Choi, E.
521 H. Viral RNA Load in Mildly Symptomatic and Asymptomatic Children with COVID-19,
522 Seoul, South Korea. *Emerg Infect Dis* **2020**, *26* (10), 2497–2499.
523 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2610.202449>.
- 524 (32) Hart, O. E.; Halden, R. U. Computational Analysis of SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 Surveillance by
525 Wastewater-Based Epidemiology Locally and Globally: Feasibility, Economy, Opportunities
526 and Challenges. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**, *730*, 138875.
527 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138875>.


- 528 (33) Walsh, K. A.; Jordan, K.; Clyne, B.; Rohde, D.; Drummond, L.; Byrne, P.; Ahern, S.; Carty, P. G.;
529 O'Brien, K. K.; O'Murchu, E.; O'Neill, M.; Smith, S. M.; Ryan, M.; Harrington, P. SARS-CoV-
530 2 Detection, Viral Load and Infectivity over the Course of an Infection. *Journal of Infection*
531 **2020**, *81* (3), 357–371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.06.067>.
- 532 (34) Gonzalez, R.; Curtis, K.; Bivins, A.; Bibby, K.; Weir, M. H.; Yetka, K.; Thompson, H.; Keeling,
533 D.; Mitchell, J.; Gonzalez, D. COVID-19 Surveillance in Southeastern Virginia Using
534 Wastewater-Based Epidemiology. *Water Research* **2020**, *186*, 116296.
535 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116296>.
- 536 (35) Westhaus, S.; Weber, F.-A.; Schiwy, S.; Linnemann, V.; Brinkmann, M.; Widera, M.; Greve, C.;
537 Janke, A.; Hollert, H.; Wintgens, T.; Ciesek, S. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Raw and Treated
538 Wastewater in Germany – Suitability for COVID-19 Surveillance and Potential Transmission
539 Risks. *Science of The Total Environment* **2021**, *751*, 141750.
540 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141750>.
- 541 (36) Ahmed, W.; Angel, N.; Edson, J.; Bibby, K.; Bivins, A.; O'Brien, J. W.; Choi, P. M.; Kitajima, M.;
542 Simpson, S. L.; Li, J.; Tscharke, B.; Verhagen, R.; Smith, W. J. M.; Zaugg, J.; Dierens, L.;
543 Hugenholtz, P.; Thomas, K. V.; Mueller, J. F. First Confirmed Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
544 Untreated Wastewater in Australia: A Proof of Concept for the Wastewater Surveillance of
545 COVID-19 in the Community. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**, *728*, 138764.
546 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138764>.
- 547 (37) La Rosa, G.; Iaconelli, M.; Mancini, P.; Bonanno Ferraro, G.; Veneri, C.; Bonadonna, L.; Lucentini,
548 L.; Suffredini, E. First Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Untreated Wastewaters in Italy. *Science of*
549 *The Total Environment* **2020**, *736*, 139652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139652>.
- 550 (38) Kumar, M.; Patel, A. K.; Shah, A. V.; Raval, J.; Rajpara, N.; Joshi, M.; Joshi, C. G. First Proof of
551 the Capability of Wastewater Surveillance for COVID-19 in India through Detection of Genetic
552 Material of SARS-CoV-2. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**, *746*, 141326.
553 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141326>.

- 554 (39) Medema, G.; Heijnen, L.; Elsinga, G.; Italiaander, R.; Brouwer, A. Presence of SARS-Coronavirus-
555 2 RNA in Sewage and Correlation with Reported COVID-19 Prevalence in the Early Stage of
556 the Epidemic in The Netherlands. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2020**, 7 (7), 511–516.
557 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.0c00357>.
- 558 (40) Lodder, W.; de Roda Husman, de R. SARS-CoV-2 in Wastewater: Potential Health Risk, but Also
559 Data Source. *The Lancet Gastroenterology & Hepatology* **2020**, 5 (6), 533–534.
560 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253\(20\)30087-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(20)30087-X).
- 561 (41) Randazzo, W.; Truchado, P.; Cuevas-Ferrando, E.; Simón, P.; Allende, A.; Sánchez, G. SARS-
562 CoV-2 RNA in Wastewater Anticipated COVID-19 Occurrence in a Low Prevalence Area.
563 *Water Research* **2020**, 181, 115942. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115942>.
- 564 (42) Wu, F.; Zhang, J.; Xiao, A.; Gu, X.; Lee, W. L.; Armas, F.; Kauffman, K.; Hanage, W.; Matus, M.;
565 Ghaeli, N.; Endo, N.; Duvallet, C.; Poyet, M.; Moniz, K.; Washburne, A. D.; Erickson, T. B.;
566 Chai, P. R.; Thompson, J.; Alm, E. J. SARS-CoV-2 Titers in Wastewater Are Higher than
567 Expected from Clinically Confirmed Cases. *mSystems* **2020**, 5 (4).
568 <https://doi.org/10.1128/mSystems.00614-20>.
- 569 (43) Nemudryi, A.; Nemudraia, A.; Wiegand, T.; Surya, K.; Buyukyoruk, M.; Cicha, C.; Vanderwood,
570 K. K.; Wilkinson, R.; Wiedenheft, B. Temporal Detection and Phylogenetic Assessment of
571 SARS-CoV-2 in Municipal Wastewater. *Cell Reports Medicine* **2020**, 1 (6), 100098.
572 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xcrm.2020.100098>.
- 573 (44) Betancourt, W. Q.; Schmitz, B. W.; Innes, G. K.; Prasek, S. M.; Pogreba Brown, K. M.; Stark, E.
574 R.; Foster, A. R.; Sprissler, R. S.; Harris, D. T.; Sherchan, S. P.; Gerba, C. P.; Pepper, I. L.
575 COVID-19 Containment on a College Campus via Wastewater-Based Epidemiology, Targeted
576 Clinical Testing and an Intervention. *Science of The Total Environment* **2021**, 779, 146408.
577 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146408>.
- 578 (45) Gibas, C.; Lambirth, K.; Mittal, N.; Juel, M. A. I.; Barua, V. B.; Brazell, L. R.; Hinton, K.; Lontai,
579 J.; Stark, N.; Young, I.; Quach, C.; Russ, M.; Kauer, J.; Nicolosi, B.; Chen, D.; Akella, S.; Tang,

- 580 W.; Schlueter, J.; Munir, M. Implementing Building-Level SARS-CoV-2 Wastewater
581 Surveillance on a University Campus. *Science of The Total Environment* **2021**, 146749.
582 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.146749>.
- 583 (46) Barich, D.; Slonczewski, J. L. Wastewater Virus Detection Complements Clinical COVID-19
584 Testing to Limit Spread of Infection at Kenyon College. Preprint accessed at *medRxiv* **2021**,
585 2021.01.09.21249505. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.09.21249505>.
- 586 (47) Travis, S. A.; Best, A. A.; Bochniak, K. S.; Dunteman, N. D.; Fellingner, J.; Folkert, P. D.; Koberna,
587 T.; Kopek, B. G.; Krueger, B. P.; Pestun, J.; Pikaart, M. J.; Sabo, C.; Schuitema, A. J. Providing
588 a Safe, in-Person, Residential College Experience during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Preprint
589 accessed at *medRxiv* **2021**, 2021.03.02.21252746. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.02.21252746>.
- 590 (48) Harris-Lovett, S.; Nelson, K.; Beamer, P.; Bischel, H. N.; Bivins, A.; Bruder, A.; Butler, C.;
591 Camenisch, T. D.; Long, S. K. D.; Karthikeyan, S.; Larsen, D. A.; Meierdiercks, K.; Mouser, P.;
592 Pagsuyoin, S.; Prasek, S.; Radniecki, T. S.; Ram, J. L.; Roper, D. K.; Safford, H.; Sherchan, S.
593 P.; Shuster, W.; Stalder, T.; Wheeler, R. T.; Korfmacher, K. S. Wastewater Surveillance for
594 SARS-CoV-2 on College Campuses: Initial Efforts, Lessons Learned and Research Needs.
595 Preprint accessed at *medRxiv* **2021**, 2021.02.01.21250952.
596 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.01.21250952>.
- 597 (49) Ahmed W; Simpson S; Bertsch P; Bibby K; Bivins A; Blackall L; Bofill-Mas S; Bosch A; Brandao
598 J; Choi P; Ciesielski M; Donner E; D'Souza N; Farnleitner A; Gerrity D; Gonzalez R; Griffith J;
599 Gyawali P; Haas C; Hamilton K; Hapuarachchi C; Harwood V; Haque R; Jackson G; Khan S;
600 Khan W; Kitajima M; Korajkic A; La Rosa G; Layton B; Lipp E; McLellan S; McMinn B;
601 Medema G; Metcalfe S; Meijer W; Mueller J; Murphy H; Naughton C; Noble R; Payyappat S;
602 Petterson S; Pitkanen T; Rajal V; Reyneke B; Roman F; Rose J; Rusinol M; Sadowsky M; Sala-
603 Comorera L; Setoh YX; Sherchan S; Sirikanchana K; Smith W; Steele J; Sabburg R; Symonds
604 E; Thai P; Thomas K; Tynan J; Toze S; Thompson J; Whiteley A; Wong J; Sano D; Wuertz S;
605 Xagorarakis I; Zhang Q; Zimmer-Faust A; Shanks O. Minimizing Errors in RT-PCR Detection

- 606 and Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 RNA for Wastewater Surveillance. **2021**. Preprint accessed
607 at *preprints.org* <https://10.20944/preprints202104.0481.v1>
- 608 (50) Yang, Q.; Saldi, T.; Lasda, E.; Decker, C.; Camille L. Paige, Denise Muhlrads, Patrick K. Gonzales,
609 P.; Fink, M.; Tat, K.; Hager, C.; Davis, J.; Ozeroff, C.; Meyerson, N.; Clark, S.; Fattor, W.;
610 Gilchrist, A.; Barbachano-Guerrero, A.; Worden-Sapper, E.; Wu, S.; Brisson, G.; McQueen, M.;
611 Dowell, R.; Leinwand, L.; Parker, R.; Sawyer, S. Just 2% of SARS-CoV-2-positive individuals
612 carry 90% of the virus circulating in communities. **2021**. Preprint accessed at *medRxiv* doi:
613 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.01.21252250>
- 614 (51) Bjorkman, K.; Saldi, T.; Lasda, E.; Bauer, L.; Kovarik, J.; Gonzales, P.; Fink, M.; Tat, K.; Hager,
615 C.; Davis, J.; Ozeroff, C.; Brisson, G.; Larremore, D.; Leinwand, L.; McQueen, M.; Parker, R.
616 Higher viral load drives infrequent SARS-CoV-2 transmission between asymptomatic residence
617 hall roommates. **2021**. Preprint accessed at *medRxiv* doi:
618 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.09.21253147>
- 619 (52) Yang, Q.; Meyerson, N. R.; Clark, S. K.; Paige, C. L.; Fattor, W. T.; Gilchrist, A. R.; Barbachano-
620 Guerrero, A.; Healy, B. G.; Worden-Sapper, E. R.; Wu, S. S.; Muhlrads, D.; Decker, C. J.; Saldi,
621 T. K.; Lasda, E.; Gonzales, P.; Fink, M. R.; Tat, K. L.; Hager, C. R.; Davis, J. C.; Ozeroff, C. D.;
622 Brisson, G. R.; McQueen, M. B.; Leinwand, L. A.; Parker, R.; Sawyer, S. L. Saliva TwoStep for
623 Rapid Detection of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Carriers. *eLife* **2021**, *10*, e65113.
624 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.65113>.
- 625 (53) Cole, D.; Long, S. C.; Sobsey, M. D. Evaluation of F+ RNA and DNA Coliphages as Source-
626 Specific Indicators of Fecal Contamination in Surface Waters. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2003**,
627 *69* (11), 6507–6514. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.69.11.6507-6514.2003>.
- 628 (54) Boulder County Public Health. *Public Health Order 2020-07 Prohibiting Gatherings Involving*
629 *Persons Aged Between 18 and 22 Years in the City of Boulder and Stay-at-Home for Subject*
630 *Properties*; **2020**; Vol. 2020-07.

- 631 (55) Crits-Christoph, A.; Kantor, R.; Olm, M.; Whitney, O.; Al-Shayeb, B.; Lou, Y.; Flamholz, A.;
632 Kennedy, L.; Greenwald, H.; Hinkle, A.; Hetzel, J.; Spitzer, S.; Koble, J.; Tan, A.; Hyde, F.;
633 Schroth, G.; Kuersten, S.; Banfield, J.; Nelson, K. Genome Sequencing of Sewage Detects
634 Regionally Prevalent SARS-CoV-2 Variant. *mBio* 2021, 12 (1) e02703-20.
635 <http://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.02703-20>
- 636 (56) Shmitz, B.; Innes, G.; Prasek, S.; Betancourt, W.; Stark, E.; Foster, A.; Abraham, G.; Gerba, C.;
637 Pepper, I. Enumerating asymptomatic COVID-19 cases and estimating SARS-CoV-2 fecal
638 shedding rates via wastewater-based epidemiology. **2021**. Preprint accessed at *medRxiv* doi:
639 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.16.21255638>
- 640 (57) Foladori, P; Cutrupi, F; Segata, N; Manara,S; Pinto, F; Malpei, F; Bruni, L; La Rosa, G. SARS-
641 CoV-2 from faeces to wastewater treatment: What do we know? A review. *Science of The Total*
642 *Environment*. **2020**. 743, 140444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140444>.
- 643 (58) Minot, S.; Sinha, R.; Chen, J.; Li, H.; Keilbaugh, S.A.; Wu, G.D.; Lewis, J.D.; Bushman, F.D. The
644 human gut virome: inter-individual variation and dynamic response to diet. *Genome Research*.
645 2011, 21(10), 1616-1625. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.122705.111>.
- 646 (59) Rosario, K.; Symonds, E. M.; Sinigalliano, C.; Stewart, J.; Breitbart, M. Pepper Mild Mottle Virus
647 as an Indicator of Fecal Pollution. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2009**, 75 (22), 7261–7267.
648 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00410-09>.
649




650

651 **Figure 1.** (a) Map of sample locations distributed across the University of Colorado Boulder's campus.


652 (b) Picture of the internal components of the composite autosampler design. (c) Picture of the composite

653 autosampler in operation.



654


655 **Figure 2.** (a) Median SARS-CoV-2 E copies/L wastewater as determined by the SENB+ pipeline. (b)
656 Heatmap displaying the SENB+ SARS-CoV-2 E copies/L on a log scale; grey indicates no detectable
657 amplifications. (c) Per capita average SENB+ SARS-CoV-2 E copies/L over the sampling campaign
658 distributed per sampled wastewater flow, indicating the overall temporal prevalence of SARS-CoV-2
659 within a single structure. (d) Heatmap displaying the ratio of SARS-CoV-2 E copies/L to the human
660 RNaseP copies/L as determined by the SURV1 pipeline on a log scale; grey indicates no detectable
661 amplifications. SARS-CoV-2 N concentrations confirm the displayed trends (**Supplemental Figure 10**).
662 (e) Population served by each sampler. (f) Heatmap displaying the confirmed medical services positives
663 mapped to each sampler. (g) Prevalence, measured by the total number of SARS-CoV-2 infections
664 detected among a population served by a sampler divided by the total number of that population. (h) Sum
665 of confirmed positives per day.



666

667 **Figure 3.** Residency reported (bars) versus SENB+ SARS-CoV-2 E copies/L wastewater (points)

668 detected for the primary (red) and backup (C[Backup Isolation], blue) isolation structures.



669

670 **Figure 4.** Heatmap of the F+ bacteriophage copies/L wastewater detected on a log scale. Darker shades of
671 orange indicate higher concentrations, with grey indicating no detectable amplifications.